

Essex and Southend-on-Sea Replacement Waste Local Plan

Modifications Consultation: Schedule of all representations

March 2017

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Main Modifications | 2 |
| Modification M1 – ‘Waste Challenge at a Glance’ | 2 |
| Modification M2 - Paragraph 5.3 | 25 |
| Modification M3 - Policy 1 ‘Need for Waste Management Facilities’ | 26 |
| Modification M4 - Policy 2 ‘Safeguarding Waste Management Sites and Infrastructure’ | 28 |
| Modification M5 – Policy 3 ‘Strategic Site Allocations’ | 28 |
| Modification M6 – Paragraph 8.10 | 49 |
| Modification M7 – Policy 4 ‘Areas of Search’ | 49 |
| Modification M8 – Policy 5 ‘Enclosed Waste Facilities on Unallocated Sites or Outside Areas of Search’ | 50 |
| Modification M9 – Policy 6 ‘Open Waste Facilities on Unallocated Sites or Outside Areas of Search’ | 55 |
| Modification M10 – Policy 7 ‘Radioactive Waste Management at Bradwell-on-Sea’ | 55 |
| Modification M11 – Policy 9 ‘Waste Disposal Facilities on Unallocated Sites’ | 56 |
| Modification M12 – Paragraph 9.33 | 56 |
| Modification M13 – Policy 10 ‘Development Management Criteria’ | 57 |
| Modification M14 – Policy 12 ‘Transport and Access’ | 58 |
| Modification M15 – Bellhouse Landfill Site | 59 |
| Modification M16 – Little Bullocks and Crumps Farm, Great and Little Canfield | 59 |
| Modification M17 – Morses Lane, Brightlingsea | 62 |
| Modification M18 – Newport Quarry | 94 |
| Modification M19 – Rivenhall | 95 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Modification M20 - Sandon | 106 |
| Modification M21 – Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms..... | 106 |
| Modification M22 – Wivenhoe Quarry Plant Area | 133 |
| Modification M23 – Dollymans Farm..... | 134 |
| Modification M24 – Table 21 Development in Waste Consultation Areas | 300 |
| Modification M25 – Table 21 Development in Waste Consultation Areas | 301 |
| Modification M26 – Oakwood and Crusader Business Park..... | 301 |
| Minor Modifications | 302 |
| Modification M27 – Paragraph 4.11 | 302 |
| Modification M28 – Paragraph 4.12 | 303 |
| Modification M29 – Paragraph 4.16 | 303 |
| Modification M30 – Paragraph 4.24 | 303 |
| Modification M31 - Paragraph 4.25 | 304 |
| Modification M32 – Paragraph 4.26 | 305 |
| Modification M33 – Paragraph 5.2 | 305 |
| Modification M34 – Paragraph 6.6 | 306 |
| Modification M35 – Paragraph 7.1 | 307 |
| Modification M36 – Paragraph 7.2 | 310 |
| Modification M37 – Paragraph 8.7 | 311 |
| Modification M38 – Paragraph 8.15 | 311 |
| Modification M39 – Paragraph 8.23 and 8.26 | 312 |
| Modification M40 – Paragraph 8.32 | 314 |
| Modification M41 – Paragraph 9.21 | 314 |
| Modification M42 – Paragraph 9.23 | 314 |
| Modification M43 – Paragraph 9.44 | 314 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Modification M44 – Table 6 Monitoring Framework | 315 |
| Modification M45 – Basildon Waste Recycling Centre | 315 |
| Modification M46 - Rivenhall | 315 |
| Modification M47 – Little Bullocks and Crumps Farm, Great and Little Canfield and Newport Quarry | 328 |
| Modification M48 – Festival Business Park, Basildon | 328 |
| Modification M49 – Land off Axial Way, Myland, Colchester | 329 |
| Modification M50 – Tollgate, Stanway, Colchester | 329 |
| Modification M51 – Langston Road/Oakwood Hill, Loughton, Epping Forest | 329 |
| Modification M52 – Glossary ‘Residual Waste’ | 330 |
| Modification M53 – Glossary ‘Water Bodies’ | 331 |
| Unrelated Representations | 331 |
| MC2 – Site Assessment and Methodology Report Addendum | 341 |
| MC3 – Sustainability Appraisal Addendum | 352 |

Introduction

This document sets out representations received during the modifications consultation period on the Replacement Waste Local Plan. Consultation took place between 5 January and 16 February 2017 with representations relating to:

- MC1 Schedule of Modifications
- MC2 Site Assessment and Methodology Addendum
- MC3 Sustainability Appraisal Addendum

Copies of all documentation were available online via www.essex.gov.uk/WLP and www.southend.gov.uk/wastelocalplan. Paper copies of the Schedule of Modifications were available at County Hall in Chelmsford, at the Civic Centre in Southend and at Essex and Southend libraries and district/borough/city council offices.

In total 372 consultees submitted 553 responses.

All representations received are set out in this report in Plan order.

Representations relating to site allocations are at the end of the report and displayed in the order shown in Policy 3 of the RWLP

Appendix 1 of this document contains all attachments submitted alongside representations, including maps and other information.

This document was submitted to the Inspector on Monday 20 March 2017.

Main Modifications

Modification M1 – ‘Waste Challenge at a Glance’

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 985065, 44 | No | <p>As things stand this specifically allocates Rivenhall (as the only relevant consented plant in the plan area) to take imported London waste for incineration but without any clear justification. At present, the waste disposal authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the plan area. (Deleted - a competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the plan area). In line with the plans strategy for the plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the plan area in the longer term. Same comments as for mods 3 and 5. In addition, why was the reference to a competitive tender process deleted? The original wording is legally compliant, whereas the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned material is legally questionable.</p> | |
| 1057927, Hayleys Padfield Ltd, 63 | No | <p>It is noted in Appendix A that the Plan now identifies a shortfall of some 7.05mt of inert waste capacity which will need to be managed over the plan period. This is an increase of some 4.47mt over that originally identified in the Local Plan submitted for examination in public. We welcome the up-to-date figures as they provide a far more accurate picture of the inert waste</p> | <p>In order to ensure that that the statement since no other submitted sites have been deemed suitable for the management of inert waste in the Plan area is correct and the Plan is sound sound/legally compliant, Green Belt sites need to be reassessed</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>capacity required for the plan period. It has however, as set out above, resulted in a significant increase in unmet capacity which isn't being provided for through site allocations. Appendix 1 however suggests that no other submitted sites have been deemed suitable for the management of inert waste. In our view this statement is incorrect. The inspector recommended a number of modifications which were deemed necessary to make the plan sound/legally compliant and appropriate for adoption. One such recommendation was that discounting a site purely on the grounds that it is situated in the Green Belt renders the plan unsound. The inspectors recommendations in relation to Dollymans Farm and its subsequent allocation in our view, is a clear steer that other sites discounted purely because of their location in the Green Belt should also be reconsidered. As set out within paragraph 6 of the NPPW, local authorities should work collaboratively with local planning authorities and first look for suitable sites and areas outside the Green Belt for waste management facilities that, if located in the Green Belt, would be inappropriate development. There is now an identified need for 7.05mt of inert waste capacity over the plan period and Essex County Council has not identified enough sites for inert waste disposal to meet the calculated demand over the plan period, with an increased shortfall of 4.47mt. Therefore in accordance with paragraph 6 of the NPPW and paragraph 83 of the NPPF, sites within the Green Belt should be considered to meet the shortfall in need. The methodology of Site Assessment and Selection Report states that stage 2 introduces a sequential approach whereby sites that are in the green belt or score red for traffic and transportation are held back (unless there are</p> | <p>for allocation.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>exceptional circumstances). Rather than being excluded completely such as at Stage 1, sites in the green belt or that do not comply with transport policy would only be considered for allocation if, after the rest of the assessment had been carried out through Stage 3, insufficient sites that passed Stage 2 were suitable for meeting the capacity gap associated with a particular waste stream. . Despite this statement which is in line with the NPPF and NPPW guidance set out above, the increase in shortfall and the inspectors observations, Essex County Council continues to take a blanket approach to rejecting all landfill/inert waste disposal sites within the Green Belt, regardless of other sustainability factors, with only Dollymans Farm being allocated in response to concerns raised by the inspector in relation to that specific site. Furthermore the blanket approach has resulted in a lack of waste facilities and in particular inert waste recycling facilities in the south of the County. As a result the plan is not in accordance with the three dimensions of sustainable development, namely economic, social and environmental. In particular it will result in long journeys within and out of the County to dispose of waste. Especially given that it is the southern part of the county which is the most populated. As a result there is a strong and over reliance on inert waste sites in the North of Essex and a long distance in sustainability terms from Harlow, which does not accord with the Spatial Strategy. The Spatial Strategy specifically sets out that new waste developments should principally be directed to key urban centres including Harlow. An example of a site which should be reconsidered to ensure that the statement since no other submitted sites have been deemed suitable for the management</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>of inert waste in the Plan area is correct and the Plan is sound plan sound/legally compliant is Hastingwood, Harlow (W19). This 1.35 hectare Green Belt site was submitted by the landowner for consideration for either inert or non-inert waste recycling. The extent of the site proposed resulted from discussions with Essex County Council and is currently made up of 0.96 hectares of previously developed land and 0.39 hectares of agricultural land. At the time of submission the majority of the site had been used for many years for the storing, sorting and recycling of aggregates, albeit without the benefit of planning permission. Since that time the landowner has successfully acquired a Certificate of Lawful Use for the site to be used for the storage, screening and distribution of recycled of road planning (and use of associated plant and equipment) (LPA Ref: ESS/39/EPF). The majority of the site can therefore now be described as previously developed land which in our view is now a material consideration in favour of its allocation. The site was discounted on the grounds that it was situated in the Green Belt. However, it scored very well in the sustainability appraisal with benefits of allocating the site including its location is a very sustainable location in close proximity to Harlow which is an area of the County that does not have any inert waste disposal facilities; t location next to Junction 7 of the M11, a major transport corridor; the significant distance of the site from residential properties; and the low quality nature of the Green belt land particularly given that over 2/3 of its previously developed land.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|---|---|---|
| 1060507, Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee, 86 | No | <p>Currently Rivenhall is allocated as the only consented plant in the plan area to take waste imported from London. However it fails to state any clear justification. At present, the waste disposal authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the plan area. (Deleted - a competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the plan area). In line with the plans strategy for the plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the plan area in the longer term. Please see comments above for mods 3 & 5. It is also noted that the reference to a competitive tender process was deleted? Why was this? The original wording is legally compliant, whereas the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned material is legally questionable.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 477311, , 95 | No | <p>Appendix 1 para 4.21 introduces post 2026 importation of residues from London to be incinerated in the Plan area for energy recovery at consented plant. As things stand this specifically allocates Rivenhall (as the only relevant consented plant in the plan area) to take imported London waste for incineration but without any clear justification. This raises questions over additional HGV movements to and from the plant. At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term. It does not provide clarity. The plan should make it clear that this material (originally called other waste) is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) SRF/RDF because the allocation is a specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant to be trucked to the proposed (but not built) Rivenhall site. It is not clear that this is legally compliant. ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take the known SRF/RDF output from the Basildon plant. This output is legally owned by ECC as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>material it legally owns to a specific site. ECC is aware that gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material owned by ECC. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex county council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However even that assumption should now be questioned given that the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate bat (best available technology). ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence, for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management (previously "other waste ") as ECC states it wishes to do. In addition, why was the reference to a competitive tender process deleted? The original wording is legally compliant, whereas the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned material is legally questionable.</p> | |
| 1053830, , 104 | No | Appendix 1 para 4.21'...competitive tender processes should not | Appendix 1 para 4.21 Leave text unchanged or |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | be removed. This is required to be legal. Why remove. | modify to be legally compliant. |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 128 | No | Object to principle of M23 (see M23 for reasoning), which is cross referenced in M1, but if it Inspector is minded to approve M23; the Council accepts that the figures would need to change. | |
| 1061659, , 182 | No | As things stand this specifically allocates Rivenhall (as the only relevant consented plant in the plan area) to take imported London waste for incineration but without any clear justification. At present, the waste disposal authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco park facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the plan area. (Deleted - a competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the plan area). In line with the plans strategy for the plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the plan area in the longer term. Same comments as for mods 3 and 5. In addition, why was the reference to a competitive tender process deleted? The original wording is legally compliant, whereas the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned material is legally questionable. | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1061682, , 199 | No | <p>At the moment this point specifically allocates Rivenhall as the only relevant and consented plant in this area, to take imported London waste for incineration but without justification. At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term. The reference to a competitive tender process was deleted? Why? This would therefore question that the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned waste is legal. This does not clearly define what exactly "other waste" actually is. It should be made clear that the 200,000 tonnes of waste per year will be SRF/RDF as this has been allocated from the Basildon plant to be driven down to the Rivenhall site. This site has and may not still be built and is adds additional pollution. It is still unclear if this is even legally allowed. Essex County Council are proposing to allocate the Rivenhall site which as stated above has not even been built or received a permit, to take the SRF/RDF waste from Basildon which coincidentally is owned by ECC as was stated in the operational contract for the plant. It would therefore appear that ECC are allocating their own waste to a specific site. ECC are also aware that the applicant for the site at Rivenhall, Gent</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>Fairhead has stated in their planning documentation that the site at Rivenhall will take the output from the Basildon site. This is not only confusing the planning and procurement by doing this; it is also a conflict of interests I feel. This should therefore be amended so that the waste material should go through an open procurement process and not all be pushed towards an already environmentally unsound plant. Just to boost their figures. ECC had delayed the procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon to allow further sites to come forward, yet have still allocated Rivenhall to take all the waste knowing that this site would be the only one able to take the waste in the time frame. In view of the recent environmental agency permit refusal and the sites failure to demonstrate BAT, their assumption should be questioned as the plant has not been built and has not licence in which to enable a contract between the companies to take the waste.</p> | |
| 1061711, Goslings Granary, 206 | No | <p>The following deleted words should be reinstated: - "A competitive tender process will identify the long term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area." The justification for the above wording being reinstated is in order to make the Plan legally compliant. The future treatment/disposal of the stabilised residual output from the Tovi Eco Park Facility at Basildon is the financial responsibility of Essex County Council who in seeking to let a contract for the further waste management processing of this waste have a legal duty pursuant to the Public Procurement Regulations and Public Contracts Regulations to seek tenders for such further processing in order to demonstrate that they</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>have achieved best value for money which is fundamental to all public sector procurement. The next sentence should be amended to read " However in line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to waste management, where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which if it secures all necessary further planning permission and an Environmental Permit and the owners are successful in tendering for a contract from Essex County Council for waste management it may have capacity to manage the residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term" The reason for this proposed change is to be 'effective' and 'positively' prepared the Plan must reflect the best available data. The proposed IWMF at Rivenhall was refused an Environmental Permit in December 2016 and in order to meet best available technology requirements will need planning permission for a much taller chimney which will be highly contentious and will also need an Environmental Permit. A further sentence should then be added "Other more appropriately located enclosed waste management facilities may come forward on presently unallocated sites or within or outside present areas of search in accordance with Policy 5 as amended." The justification for these changes is to reflect Policy 5 in the Plan.</p> | |
| 1059617, , 220 | No | <p>I believe that the following deleted words should be reinstated: - "A competitive tender process will identify the long term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area." The above wording needs to be reinstated in order to make the Plan legally compliant. The future treatment/disposal of the stabilised</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>residual output from the Tovi Eco Park Facility at Basildon is the responsibility of Essex County Council who have a legal duty to the Public Procurement Regulations and Public Contracts Regulations to look for tenders for such further processing in order to demonstrate that they have found the best deal which is fundamental to all public sector procurement. . The next sentence needs amending to state" However in line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to waste management, where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which if it secures all necessary further planning permission and an Environmental Permit and the owners are successful in tendering for a contract from Essex County Council for waste management it may have capacity to manage the residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term". The reason for this proposed change is to be 'effective' and 'positively' prepared the Plan must reflect the best available data. The proposed IWMP at Rivenhall was refused an Environmental Permit in December 2016 will need planning permission for a much taller chimney and will also need an Environmental Permit.</p> | |
| 1059617, , 228 | No | <p>Appendix 1 para 4.21 introduces post 2026 importation of residues from London to be incinerated in the Plan area for energy recovery at consented plant. This specifically allocates Rivenhall to take imported waste which is against Policy 12 Transport and Access of the Plan and is without any clear justification.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|---|---|---|
| 988283, Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council, 236 | No | <p>As things stand this specifically allocates Rivenhall (as the only relevant consented plant in the plan area) to take imported London waste for incineration but without any clear justification. This raises questions over additional HGV movements to and from the plant which have not been indicated. At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term. We repeat our comments as above for modifications 3 and 5. In addition, why was the reference to a competitive tender process deleted? The original wording is legally compliant, whereas the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned material is legally questionable.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1062089, Coggeshall Parish Council, 329 | No | <p>This specifically allocates Rivenhall (as the only relevant consented plant in the plan area) to take imported London waste for incineration but without any clear justification. At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with respect to its own waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term. In addition, the plan as written cannot support the net self-sufficiency with along waste journey as described as it continues to move waste significant distance throughout the county. Little effort was made to provide consolidation points for smaller sorting of waste as opposed to moving waste to large sorting centres with multiple journeys in addition, please can the review explain why was the reference to a competitive tender process deleted ? We believe the original wording is legally compliant, whereas the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned material is legally questionable. This modification does not provide the intended clarity. We believe the plan should make it clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) SRF/RDF because the allocation is specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant to be trucked to the proposed (but not built) Rivenhall site. One of the key aspects of</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>the review is to ensure legal compliance and we do not believe that is legally compliant. It appears that ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take output from the Basildon plant. This output is known to be SRF/RDF which ECC legally owns as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. ECC appears to be allocating material it legally owns to a specific private facility without any adherence to their procurement processes and procedures or those associated with the provision of government contracts. This could, clearly, be interpreted as meaning that agreement has been reached between ECC and Gent Fairhead without either the proper planning or procurement procedures being followed. This would be ultra vires the Councils powers and shows a level of pre-determination. ECC is aware that Gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site, has specifically stated in their planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. We believe the plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex County Council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process in the knowledge that only Rivenhall in the plan area and could be used in the stated time horizon. In addition, the inclusion of Rivenhall should now be questioned given that the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>December 2016. The refusal was because of the applicants failure to utilise the Best Available Technology (BAT), air quality emissions with predicted emissions more than twice the legal limits and the stack height that is too low for a plant of this size (changes will contravene the Secretary of State planning conditions 2010). Consequently, we believe that ECC is clearly attempting to allocate waste material it owns (SRF Form Basildon) to a plant that has not been built, has no operating licence, will require significant redesign, gas dispersion remodelling, an environmental impact assessment and must go through the planning process again before it is even possible to consider processing waste and this does not appear sensible, never mind legal. Consequently, we require an explanation as to why ECC is allocating a plant (Rivenhall) that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it (ECC) owns? In addition, the applicants own response to the EA (Fitchner Report in response to second schedule 5 questions from the EA section 2) clearly stated that if the EA permit was refused the plant would not go ahead and given the above allocating waste to the plant is at best irresponsible. Furthermore, and importantly the plan does not consider any alternatives should the Rivenhall plant may not survive the next round of planning or the next EA permit application and as such the plan must be revisited in light of the accreditation problems the Rivenhall plant faces. We also believe that, MAP 5 is incorrect insomuch as it fails to allocate Rivenhall for "residual non-hazardous waste management" as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1062112, , 336 | No | This change refers only to Rivenhall Airfield as that is the only consented plant that could burn the waste in the plan area. Please explain why Rivenhall Airfield site should accept London waste? | |
| 1062747, , 399 | No | We are however disappointed that although Essex aims to be net self-sufficient by the end of the Plan, we now understand that it will still import waste from greater London, so require the County to process and provide landfill We do not consider sufficient weight has been given to the various forms of waste arising from projected Local Plans and associated infrastructure considerations. | |
| 743809, , 466 | No | As things stand, this paragraph specifically allocates Rivenhall (as the only relevant consented plant in the plan area) to take imported London waste for incineration but without any clear justification. At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term. Why was the reference to a competitive tender process deleted? Can ECC explain/give justificati0n? The | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>original wording is legally compliant, whereas the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned material is legally questionable. This does not provide clarity. The plan should make it clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) SRF/RDF because the allocation is the specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant - to be trucked to the proposed (but not yet built) Rivenhall site. It is not clear whether this is legally compliant. ECC wants to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take output from the ECC Basildon plant. This output is known to be SRF/RDF which ECC legally owns (as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant). Therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific privately owned site. ECC is aware that gent Fairhead, (applicant for the Rivenhall site) has specifically stated in its planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. Amend the plan : ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. Such material should by law be subject to an open procurement process by ECC. ECC has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but ECC has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. Even that assumption should now be questioned please. Note 1: the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site (December 2016) because of the failure to</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>demonstrate bat. Note 2: as the site does not have full planning consents nor a licence to operate and though not to be directly considered here, i would call the inspectors attention to the planned short stack. Yet would not current technical knowledge have dictated long ago that a much higher stack would be necessary for such an undertaking? This is also further compounded by the water processing cycle situation. On the part of ECC, it would appear that it is therefore attempting to allocate a private plant (at Rivenhall) that has not yet been built (and is still going through planning). Importantly, ECC has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. Map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for "residual non-hazardous waste management" as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |
| 1063344, , 474 | No | <p>As things stand this specifically allocates Rivenhall (as the only relevant consented plant in the plan area) to take imported London waste for incineration but without any clear justification. At present, the waste disposal authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term. This does not seem to be legally compliant as ECC is planning</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>to allocate material from the Basildon plant, which it owns to the proposed Rivenhall facility whereas the allocation of material owned by ECC should be subject to an open procurement process. The plan should be amended to ensure there is no single allocation, for this specific material . Essex county council stated that it postponed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a several years so that further sites could come into operation yet has allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process in the knowledge that Rivenhall would be the only site in the plan area available in the stated time horizon. Even that assumption should be questioned since the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 due to the failure to demonstrate bat. ECC is thus trying to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management as ECC states it wishes to do. In addition, why was the reference to a competitive tender process deleted? The original wording is legally compliant, whereas the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned material is legally questionable.</p> | |
| 746050, Rivenhall Parish Council, 480 | No | <p>The Parish Council would submit there is neither clarity nor justification as to why the Rivenhall site should take London waste post 2026. As things stand the change clearly refers only to Rivenhall as that is the only consented plant (albeit that the consent is incomplete) in the Plan area.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 618724, , 513 | No | <p>As things stand this specifically allocates Rivenhall (as the only relevant consented plant in the plan area) to take imported London waste for incineration but without any clear justification. In addition, why was the reference to a competitive tender process deleted? The original wording is legally compliant, whereas the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned material is legally questionable. This does not provide clarity. The plan should make it clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) SRF/RDF. The waste is specifically a known output from the operational Basildon plant allocated to the proposed (but not built) Rivenhall site. The proposed text is an improvement on the vague other waste previously proposed but still does not properly define the material. It is not clear that this is legally compliant. ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF output from the Basildon plant. This output is waste material which ECC legally owns - as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific private site. ECC is also aware that gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex county council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but has</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However even that assumption could now be questioned given that the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate bat. ECC is therefore attempting to allocate its own waste to a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence, and has delayed its procurement tender process in order in part in the hope that Rivenhall will be built. How is that legally compliant? In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |
| 911132, Cressing Parish Council, 523 | No | <p>Currently, this specifically allocates Rivenhall (as the only relevant consented plant in the plan area) to take imported London waste for incineration but without any clear justification. This raises questions over additional HGV movements to and from the plant. At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term. In addition, the reference to a competitive tender process appears to have been deleted. The original wording is legally compliant, whereas the allocation of Rivenhall to take ECC owned material is legally questionable. This does not provide clarity. The plan should be clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF because the allocation is a specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant to be trucked to the proposed Rivenhall site. It is not clear that this is legally compliant. It is proposed to allocate the proposed private site at Rivenhall to take the known SRF/RDF output from the Basildon plant. This output is legally owned by ECC as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore planning and procurement appears to be confused by allocating material ECC legally owns to a specific site. The applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that the Basildon output can be sent to the Rivenhall site. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material owned by ECC. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. ECC has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-board but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However that assumption should now be questioned given that the Environment Agency refused the permit</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M1? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate BAT (best available technology). ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence, for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management (previously "other waste") as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |

Modification M2 - Paragraph 5.3

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M2? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 1062747, 400 | No | <p>Future generations may not think you have given sufficient consideration to the suitability of the geology for the storage of hazardous and/or radioactive materials.</p> | |

Modification M3 - Policy 1 'Need for Waste Management Facilities'

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M3? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|---|--|---|
| 985065, 39 | No | This is not clear! The term 'other waste' is totally vague - it should be made clear that this material is the 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF - because you know that this is the output from the operational Basildon plant - that would have to be brought in by lorry to the proposed (but not built) Rivenhall site. | |
| 983638, 62 | No | There is no clarity provided to indicate what this 'other waste' is. It is, in fact, 200,000 tonnes per annum of SRF/RDF from the Basildon plant, which ECC wants to send to the proposed site at Rivenhall Airfield. This should be clearly stated. | |
| 1060507, Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee, 81 | No | THE PLAN SHOULD CLARIFY THAT THIS MATERIAL IS 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF. THIS IS KNOWN TO BE OUTPUT FROM THE OPERATION BASILDON SITE WHICH WILL BE SENT VIA ROAD TO THE PROPOSED SITE AT RIVENHALL. | |
| 477311, 90 | No | IT DOES NOT PROVIDE CLARITY. THE PLAN SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THIS MATERIAL (ORIGINALLY CALLED OTHER WASTE) IS 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF BECAUSE THE ALLOCATION IS A SPECIFICALLY KNOWN OUTPUT FROM THE OPERATIONAL BASILDON PLANT TO BE TRUCKED TO THE PROPOSED (BUT NOT BUILT) RIVENHALL SITE. | |
| 1061659, 175 | No | IT DOES NOT CLEAR DETAIL THE PLAN SHOULD MAKE IT PLAIN and CLEAR THAT THIS MATERIAL IS 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF BECAUSE THE ALLOCATION IS SPECIFICALLY KNOWN OUTPUT FROM THE OPERATIONAL BASILDON PLANT TO BE TRUCKED TO THE PROPOSED (BUT NOT BUILT) RIVENHALL SITE. | |
| 1061682, 193 | No | This does not clearly define what exactly "other waste" actually is. It should be made clear that the 200,000 tonnes of waste per year will be SRF/RDF as this has been allocated from the Basildon plant to be driven down to the Rivenhall site. This site | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M3? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | has and may not still be built and is adds additional pollution. | |
| 1059617, 223 | No | I object to this as it doesn't provide any clarity. The plan should be clear that this is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) SRF/RDF as this is specifically known output from the operational plant to be transported 38miles along already over capacity a120 to the proposed but not built and no environmental permit Rivenhall site. | |
| 988283, Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council, 231 | No | It does not provide clarity. The plan should make it clear that this material (originally called other waste) is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) SRF/RDF because the allocation is a specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant to be trucked to the proposed (but not built) Rivenhall site. | |
| 1062089, Coggeshall Parish Council, 323 | No | This modification does not provide the intended clarity. We believe the plan should make it clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) SRF/RDF because the allocation is specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant to be trucked to the proposed (but not built) Rivenhall site. | |
| 743809, 453 | No | This does not provide clarity. The plan should make it clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) SRF/RDF because the allocation is the specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant - to be trucked to the proposed (but not yet built) Rivenhall site. | |
| 746050, Rivenhall Parish Council, 478 | No | The change fails to provide clarity. The Plan should instead make it clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum of the output from the Basildon plant which is a specific waste type (SRF/RDF). | |
| 618724, 508 | No | This does not provide clarity. The plan should make it clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) SRF/RDF. The waste is specifically a known output from the operational Basildon plant allocated to the proposed (but not built) Rivenhall site. The proposed text is an improvement on the vague other waste previously proposed but still does not properly define the | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M3? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | material. | |
| 911132, Cressing Parish Council, 518 | No | This does not provide clarity. The plan should be clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF because the allocation is a specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant to be trucked to the proposed Rivenhall site. | |

Modification M4 - Policy 2 'Safeguarding Waste Management Sites and Infrastructure'

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M4? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1062913, Anglian Water, 443 | Yes | Anglian Water is in support of MAIN 4 Policy 2. | However, the text refers to WTC, this should be WRC (Water Recycling Centre) |

Modification M5 – Policy 3 'Strategic Site Allocations'

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 985065, 40 | No | Is this legally compliant? Essex County Council is proposing that an unbuilt (and not yet fully approved) private site at Rivenhall, take output from the Basildon plant. This output is known to be (TPA) SRF/RDF which Essex County Council legally owns, as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore, ECC appears to be disregarding the planning process that the Rivenhall site is engaged in, and jumping ahead to name the Rivenhall site as the one that will receive Basildon's output. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>allocation made for this specific material. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an OPEN PROCUREMENT PROCESS. ECC has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RED from Basildon ahead of that procurement process, knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However, even that assumption should now be questioned, given that the Environment Agency has refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site (in December 2019) because of their failure to demonstrate Best Available Technology (BAT). ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that HAS NOT BEEN BUILT, IS STILL GOING THROUGH PLANNING, AND HAS NO LICENCE for a potential contract to take waste material that it owns. IN ADDITION, MAP 5 FAILS TO ALLOCATE RIVENHALL FOR RESIDUAL NON-HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT AS ECC STATES IT WISHES TO DO.</p> | |
| 1059617, 54 | No | <p>I disagree with the proposed appendix 4 policy 3 clause 3 updates "other waste management" to IWMF2 (Rivenhall airfield). ECC are proposing to allocate the proposed (not built) private site at Rivenhall to take output from the Basildon plant which ECC legally own as stated in the operational contract from the Basildon plant. ECC are confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific site. Agent Fairhead the applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning applications submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. The legality of this seems very questionable?</p> | <p>The plan should be changed to ensure that there is no one specific allocation made for this specific material and that the correct open procurement process is taken, especially as the Rivenhall sites environmental permit was refused in December 2016. ECC are trying to allocate a site that has not been built and is still going through the planning process and has no license for a potential contact to take waste material that it owns. Map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> |
| 984614, 58 | No | <p>This may not be legal. ECC is proposing that waste from the Basildon plant be allocated to Rivenhall which is yet to be constructed. This output is known to be SRF/RDF which ECC legally owns as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. It appears that ECC is allocating material it owns to a specific site thus confusing the planning and procurement process. ECC is aware that Gent Fairhead has, in planning</p> | <p>The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for the waste material. It is a requirement in law that waste material should be subject to an open procurement process. ECC has stated that it delayed for a year its final procurement process for the Basildon SRF/RDF allowing further sites to become operation and yet</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | documents submitted to ECC made specific reference to the Basildon output and that it is to be sent to Rivenhall | has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take it ahead of that procurement process. This was done with the knowledge that only Rivenhall could be used in the stated time horizon. In light of the December 2016 decision by the Environmental Agency to refuse an operating licence this assumption should now be questioned. ECC is therefore attempting to allocate waste material it owns to a plant that has not been built, is still going through planning amendments and furthermore has no licence to operate |
| 1057927, Hayleys Padfield Ltd, 64 | No | The inspector recommended a number of modifications which were deemed necessary to make the plan sound/legally compliant and appropriate for adoption. One such recommendation was that discounting a site purely on the grounds that it is situated in the Green Belt renders the plan unsound. The inspectors recommendations in relation to Dollymans Farm and its subsequent allocation in our view, is a clear steer that other sites discounted purely because of their location in the Green Belt should also be reconsidered. As set out within paragraph 6 of the NPPW, local authorities should work collaboratively with local planning authorities and first look for suitable sites and areas outside the Green Belt for waste management facilities that, if located in the Green Belt, would be inappropriate development. There is now an identified need for 7.05mt of inert waste capacity over the plan period and Essex County Council has not identified enough sites for inert waste disposal to meet the calculated demand over the plan period, with an increased shortfall of 4.47mt. Therefore in accordance with paragraph 6 of the NPPW and paragraph 83 of the NPPF, sites within the Green Belt should be considered to meet the shortfall in need. The methodology of Site Assessment and Selection Report states that Stage 2 introduces a sequential approach whereby sites that are in the green belt or score red for traffic and transportation are held back | Allocate Hastingwood, Harlow (W19) as an inert waste recycling site, add to Appendix 4, Policy 3, Clause 2 (Inert Waste Recycling) and add table to Appendix 18 accordingly. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>(unless there are exceptional circumstances). Rather than being excluded completely such as at Stage 1, sites in the green belt or that do not comply with transport policy would only be considered for allocation if, after the rest of the assessment had been carried out through Stage 3, insufficient sites that passed Stage 2 were suitable for meeting the capacity gap associated with a particular waste stream. . Despite this statement which is in line with the NPPF and NPPW guidance set out above, the increase in shortfall and the inspectors observations, Essex County Council continues to take a blanket approach to rejecting all landfill/inert waste disposal sites within the Green Belt, regardless of other sustainability factors, with only Dollymans Farm being allocated in response to concerns raised by the inspector in relation to that specific site. Furthermore the blanket approach has resulted in a lack of waste facilities and in particular inert waste recycling facilities in the south of the County. As a result the plan is not in accordance with the three dimensions of sustainable development, namely economic, social and environmental. In particular it will result in long journeys within and out of the County to dispose of waste. Especially given that it is the southern part of the county which is the most populated. As a result there is a strong and over reliance on inert waste sites in the North of Essex and a long distance in sustainability terms from Harlow, which does not accord with the Spatial Strategy. The Spatial Strategy specifically sets out that new waste developments should principally be directed to key urban centres including Harlow. An example of a site which should be allocated in the Plan to ensure it is sound/legally compliant is Hastingwood, Harlow (W19). This 1.35 hectare Green Belt site was submitted by the landowner for consideration for either inert or non-inert waste recycling and was discounted, like Dollymans Farm, purely on the grounds of its location in the Green Belt. It is currently made up of 0.96 hectares of previously developed land and 0.39 hectares of agricultural land. At the time of submission the majority of the site had been</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>used for many years for the storing, sorting and recycling of aggregates, albeit without the benefit of planning permission. Since that time the landowner has successfully acquired a Certificate of Lawful Use for the site to be used for the storage, screening and distribution of recycled of road plantings (and use of associated plant and equipment) (LPA Ref: ESS/39/EPF). The majority of the site can therefore now be described as previously developed land which in our view is now a material consideration in favour of its allocation. The site was discounted on the grounds that it was situated in the Green Belt. However, it scored very well in the sustainability appraisal with benefits of allocating the site including its location is a very sustainable location in close proximity to Harlow which is an area of the County that does not have any inert waste disposal facilities; it's location next to Junction 7 of the M11, a major transport corridor; the significant distance of the site from residential properties; and the low quality nature of the Green belt land particularly given that over 2/3 of it is previously developed land.</p> | |
| 983638, 66 | No | <p>ECC legally owns SRF/RDF waste at the Basildon site, which it is proposing to remove from the Basildon plant and allocate to a specific site, namely the proposed, private site at Rivenhall Airfield. The applicant for the Rivenhall site, Gent Fairhead, has stated in documents submitted to ECC that the Basildon SRF/RDF waste can be sent to their Rivenhall site. Therefore, I do not believe that this modification is legally compliant. This plan needs to be amended, so that there is not one single allocation available for this ECC owned waste. Although ECC delayed its final procurement process for the SRF/RDF from Basildon for several years, to allow for further sites to be considered, it has still allocated Rivenhall to take this waste, prior to any other potential sites being identified. If the purpose for this is to allow the process to be completed within specified time frames, this may not</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | happen, due to the fact that the Environmental Agency has refused the Rivenhall site a permit, due to its failure to demonstrate BAT. This means that ECC is trying to allocate a plant that has no licence, and may never be built, for a contract to take ECC owned waste. Also, ECC has stated that it wants the Rivenhall site to take 'residual non-hazardous waste', but this is not stated on MAP 5. | |
| 487944, Rochford District Council, 79 | No | The Council would also like to point out that the location of Dollymans Farm on Map 5: Strategic Site Allocations is not identified correctly; it is located further to the south east nearer the Fair Glen junction. | |
| 1060507, Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee, 82 | No | It is not obvious that this modification is legal. Essex county council proposes to assign the proposed, private, Rivenhall site to take output from the plant in Basildon. This output is known to be SRF/RDF and owned by ECC as set out in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. ECC is therefore confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific site. ECC is aware that the applicant for the Rivenhall site, gent Fairhead, has unambiguously stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. No single allocation should be made for this specific material. The plan should be amended to reflect this. By law this waste material should be subject to an open procurement process. ECC has said that its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon has been delayed for a few years to allow further sites to become available. However, it has nonetheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon in advance of that procurement process in the knowledge that only Rivenhall could be used in the stated time scale in the area covered by this plan. This assumption should now be questioned given that the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 due to the failure to demonstrate bat. ECC is therefore attempting to allocate an unbuilt plant which is still going through | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | the planning process to take output from the Basildon plant. In addition ECC has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. ECC states that Rivenhall should be allocated for residual non-hazardous waste management. Map 5 does not allocate the riven hall site for this use. | |
| 477311, 91 | No | It is not clear that this is legally compliant. ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take the known SRF/RDF output from the Basildon plant. This output is legally owned by ECC as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific site. ECC is aware that gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material owned by ECC. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex county council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However even that assumption should now be questioned given that the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate bat (best available technology). ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence, for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management (previously "other waste ") as ECC states it wishes to do. | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 477311, 96 | No | <p>There is one relevant consented plant in the plan area and that is Rivenhall. The heat produced will not be supplied to a district heat network. It would only be used within the plant itself and so it is not clear how this could be described as a commercial or industrial user in the sense of having some separation.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is a question over the CHP status of the plant (see mod 19 comments). Following the s73 changes, will heat have to be vented and therefore wasted? If Rivenhall is no longer CHP, the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are not justified.</p> | |
| 1060687, 102 | No | <p>It is unclear whether this is legally compliant. ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take output from the Basildon plant. This output is known to be SRF/RDF which ECC legally owns as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific site. ECC is aware that Gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent.</p> | <p>I believe the plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex county council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for srf/rdf from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the srf/rdf from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However even that assumption should now be questioned given that the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate bat. ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> |
| 1053830, 103 | No | <p>There is a conflict here about ownership by ECC of the Basildon waste and the allocation of this waste to the unbuilt private Rivenhall site. Rivenhall is not owned by ECC and Gent Fairhead</p> | <p>Amend to indicate that no single site is allocated to this specific waste output from the Basildon site. The waste must be allocated on a legal tender</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | the owners of Rivenhall would have to tender for this waste in a competitive environment. The Rivenhall site does not currently have an Environment Licence or therefore a valid planning permission consummate with running the site to manage any waste. Given the ECC timelines only Rivenhall has an opportunity to bid for this waste. Therefore there is a clear conflict here with regards to procurement and planning. | system. ECC should be looking for other destinations for this waste as Rivenhall is not with a valid Environment Licence and its planning permission, pushed through by ECC, and does not show Best Available Technology. ECC should revisit the timelines for allocating this waste and its designation so that all other competitors other than the Rivenhall site are not excluded. |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 129 | Yes | Support change to Clause 1 as this is a factual update to the name of Basildon Waste Water Treatment Works. | |
| 1061522, 145 | No | I question the legality of this and believe Essex County Council has prejudged the outcome. Furthermore, the base of the ECC support for the proposal has been undermined by the Environment Agency refusing a permit (Dec 2016) thus indicating poor decision making at ECC. | Amend to indicate that no single site is allocated to this specific waste output from the Basildon site. The waste must be allocated on a legal tender system. ECC should be looking for other destinations for this waste as Rivenhall is not with a valid Environment Licence and its planning permission, pushed through by ECC, and does not show Best Available Technology. ECC should revisit the timelines for allocating this waste and its designation so that all other competitors other than the Rivenhall site are not excluded. |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 149 | No | Clause 4 - Object to principle of Modification 23, but if Inspector is minded to approve accept that Clause 4 would need to change. | Remove Dollymans Farm from the Waste Local Plan as a waste development/land use allocation. |
| 1061574, 155 | No | Essex County Council is proposing that output from the Basildon site - potentially 200,000 tons per annum, the equivalent of 5264 x 38 ton truckloads - is transported by road to Rivenhall. This is not environmentally sustainable. The proposed site at Rivenhall has been refused a licence to operate by The Environment Agency and although the developer is proposing to seek an | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>appeal of this decision, it will involve new plans to vary the height of the stack - maybe 60m higher than already approved. I cannot see how this is either legal, because of the lack of any due procurement process, nor, given the unbuilt nature of the intended facility of this waste material, is a viable way to proceed.</p> | |
| 923503, A H Philpot & Sons, 168 | Yes | <p>Modification 5, which consists of a change to Policy 3 to allocate Dollymans Farm, Basildon/Rochford (L(i)16) for inert landfill is strongly supported in planning terms. As discussed in detail at the Examination in Public, Dollymans Farm represents a suitable and sustainable site allocation within the Development Plan. Its allocation is required in order for the plan to be considered to be sound as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. In this regard the land at Dollymans Farm benefits from being ideally located in very close proximity to the urban centres of Basildon, Wickford and Rayleigh. It is on a main transport corridor (the A130). Therefore allocation of this land for an inert waste disposal and inert waste recycling centre is a very sustainable location for the facility. The allocation of this site for the disposal of inert waste, is recognition of the need to allocate a site in closest proximity to the largest centres of population within the County. Prior to the allocation of Dollymans Farm, it was acknowledged within the Spatial Portrait that there were no available inert waste sites in the Basildon area. As acknowledged at the Examination in Public, this site is a former borrow pit and is of very poor visual amenity value. Restoration of the site following the disposal of inert waste will enable an improved topography of the site, in keeping with the surrounding landscape. The site is also located a long distance from neighbouring residential dwellings to ensure that there would be no adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring amenity and benefits from good access. In addition, Dollymans Farm has also been promoted for use as a recycling centre, in association with the inert waste use over the plan period. As acknowledged at the Examination in Public, the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>argument for the need for a recycling centre was not so overwhelming that it would render the overall plan unsound. However, a recycling centre would be a suitable use in conjunction with the disposal of inert waste. Whilst the applicant's preference would be for an inert waste recycling facility to be formally allocated as part of the Waste Local Plan, it is acknowledged that a suitable case could be made as part of a future planning application. This was discussed at the Examination in Public and it is the applicant's intention to proceed on this basis. Overall the amendment to Policy 3 is strongly supported and provides a plan that is justified, effective and consistent with national policy as required by the NPPF.</p> | |
| 987897, 170 | No | <p>I believe there is a compliance issue here. How can ECC lawfully allocate waste it owns the SRF/RDF output from the Basildon plant to a site that is not yet built, and for which, currently, no planning permission exists to enable it to be built in a manner compliant with the Environment Agency's requirements as to stack height? ECC is relying on the applicant Gent Fairheads statement in its planning documents that the Rivenhall site is the one to which Basildon specific outputs can be sent; this could, clearly, be interpreted as meaning that agreement has been reached between ECC and Gent Fairhead without either the proper planning or procurement procedures being followed. This would be ultra vires the Council's powers. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material, in case, the proper procedures having been followed, the Rivenhall site is unable to proceed to construction. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex County Council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from the Basildon plant for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream, and yet the plan allocates the Rivenhall site to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process. It is not prudent to assume that Rivenhall will be operational in time to</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>take such waste, even ignoring the breach of the procumbent rules implicit in allocating waste to it, given that the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016. Why would ECC allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it owns? In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |
| 1061659, 176 | No | <p>It is questionable whether this is legally compliant. ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take output from the Basildon plant. This output is known to be SRF/RDF which ECC legally owns as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific site. ECC is aware that gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex county council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However even that assumption should now be questioned given that the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate bat. ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition,</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management as ECC states it wishes to do. | |
| 1061676, 190 | No | <p>It is not clear that this is legally compliant. ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take output from the Basildon plant. This output is known to be SRF/RDF which ECC legally owns as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific site. ECC is aware that gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex county council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However even that assumption should now be questioned given that the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate bat. ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1061682, 194 | No | <p>It is still unclear if this is even legally allowed. Essex County Council are proposing to allocate the Rivenhall site which as stated above has not even been built or received a permit, to take the SRF/RDF waste from Basildon which coincidentally is owned by ECC as was stated in the operational contract for the plant. It would therefore appear that ECC are allocating their own waste to a specific site. ECC are also aware that the applicant for the site at Rivenhall, Gent Fairhead has stated in their planning documentation that the site at Rivenhall will take the output from the Basildon site. This is not only confusing the planning and procurement by doing this, it is also a conflict of interests I feel. This should therefore be amended so that the waste material should go through an open procurement process and not all be pushed towards an already environmentally unsound plant. Just to boost their figures. ECC had delayed the procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon to allow further sites to come forward, yet have still allocated Rivenhall to take all the waste knowing that this site would be the only one able to take the waste in the time frame. In view of the recent environmental agency permit refusal and the sites failure to demonstrate BAT, their assumption should be questioned as the plant has not been built and has not licence in which to enable a contract between the companies to take the waste.</p> | |
| 1061711, Goslings Granary, 209 | No | <p>The first sentence of Policy 3 should be amended to read: - "Waste management at the following locations (see Strategic Site Allocations Map) will be permitted where proposals take into account the requirements identified in the relevant development principles and meet Development Management Criteria." The justification for this change is to reflect the requirements of the Plan of Policy 10 Development Management Criteria.</p> | |
| 1059617, 224 | No | <p>I object to the allocation of waste which ECC legally own being allocated to the proposed (not built and no environmental permit) private Rivenhall site from the Basildon plant. ECC appear to be allocating waste without any open procurement procedures. The</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | <p>plan must be amended to ensure that ECC is acting legally and also Policy 12 Transport and Access of the Plan is meeting so a site closer to the Basildon plant is allocated. In addition to the above Map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management as ECC states it intends to.</p> | |
| <p>988283, Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council, 232</p> | <p>No</p> | <p>It is unclear whether this is legally compliant. ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take the known SRF/RDF output from the Basildon plant. This output is legally owned by ECC as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant, therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific site. ECC is aware that Gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site, has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material owned by ECC. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex County Council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream, but has nevertheless has allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. That assumption should now be questioned given that the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate bat (best available technology). ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence, for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management (previously "other waste") as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1062089, Coggeshall Parish Council, 324 | No | <p>One of the key aspects of the review is to ensure legal compliance and we do not believe that is legally compliant. It appears that ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take output from the Basildon plant. This output is known to be SRF/RDF which ECC legally owns as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. ECC appears to be allocating material it legally owns to a specific private facility without any adherence to their procurement processes and procedures or those associated with the provision of government contracts. This could, clearly, be interpreted as meaning that agreement has been reached between ECC and Gent Fairhead without either the proper planning or procurement procedures being followed. This would be ultra vires the Councils powers and shows a level of pre-determination. ECC is aware that Gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site, has specifically stated in their planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. We believe the plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex County Council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process in the knowledge that only Rivenhall in the plan area and could be used in the stated time horizon. In addition, the inclusion of Rivenhall should now be questioned given that the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016. The refusal was because of the applicants failure to utilise the Best Available Technology (BAT), air quality emissions with predicted emissions more than twice the legal limits and the stack height that is too low for a plant of this size (changes will contravene the Secretary of State planning conditions 2010).</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>Consequently, we believe that ECC is clearly attempting to allocate waste material it owns (SRF Form Basildon) to a plant that has not been built, has no operating licence, will require significant redesign, gas dispersion remodelling, an environmental impact assessment and must go through the planning process again before it is even possible to consider processing waste and this does not appear sensible, never mind legal. Consequently, we require an explanation as to why ECC is allocating a plant (Rivenhall) that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it (ECC) owns? In addition, the applicants own response to the EA (Fitchner Report in response to second schedule 5 questions from the EA section 2) clearly stated that it the EA permit was refused the plant would not go ahead and given the above allocating waste to the plant is at best irresponsible. Furthermore, and importantly the plan does not consider any alternatives should the Rivenhall plant may not survive the next round of planning or the next EA permit application and as such the plan must be revisited in light of the accreditation problems the Rivenhall plant faces. We also believe that, MAP 5 is incorrect inasmuch as it fails to allocate Rivenhall for "residual non-hazardous waste management" as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |
| 1062112, 335 | No | <p>Is this change legally compliant, should it not be up to market forces to decide where waste goes? Rather than ECC proposing an unbuilt private site at Rivenhall Airfield? Why are ECC proposing that Rivenhall Airfield should be specifically allocated to take the waste output from Basildon? But ECC owns this waste material by contract. Does this allocation confuse planning and future contracts? Please note that towards the end of 2016 the Environment Agency refused a permit application for the site, so surely there is uncertainty regarding this allocation as the site has not been built and doesn't have and Environment permit or full planning permission.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 743809, 454 | No | <p>It is not clear whether this is legally compliant. ECC wants to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take output from the ECC Basildon plant. This output is known to be SRF/RDF which ECC legally owns (as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant). Therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific privately owned site. ECC is aware that gent Fairhead, (applicant for the Rivenhall site) has specifically stated in its planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. Amend the plan: ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. Such material should by law be subject to an open procurement process by ECC. ECC has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but ECC has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. Even that assumption should now be questioned please. Note 1: the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site (December 2016) because of the failure to demonstrate bat. Note 2: as the site does not have full planning consents nor a licence to operate and though not to be directly considered here, i would call the inspectors attention to the planned short stack. Yet would not current technical knowledge have dictated long ago that a much higher stack would be necessary for such an undertaking? This is also further compounded by the water processing cycle situation. On the part of ECC, it would appear that it is therefore attempting to allocate a private plant (at Rivenhall) that has not yet been built (and is still going through planning). Importantly, ECC has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. Map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for "residual non-hazardous waste management" as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1063344, 470 | No | <p>This does not seem to be legally compliant as ECC is planning to allocate material from the Basildon plant, which it owns to the proposed Rivenhall facility whereas the allocation of material owned by ECC should be subject to an open procurement process. The plan should be amended to ensure there is no single allocation, for this specific material. Essex county council stated that it postponed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a several years so that further sites could come into operation yet has allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process in the knowledge that Rivenhall would be the only site in the plan area available in the stated time horizon. Even that assumption should be questioned since the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 due to the failure to demonstrate bat. ECC is thus trying to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |
| 746050, Rivenhall Parish Council, 479 | No | <p>It is not clear that this change is legally compliant in that the County Council is proposing that the private site proposed at Rivenhall Airfield should be specifically allocated to take the SRF/RDF output from Basildon which ECC owns by contract. Does this allocation confuse the planning regime and future procurement and is that legally compliant? The Parish Council would submit that the matter of where the SRF/RDF goes is for the market via an open procurement process in the normal way. A further uncertainty regarding this allocation is that the Rivenhall plant is not built and does not yet have full planning or an Environmental Permit. In December 2016 the EA refused a permit application for the site due to the failure to demonstrate BAT. ECC has stated an intention to go to the market for a long term contract (or contracts) by 2020 but there is a significant risk that the site would not be available.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 988228, 506 | No | The Rivenhall IWMF has not been built and does not have an environmental licence so how can it be allocated as the place to take output from the Basildon site? Dealing with this waste owned by ECC should be put out for tender rather than being allocated straight to Gent Fairhead. | Remove Dollymans Farm from the Waste Local Plan as a waste development/land use allocation. |
| 618724, 509 | No | It is not clear that this is legally compliant. ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF output from the Basildon plant. This output is waste material which ECC legally owns - as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific private site. ECC is also aware that gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex county council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However even that assumption could now be questioned given that the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate bat. ECC is therefore attempting to allocate its own waste to a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence, and has delayed its procurement tender process in order in part in the hope that Rivenhall will be built. How is that legally compliant? In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management as ECC states it wishes to do. | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M5? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 911132, Cressing Parish Council, 519 | No | <p>It is not clear that this is legally compliant. It is proposed to allocate the proposed private site at Rivenhall to take the known SRF/RDF output from the Basildon plant. This output is legally owned by ECC as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore planning and procurement appears to be confused by allocating material ECC legally owns to a specific site. The applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that the Basildon output can be sent to the Rivenhall site. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material owned by ECC. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. ECC has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-board but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However that assumption should now be questioned given that the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate BAT (best available technology). ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence, for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management (previously "other waste") as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |

Modification M6 – Paragraph 8.10

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M6? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|---|---|---|
| 990583, The Churchmanor Estates Co Plc, 18 | No | Whilst I can accept most of the proposed amendment to the wording, the incorporation of words <i>seek to</i> introduce a wholly unreasonable ambiguity and uncertainty. Local plan making is a process and it can only be on the adoption of the plan and any reallocation, that there can be defining criteria for the Waste Plan to reallocate an Area of Search. | The plan should therefore be amended to delete the words 'seek to' and incorporate the words 'on adoption' after re-allocate. This has consequential effects on the designation of Areas of Search as defined on the relevant maps. |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 130 | Yes | Support the changes to aid clarity on what Areas of Search are and their interrelationship with wider Development Plans. | |

Modification M7 – Policy 4 'Areas of Search'

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M7? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 131 | Yes | Support the changes to aid clarity on what Areas of Search are intended to be for. | |

Modification M8 – Policy 5 ‘Enclosed Waste Facilities on Unallocated Sites or Outside Areas of Search’

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M8? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|---|--|---|
| 985065, 45 | No | There is one relevant consented plant in the plan area and that is Rivenhall. The heat produced will not be supplied to a district heat network. It would only be used within the plant itself but it is not clear how this could be described as a commercial or industrial user in the sense of having some separation. Furthermore, there is a question over the CHP status of the plant (see mod 19 comments). Following the s73 changes, will heat have to be vented and therefore wasted? If Rivenhall is no longer CHP, the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are not justified. | |
| 983638, 68 | No | Rivenhall is the only relevant plant within the plan area, and the heat produced will only be used within the plant, not used within the district network. As previously stated, (re: modification 19) the CHP status of the plant is in doubt. Will the heat have to be vented (therefore, wasted energy)? I do not believe that the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are justified, if this site is no longer CHP. | |
| 1060507, Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee, 87 | No | Rivenhall is the only relevant consented plan in the plan area. The heat produced will not be supplied to a district heat network, but only used within the plant itself. It is unclear how the plant itself could be described as a commercial or industrial user as there is no separation from the plant to commercial or industrial users. In addition, there is a question over the CHP status of the plant (see mod 19 comments). Following the s73 changes, will heat have to be vented and therefore wasted? If Rivenhall is no longer CHP, the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are not justified. | |
| 1061659, 183 | No | There is one relevant consented plant in the plan area and that is Rivenhall. The heat produced will not be supplied to a district heat network. It would only be used within the plant itself but it is not clear how this could be described as a commercial or industrial user in the sense of having some separation. Furthermore, there is a question over the CHP status of the plant (see mod 19 | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M8? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | comments). Following the s73 changes, will heat have to be vented and therefore wasted? If Rivenhall is no longer CHP, the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are not justified. | |
| 1061682, 200 | No | The only one relevant consented plant in the plan area, being Rivenhall. The heat they would produce will be used within the plant and not supplied to the district. It is unclear therefore how this could be described as a commercial or industrial user in the sense of having some separation. There is also question over the CHP status of the plant if you see my comments previously made in MOD 1. Due to the changes in S73 will heat not be vented into the atmosphere and wasted? Therefore if Rivenhall is not going to be CHP the plan description is incorrect. | |
| 1061711, Goslings Granary, 208 | No | Policy 5 amongst other elements states "In addition sites should be located at or in : a) employment areas that are existing or allocated in a Local Plan for general industry(B2) and storage and distribution (B8); or b) existing permitted waste management sites or co-located with other waste management development; or c) same site or co-located in close proximity to where Waste arises; or d) the curtilage of a Waste Water Treatment Works; or e) Previously Developed Land; or f) redundant agricultural or forestry buildings and there curtilages." The Rivenhall site when it was first put forward as a site for an IWMF, did not meet any of these locational requirements. It is not located in an employment area. It was not co-located with any other waste management development. It is not co-located in close proximity to where Waste arises, in fact it is 38 miles by road from the Tovi Eco Park Facility and all residual Waste would need to be brought in by road the least acceptable means of waste transport, using the A120 which is acknowledged as being operating at well over capacity. There are proposals being considered for options to upgrade the A120 but there is no guarantee that funding will be available to carry out improvements to the A120. It is not in the curtilage of a Water Treatment Works. It is not on Previously | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M8? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | Developed Land as defined in the NPPF. It is does not use redundant agricultural or forestry buildings or their curtilages. There is therefore considerable scope for a more appropriately located site much closer to the Tovi Eco Park Facility at Basildon to come forward that meets the requirements of Policy 12 Transport and Access of the Plan within the Plan period. | |
| 1059617, 221 | No | Policy 5 amongst other elements states "In addition sites should be located at or in : a) employment areas that are existing or allocated in a Local Plan for general industry(B2) and storage and distribution (B8); or b) existing permitted waste management sites or co-located with other waste management development; or c) same site or co-located in close proximity to where Waste arises; or d) the curtilage of a Waste Water Treatment Works; or e) Previously Developed Land; or f) redundant agricultural or forestry buildings and there curtilages." The Rivenhall site didn't and does not meet any of these locational requirements. It is not located in an employment area. It is not co-located in close proximity to where Waste arises, it is 38 miles by road from the Tovi Eco Park Facility and all residual Waste therefore would need to be brought in by road the least acceptable means of waste transport, using the A120 which is already operating at well over capacity. There are proposals being considered for options to upgrade the A120 but there is no guarantee that funding will be available to carry out improvements to the A120. It is not in the curtilage of a Water Treatment Works. It is not Previously Developed Land as stated in the NPPF. It is does not use old agricultural or forestry buildings. There is therefore a requirement for a more appropriately located site significantly closer to the Tovi Eco Park Facility at Basildon to come forward that meet the requirements of Policy 12 Transport and Access of the Plan within the Plan period. | |
| 1059617, 229 | No | Proposals for energy recovery facilities with combined heat and power are expected to demonstrate that the heat produced will be supplied to a district heat network or direct to commercial or industrial users. I object to this as Rivenhall will not possibly | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M8? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | technically be a CHP plant with the changes in waste and following the S73 changes heat would be wasted as it is not going to a commercial or industrial user therefore heat would be wasted. | |
| 988283, Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council, 237 | No | There is one relevant consented plant in the plan area - and that is Rivenhall. The heat produced will not be supplied to a district heat network. It would only be used within the plant itself and so it is not clear how this could be described as a commercial or industrial user in the sense of having some separation. Furthermore, there is a question over the CHP status of the plant (see mod 19 comments). Following the s73 changes, will heat have to be vented and therefore wasted? If Rivenhall is no longer CHP, the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are not justified. | |
| 1062089, Coggeshall Parish Council, 330 | No | There is only one relevant consented plant in the plan area and that is Rivenhall. The heat produced will not be supplied to a district heat network and the revised proportions of the plant indicate a significant proportion of the heat is wasted to atmosphere. Originally it (the heat) would only be used within the plant itself but it is not clear how this could be described as a commercial or industrial user in the sense of having some separation. Furthermore, there is a question over the CHP status of the plant (see mod 19 comments). Following the s73 changes (Feb 2016), since there is no facility to recover the additional heat within the application we believe will heat be vented and therefore wasted and that Rivenhall is no longer CHP, the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are not justified. | |
| 743809, 467 | No | There is one relevant consented plant in the plan area: Rivenhall. The heat produced will not be supplied to a district heat network. It would only be used within the plant itself but it is not clear how this could be described as a commercial or industrial user in the sense of having some separation. There is a question mark over the CHP status of the plant (see mod 19 comments). Following the s73 changes, will heat have to be vented and therefore wasted? Is this acceptable/appropriate to the | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M8? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | inspector? If Rivenhall is no longer CHP, the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are not justified. | |
| 1063344, 475 | No | There is one relevant consented plant in the plan area and that is Rivenhall. The heat produced will not be supplied to a district heat network. It would only be used within the plant itself but it is not clear how this could be described as a commercial or industrial user in the sense of having some separation. Furthermore, there is a question over the CHP status of the plant (see mod 19 comments). Following the s73 changes, will heat have to be vented and therefore wasted? If Rivenhall is no longer CHP, the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are not justified. | |
| 618724, 514 | No | There is one relevant consented plant in the plan area and that is Rivenhall. The heat produced will not be supplied to a district heat network. It would only be used within the plant itself but it is not clear how this could be described as a commercial or industrial user in the sense of having some separation. Furthermore, there is a question over the CHP status of the plant (see mod 19 comments). Following the s73 changes, will heat have to be vented and therefore wasted? If Rivenhall is no longer CHP, the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are not justified. | |
| 911132, Cressing Parish Council, 524 | No | Rivenhall is the only relevant consented plant in the plan area. The heat produced will not be supplied to a district heat network. It would only be used within the plant itself and so it is not clear how this could be described as a commercial or industrial user in the sense of having some separation. Furthermore, there is a question over the CHP status of the plant (see mod 19 comments). Following the S73 changes, will heat have to be vented and therefore wasted? If Rivenhall is no longer CHP, the plan descriptions for Rivenhall are not justified. | |

Modification M9 – Policy 6 ‘Open Waste Facilities on Unallocated Sites or Outside Areas of Search’

No Comments Received.

Modification M10 – Policy 7 ‘Radioactive Waste Management at Bradwell-on-Sea’

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M10? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1062191, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Magnox Limited, 350 | Yes | The NDA and Magnox Limited would like to confirm their support for the following modifications, which are consistent with the representations made by GVA (on behalf of the NDA and Magnox Limited) to the consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft of the RWLP: Main Modification 10 the modification to Policy 7. Minor Modification 27 the modification to paragraph 4.11. Minor Modification 35 the modification to paragraph 6.6. Minor modification 40 the modification to paragraph 8.32. While the NDA and Magnox welcome the abovementioned modifications to the RWLP, they maintain their view that further minor modifications are still required for the Plan to be considered sound. While the NDA and Magnox welcome the abovementioned modifications to the RWLP, they maintain their view that further minor modifications are still required for the Plan to be considered sound. | |

Modification M11 – Policy 9 ‘Waste Disposal Facilities on Unallocated Sites’

No Comments Received

Modification M12 – Paragraph 9.33

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M12? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 132 | Yes | Support the changes to make the plan more positive in respect of this issue. | |
| 1063440, Natural England, 494 | Yes | We support the modification "Restoration schemes should, in the first instance, be seen as an opportunity to enhance and to upgrade PROW where possible, ... in all cases, restoration schemes should provide for access which is at least as good as that existing before the workings began." | |

Modification M13 – Policy 10 ‘Development Management Criteria’

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M13? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 133 | Yes | Support the changes to make the plan more positive in respect of this issue. | n/a |
| 1063440, Natural England, 497 | No | The additional detail provided around Clause b (protection of water resources) is welcomed; however we recommend a slight change of wording. | <p>We recommend making the clear distinction between water quality and water quantity; the current additional text is unclear. We advise amending the text from:</p> <p>b. the quality of water within water bodies, with particular regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - preventing the deterioration of their existing status; or - -failure to achieve the objective of good status, and - -the quantity of water for resource purposes within water bodies. <p>To the following:</p> <p>b. water resources, with particular regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - -the quality of water within water bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o preventing the deterioration of their existing status; or o -failure to achieve the objective of good status, and |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M13? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | - the quantity of water for resource purposes within water bodies |
| 1064243, Historic England, 527 | Yes | We are pleased to note the inclusion of a requirement for the enhancement of the natural, historic and built environment | n/a |

Modification M14 – Policy 12 ‘Transport and Access’

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M14? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 1064243, Historic England, 528 | No | We note that waste management developments will be permitted to use existing road connections, subject to a hierarchy of alternative options and an assessment of impact to various considerations. One of these considerations is a proximity to sensitive receptors. Whilst we are supportive of including consideration of the historic environment, we reiterate that proximity alone is not an adequate assessment when the sensitive receptor is an element of the historic environment such as a heritage asset. Impact to significance can occur at some considerable distance when referring to landscape character for example. Conversely, development may occur in close proximity to a listed building where there is no loss of significance to it or to its setting. . | We request that the policy considers the significance rather than the proximity of sensitive receptors as follows: Where access to the main road network in accordance with (b) and (c) above is not feasible, road access via a suitable existing road prior to gaining access onto the main road network will exceptionally be permitted, having regard to the scale of the development, the proximity of sensitive receptors, <i>the significance of the historic environment</i> , the capacity of the road and an assessment of the impact on road safety |

Modification M15 – Bellhouse Landfill Site

No comments received

Modification M16 – Little Bullocks and Crumps Farm, Great and Little Canfield

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M16? | Brief explanation of why you agree/disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|--|---|
| 1061953, Great Canfield Parish Council, 283 | No | <p>a) Deletion of the condition that Waste shall be restricted to stable non-reactive hazardous waste. No liquids, slurries, clinical wastes, or oils shall be deposited on site. The condition was included to (partially) protect the local community and to delete it, on a technicality, at this late stage, is unacceptable.</p> <p>b). The change of the life of the site to 15 years, with availability upon adoption of the RWLP. We have already brought to the attention of the Planning Team and the Planning Inspector, that the very small amount of minerals on this site (approx. 2ft in depth) which is located approx. 9 metres below the surface means that this site can never be excavated. It is not financially viable as a minerals site and to dig a hole, simply to fill it with waste, is not lawful. Therefore to suggest that this site can commence taking waste upon adoption of the RWLP and can continue to do so for 15 years is simply not true.</p> | <p>a). This condition should be reinstated. We have already pointed out, on numerous occasions, that this site is very close to a significant number of residential properties. As is pointed out in Modification 41 that impacts on amenity can cover a range of potential pollution and disturbance from, for example, light, noise, dust, and odour as well as concerns for the possible effects on human health from the development. To even consider dumping such waste as this is ludicrous. Making fundamental changes to the plan at this late stage should not be allowed. The applicant has had plenty of time to submit details that are deliverable and effective. The introduction to this document restricted comments to those that were deemed necessary to make the plan sound/ legally compliant and appropriate for adoption. These modifications have not been discussed in detail during the hearing sessions as stated in the introduction. We made comments that were in-line with the rules (to make the plan sound/legally compliant and appropriate for adoption) which have been totally ignored. The comments made by the applicant, and included in the modifications give the applicant more freedom and have been added to the plan without any discussion. We feel the RWLP consultation process is totally one-sided.</p> <p>b). It needs to be accepted that this site cannot be</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M16? | Brief explanation of why you agree/disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | included in the plan as permission to excavate can never be given, as to do so would be unlawful |
| 1736, Takeley Parish Council, 459 | No | <p>Takeley Parish Council (TPC) PC is disappointed to learn that Essex will still be importing London waste as the majority comes to this part of Essex should not import London waste if it is unable to facilitate the waste produced in this county. Please ensure that all planning permissions and terms of site operation reiterate the use of the major trunk routes e.g. M11 & A120 and not A & B class roads e.g. B1256 TPC opposes any development at Start Hill. This is not a suitable/sustainable consideration given the pressure and over-capacity at M11 Jtn 8 Regarding the development of 3 sites at Little Bullocks & Crumps Farm TPC maintains its OBJECTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TPC concurs with ECC's originally assessment which discounted these allocations. The Minerals Local Plan was approved by the Secretary of State and adopted by ECC as recently as 2014. This Plan included a condition that extraction of minerals from sites A22 and A23 could not commence until the main Crump's Farm site was fully restored - which is not expected until around 2030. Why are ECC planners now saying that they can overrule that condition? - Some of the environmental consequences of these allocations have now either been ignored or understated. - The amount of minerals expected to be extracted from site A23 is very small, and we say, too shallow to allow the safe dumping of hazardous waste. Policy 13 clearly states that 'land raising that is considered to constitute a waste disposal activity, for its own sake, will not be permitted' so burying the waste by covering with other materials is not an option. - The RWLP fails to consider the impact on potential housing development at Priors Green (Takeley/Lt. Canfield) | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M16? | Brief explanation of why you agree/disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>- UDC Local Plan - potential for 1750 new homes and a primary school (north of B1256 opposite the above sites). There is no mention of housing development currently under construction adjacent to the site at Runnels Hay and the impact on this site. It is proposed to allocate hazardous waste to Site 2 which is adjacent to Runnels Hey.</p> <p>TPC is very concerned about the environmental impact on the River Roding and Runnels Hay Bluebell Wood (ancient woodland). The RWLP underestimates the risk of leeching and the impact on water quality.</p> <p>- There is surely a real danger of 'bird strikes' (proximity to Stansted Airport)</p> <p>- The additional HGV traffic generated by these sites would add to the already intolerable volume of HGV traffic through Takeley and along the B1256 (Elsenham site currently has permission for 400 vehicle movements per day). The noise and vibration negatively impacts on the wellbeing of our residents and destroys the local road network.</p> <p>- For the reasons stated above TPC objects to any additional HGV traffic through Takeley. There is a Vehicle Routing Agreement should be imposed.</p> | |
| 784822, Hatfield Broad Oak Parish Council, 461 | No | Deletion of the condition that Waste shall be restricted to stable non-reactive hazardous waste. No liquids, slurries, clinical wastes, or oils shall be deposited on site. The condition was included to protect the local community and to delete it in a modification is unacceptable. The change of the life of the site to 15 years, with availability upon adoption of the RWLP. Great Canfield PC have already brought to the attention of the Planning Team and the Planning Inspector, that the very small amount of minerals expected to be extracted from this site is too small and shallow. The site is not financially viable as a minerals site. | This condition should be reinstated. We agree that as Great Canfield and Takeley PCs have already pointed out, on numerous occasions, this site is very close to a significant number of residential properties. The additional HGV traffic generated by proposed extra development at these sites would add to the already extensive volume of HGV traffic via the B1256 through Hatfield Broad Oak and along the B183. The noise and vibration from 5.30 am especially in the village affects properties and negatively impacts on the wellbeing of |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M16? | Brief explanation of why you agree/disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>our residents, destroying the local road network. Footpaths are narrow and HGV traffic, often travelling at unsuitable speeds, in places pass within 2 metres of pedestrians. The possible addition of HGVs carrying hazardous waste on this narrow B road is a cause for extreme concern and should not be permitted. Planning permissions and conditions of any site operations must contain Vehicle Routeing Agreements to ensure that the major trunk routes i.e. e the M11 and A120 are used, not B183 and B1256. The construction of M11 Junction 7a can only make the present situation worse.</p> |

Modification M17 – Morses Lane, Brightlingsea

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1059754, 53 | No | <p>If I am correct it seems that a red warning has been given because of close proximity to the proposed site of a large residential area. An amber warning for a very large college in the immediate area of the site. The solution seems to be to take the operation under cover. I would consider such a work environment would lead to a great deal of dust within the building which would have to be extracted for the health and safety of the staff. How will this hazard be dealt with bearing in mind the local population and the school location? There is no mention that I can see that the road infrastructure has been taken into account not only for Brightlingsea but all the surrounding villages, when there is the A120 capable of handling this sort of traffic and without disturbing</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | any housing. What will happen if the new "garden towns" are built in the vicinity which will bring more and more traffic onto the B roads system? | |
| 990357, East of England Co-operative Society, 71 | No | <p>The Society maintains an in principle objection to the proposed inert waste recycling facility at Morses Lane, Brightlingsea. However these representations respond specifically to the proposed modifications to the allocation, in the context of the current consultation on post examination modifications. Main Modification 17 - Table 14 Morses Lane, Brightlingsea to strengthen the intended protection of amenity, particularly for proximal land uses. However whilst the justification text appears to recognise the proximity of the allocated site to several sensitive receptors, including its location immediately adjacent to a retail store and the nearby school, this is not adequately reflected in the suggested amendments to the text. There is very little information provided on how the Council derived the suggested bullet points and why other requirements suggested previously by the Society were not included. As highlighted previously through the Examination Hearings and letter dated 14th October 2016, should the allocation proceed there are a number of absolute minimum requirements of measures that should be incorporated within the Development principles for the site. It is considered that the proposed amendments do not go far enough, as set out below in more detail. Proposed Modifications: Morses Lane Site Assessment Scores It is noted that the Council suggested modifications to the Morses Lane Site Assessment Scores "to</p> | <p>Proposed Amendment - insertion of bullet point: "The inclusion of a statement that the facilities will be enclosed" The modification seeks to insert the following text to bullet point 5: it is expected that operations would be enclosed within an appropriate building. This is considered too ambiguous. The modification does not provide sufficient detail for the requirement to be deemed effective and it does not offer satisfactory assurance that neighbouring uses will be protected in terms of amenity. As such, it fails to meet the tests of soundness as set out in Paragraph 182 of the NPPF. The need to specify the enclosure of the facility was highlighted as a necessary requirement at the Examination Hearing session, however, to ensure this is effective and the requirements are clear, the Society considers that the aforementioned text should be amended to specify the following: The following mitigation measures will be established in the interests of protecting local amenity: All crushing, processing or other physical handling of inert waste, including all transfer of waste between vehicles to be enclosed within suitably designed and located building(s); The storage of waste or recovered materials should also be</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>accommodate information raised at the Hearings. In particular it amends 3D proximity to Sensitive Receptors and 3K Recreation Facilities to Amber 2. These modifications are particularly referred to within the Site Assessment and Selection Report Addendum: Rationale for Preferred Allocations (January 2017). It states that during the hearing sessions a number of elements in the site assessment proforma were inaccurate. However it then states Although updating these inaccuracies would not result in the exclusion of the site; the Authorities consider it prudent to maintain an accurate evidence base as it may be helpful to the future planning application process. However there is no discussion of the inaccuracies identified and the reasons why it does not alter the inclusion of the site. Similarly, in the Schedule of Modifications Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Addendum November 2016) for the modifications it simply states " There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA as a result of this modification. There is no discussion how this conclusion is reached. Given the inaccuracies identified, it is considered that further justification is required to justify the modifications, and the reasoning why the additional measures suggested by the Society were not incorporated. Summary The Society remains concerned, that despite inaccuracies and shortcomings identified in relation to this allocation at the Examination Hearing, the proposed modifications fall significantly short in ensuring that the site allocation would not result in demonstrable harm and an unacceptable impact on the surrounding area, in particular to the</p> | <p>fully contained within buildings, with no external storage permissible; All vehicles carrying inert waste should have such waste fully covered, whether arriving at or leaving the site, to avoid dust entering the atmosphere on the approaches to and from the facility; The buildings should include the incorporation and maintenance of effective dust extraction technologies, to prevent the escape of dust from the process and the premises with a specific and particular emphasis on silicates; and Limits on duration (hours of operation) and noise standards (from noise sensitive properties) (as per existing text in table 14). Proposed Amendment: "Additional Bullet Point regarding the need for new development not to impact on the nearby retail use" The second amendment to table 14 seeks to insert the following text to bullet point 6: The configuration and operation of the proposed facility shall have regard to impacts on neighbouring land uses, including the potential impacts on the adjacent retail use. The impact on the retail use is of great concern to the Society and this additional bullet point again provides very little information or clarity on how the Council would seek to ensure this is enforced. It should be more specific as to the requirements sought. In addition to the facility being fully enclosed as set out above, the following points are also considered necessary in relation to the impacts on the neighbouring retail use: The specification of buildings</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | existing East of England Co-operative retail store. | and operations are to include noise mitigation materials and measures, having regard to appropriate maximum standards at the boundary of the site; The design of any buildings to have regard to the landscape setting of the site, and its location on the fringe of the settlement; The siting of any buildings and processes on the site should have particular regard to safeguarding the health, safety and amenity of customers and staff at the immediately adjacent retail store, including the avoidance of unacceptable impacts on the rear servicing arrangements for the store, which includes the transfer of food products; The installation and maintenance of additional soft landscaping measures such as an enlarged earth bund, in addition to substantial tree planting (already specified in the submitted Plan), having regard to the effective mitigation of noise, dust and landscape and visual impacts; Sufficient vehicle parking and traffic management measures to be provided on site, including delivery reception and arrival management protocols, in order to prevent vehicles stacking and parking in Morses Lane (potentially including the identification of an off-site location for the stacking of vehicles away from the settlement and other sensitive receptors); This should be reinforced by the introduction of effective and enforceable parking restrictions on Morses Lane, to ensure that access to the rear servicing and staff parking areas at the |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | adjacent retail store are kept clear at all times. |
| 922607, 73 | No | I wish to object to your findings. You don't seem to have taken into consideration that this building is only a matter of a few metres from living accommodation. Have you never wondered why no crushers in the country have been put into buildings? It is a known fact that this generates more noise and you still don't seem to have taken any notice of the traffic congestion this will cause. On Monday 30 January we had an action day by the police in Brightlingsea, within a few hours (starting at 9.30/9.45am) their AMPR had clocked over 1800 traffic movements coming in and going out of Brightlingsea, with several of these being large lorries, all were tested for red diesel. This was a normal day and not in rush hour, how much more can our road take? Brightlingsea is not suitable and never will be. | |
| 1060859, 105 | No | You have commented on the closeness to residential, school, supermarket etc. but you still seem determined to build this waste site. How many more comments do you need before you take notices that our roads cannot take any more traffic? Stop telling us what we need, and how good a site it is, which it is not. Please listen to us, too close to properties, putting under cover does not help traffic situations, our roads cannot take it. | |
| 911198, 110 | No | There still seems to be a total disregard for the amount of vehicle movements to service this site, from previous approximate calculations based on a 5 day working week excluding overnight working this would add 28 movements per day to an already busy | The only change I can suggest would be to not pursue this development on this totally unsuitable site and use other existing recycling installations along the A120 corridor at Ardleigh which have better road access and |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>road from the existing site. A recent event by Essex Police and DVLA recorded in excess of 1,000 vehicle movements on the B1029 within a few hours which did not include rush hour. There is a suggestion that the plant would be enclosed to reduce the sound but no evidence of similar sites is mentioned where enclosure would reduce the noise pollution to the surrounding area. Given human nature and depending on the construction of the enclosure it is probable that in hot weather the doors would be left open for the comfort of the operatives. It has been discovered that there may be an archaeological site nearby and excavations should take place but there is no detail as to when that will take place and by whom. You should not need reminding that there is a supermarket adjacent to the proposed site and a school within 200 yards.</p> | <p>is away from retail and residential properties.</p> |
| 1060938, 115 | No | <p>1. The impact of increased heavy goods vehicles on the roads leading to the site, there is a supermarket immediately next to the site, there is a school immediately opposite the site, and there are residential properties immediately next to the site. All of which have pedestrians going to and from the supermarket creating an increased risk of harm to individuals. 2. Increased incoming and outgoing vehicles, the roads cannot take increase in usage, as the church corner is already a high risk accident spot and this will increase the chances of further incidents. 3. Noise levels to the surrounding area, there are young families and old families in the immediate vicinity of the proposed plant, having worked within this industry the noise levels will be intolerable especially at weekends. 4. The vibrations caused will cause local properties to shudder</p> | <p>you have a perfectly good abandoned site in St Osyth (the old waste site) where this can be built without any impact on residents, schools, supermarkets and is on a main road which can handle the increase in traffic.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>and have an increased risk of cracking on properties. 5. The dust levels will increase especially in the summer and cause windows, cars, caravans as well as health issues to people with asthma and other breathing issues. 6. Debris on road will be inevitable due to type of waste being bought in and spillages from lorries. 7. The smell will be intoxicating and create health risks to the surrounding residents and school. 8. The school will be disrupted through all of the above. 9. The supermarket will probably have a down turn in trade due to the locations and disruption that will be caused, as people will not be confident to shop there due to increased vehicles, noise, dust and vibration. 10. There will be a huge impact on the environment, due to the noise, dust, vibration, making birds, badgers, rabbits as well as other animal's habitats unsafe. 11. This proposal is totally unacceptable in that location, you need to think about all of the above not, Brightlingsea does not want this what so ever,</p> | |
| 1060942, 116 | No | <p>The Site in Brightlingsea is not a practical solution; the local road cannot support the extra traffic that this site would produce. The proposed site is bordering a local school and residential area and the noise and dust to the local area would cause health issues. The running of the site will cause detrimental impacts on the local residents from noise to vibrations to dust and foul smells. A site along the A120 surrounded by nothing other than fields and a dual carriageway would have surely been the better option!</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 1061041, 117 | No | <p>The main Brightlingsea Road is not safe for increased HGV use. The corner at the church is especially dangerous and is a known accident black spot! It is extremely disconcerting for drivers, especially our elderly, to meet large HGVs on our winding road at this present time. More lorries would be a disaster to this community and could even lead to fatal accidents. Our residents living along the Brightlingsea Road and on the smaller residential road leading to the proposed area will be subject to damaging vibration, extra noise and dust caused by passing lorries. The proposed site is close to the Co-op, the local school, whose students frequently visit the co-op, and local residents whose lives will be immeasurably blighted if this is permitted.</p> | Brightlingsea is not a suitable site. |
| 1060955, 120 | No | <p>The main Brightlingsea Road (Church Road) is already filled with heavy traffic if a major incident occurred there is no way of ambulances etc. getting to the town if the proposal is agreed. Dust would pollute the food in the only local large supermarket which would dissuade people from using the store. Dust would also contaminate local crops and cattle/sheep. There is a school nearby which would also be affected. Local people with lung conditions would have nowhere to hide from the pollution other than indoors which in the summer months can be unbearable in the heat. Excess traffic would cause fatalities as the road is already a hazard to cross let alone heavy vehicles which take even longer to stop. We get a high number of vehicles in the summer months with holiday makers. The noise would be awful for local residents. There are farms very close to the area also which will be polluted. This application was refused previously</p> | <p>I propose the application be refused and another area closer to the A12/A127 be found there is plenty of open land in the vicinity of those areas which would not cause any distress to local residents or wildlife. Heavy goods vehicles would be able to move freely on these roads whereas at the moment the B1027 would suffer with too many HGV's.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>because of the conditions I have mentioned yet for some reason people are choosing to ignore the previous rejection of the application. We chose to live in this area because of the peace and quiet. There is a nature reserve nearby which could also be affected by the plans. The smell from the waste site could also cause problems. Many people will see the price of their property plummet if this goes ahead. We would need CCTV to be installed if this were to go ahead to monitor traffic and make sure everything is being run as agreed.</p> | |
| 1061128, 121 | No | <p>The main Brightlingsea Road is already filled with heavy traffic if a major incident occurred there is no way of ambulances etc. getting to the town if the proposal is agreed. Dust would pollute the air and the food in the only local large supermarket which would dissuade people from using the store and the petrol station. There would be loss of employment due to this. Dust would also contaminate local crops and cattle/sheep. There is a school nearby where lots of children attend they would also be affected. Local people with lung conditions would have nowhere to hide from the pollution. The only doctors we have at present are under constant stress due to the population in the area if more people became sick due to this how would they cope? Excess traffic would cause fatalities as the road is already a hazard to cross let alone heavy vehicles which take even longer to stop. We get a high number of vehicles in the summer months with holiday makers. The noise would be awful for local residents. There are farms very close to the area also which will be polluted. This application was refused previously because of the conditions I</p> | <p>I propose the application be refused and another area closer to the A12/A127 and A120 be found there is plenty of open land in the vicinity of those areas which would not cause any distress to local residents or wildlife. Heavy goods vehicles would be able to move freely on these roads whereas at the moment the B1027 would suffer with too many HGV's. To refuse the application is the only course of action which should be taken.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>have mentioned. There was a previous application rejected. We chose to live in this area because of the peace and quiet. There is a nature reserve nearby which could also be affected by the plans. The smell from the waste site could also cause problems. Many people will see the price of their property plummet if this goes ahead. More road repairs would be needed because of the type of traffic which would be using the road more often i.e. HGV's. Any road repairs on Church Road are a headache let alone the need being more often. We would need CCTV to be installed if this were to go ahead to monitor traffic and make sure everything is being run as agreed.</p> | |
| 1061124, 122 | No | <p>We disagree because the site in Morses Lane can only be accessed via the main Brightlingsea Road which is narrow and has a number of bends, twists and turns. It already suffers from excessive traffic, in particular large container lorries and skips lorries going to the same site for EWD as well as Brett lorries going to the quarry. In addition there is the regular traffic and an increasing residential population who need to gain access to and from the town centre, all via the same single lane one narrow road. The fumes and dust are already unacceptable and to add to this, quite frankly beggars belief. The site is unsuitable; it isn't even suited for the current activity that has to be suffered. When we complain to EWD about the inevitable percentage of waste that is seen falling from their vehicles, they respond with a patronising apology and the proverbial shift of blame to the drivers sole responsibility under their 'Duty Of Care.' If this site on 'green belt' is permitted it will be an insult to our community and our so</p> | <p>There are no adaptations that could be made, it is a wholly inappropriate area to consider implementing such a large waste site. Apart from Brightlingsea having significant historic significance as well as large areas of Special Scientific Interest, it is much too close to the Residential Community who live here, The Colne Secondary School and College, The large Coop Supermarket and many Businesses . Dust and air born pollutants are carried on the wind and will have long term effects on the health on our communities for future generations. This site should be developed somewhere else where there is better access and away from local residents, schools, sports centres and supermarkets. A12 A120 etc.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | called democracy. Assessments are coded RED | |
| 1060927, 123 | No | The proposed location for the waste disposal site is not sensible due to the following reasons: 1) very close proximity to a major food retail outlet I.e. The coop with the consequent dangers of food contamination; 2) very close proximity to Colne School and the potential for particulate contamination of the air and the potential for Health and safety issues to its students due to an increase in road traffic; 3) the unsuitability of the current road infrastructure to accommodate the planned increase in road traffic (i.e., Church Road being the only road in and out of Brightlingsea); 4) the very close proximity to residential properties and the potential for Health and safety, odour and noise issues; 5) there would appear to be far more accommodating and sensible sites else where such as the Veolia site on A120 site, which has excellent road links and none of the disadvantages in point 1 to 4 above; | Move the proposed waste disposal site to a more suitable site away from residential, school and retail areas E.g., the Veolia site on the A120. |
| 1061223, 124 | No | The proposed location for the waste disposal site is not sensible due to the following reasons: 1) very close proximity to a major food retail outlet I.e. The coop with the consequent dangers of food contamination; 2) very close proximity to Colne School and the potential for particulate contamination of the air and the potential for Health and safety issues to its students due to an increase in road traffic; 3) the unsuitability of the current road infrastructure to accommodate the planned increase in road traffic (i.e., Church Road being the only road in and out of Brightlingsea; 4) the very close proximity to residential properties and the | Move the proposed waste disposal site to a more suitable site away from residential, school and retail areas E.g., the Veolia site on the A120. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | potential for Health and safety, odour and noise issues; 5) there would appear to be far more accommodating and sensible sites else where such as the Veolia site on A120 site, which has excellent road links and none of the disadvantages in point 1 to 4 above; | |
| 1061530, 147 | No | The access roads to this site are through villages and therefore the increase in heavy traffic is going to have a very detrimental effect on the people who live in these villages. More importantly, there is only one access road to Brightlingsea and at present this road is already struggling with the traffic heading in and out of the area. The modification will be far too close to The Colne Community School and College, homes and supermarket. Despite improvements in how waste is dealt with, there are still too many unknowns of the effects, particularly on young people. | The waste disposal needs to be on a site with better access, for example dual carriageways, and not near any schools, homes or businesses. |
| 1061671, 187 | No | We have received our local newspaper which h details the above. I feel that I need to add my voice of concern with regards access to Brightlingsea. As you are aware there is only one road into and out of the town and this is obviously in constant use. I see that you say that a traffic survey was completed. Perhaps you can furnish me with when this happened as there have been further houses built and the increase in the secondary school and primary school which means more people are using the road into the town. The road is of poor repair anyway due to its heavy use and with increased traffic it can only get worse. The structure of the roads with large trees on each side by a sharp bend could lead to potential accidents with lorries turning around the bend. Can I also | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | voice my concern with regards pollutants from the site as well? I am aware that you propose to use a building to contain it, but let's hope that works. Anyway I hope you find time to consider my concerns. | |
| 291406, Brightlingsea Town Council, 211 | No | Brightlingsea Town Council maintains its objection to this proposal. The Planning Committee of the Council have considered the two modifications to Appendix 15 Table 14, Morses Lane, Brightlingsea. The first modification states It is expected that operations would be enclosed within an appropriate building. This statement is too weak and the words It is expected that should be deleted. The second modification states the configuration and operation of the proposed facility shall have regard to impacts on neighbouring land uses, including the potential impacts on the adjacent retail use. The Council welcomes and supports this modification. | |
| 1061722, 215 | No | Firstly as a new resident in Brightlingsea I must record my objection to the proposed allocation of land in Morses Lane for the proposed use given that it will involve large numbers of heavy goods vehicles visiting daily allied to the noise and further air pollution from this proposed use. In my opinion access is completely unsuitable due to the already heavily overloaded single access road B1029 into the town. Realistically this should preclude any such development until improved or alternative access into Brightlingsea is provided. The subject site is also close to a Co-operative Society Supermarket, a Large Secondary School and its Playing Fields together with residential property | First modification - see above. Second modification- As a result of carefully assessing the expected impact it will surely be clearly shown that the subject site is unsuitable for the proposed use. My opinions/reasons for this are set out above. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>many of which are occupied by elderly persons. My observations on the modifications are: - 1st modification - not accepted. The text is far too loose and imprecise. The words "expected that.....appropriate building." should be revised to provide a clear and unambiguous definition of intent. 2nd modification - Reasonable but please see below for my observations.</p> | |
| 922234, 240 | No | <p>I am in disbelief that you are still continuing to think that Morses Lane Brightlingsea is the perfect site for a concrete recycling plant. I have lived in Samson's Road with my husband and young son for the last 6 years, our house backs onto Morses Lane Industrial site. Over the last three years i have noticed a significant rise in the level of noise, dirt and traffic pollution which affects my home and my health as I am a chronic asthmatic. "Eastern Waste Disposal" (EWD) who occupy part of Morses Lane, is a vast recycling operation, who have been over the last few years overly expanding to the point of outgrowing the site. Operations start at 5.30am and finish, up to 8.00pm. This means more heavy trucks using Samsons Road, houses are close to the road and residents already feel vibrations from the lorries, diesel pollution which is so harmful to us and the environment. The road surface is in a poor state and is covered permanently in thick dirt, homes and cars are constantly covered in dust. Many days I am unable to have the windows open due to dust and disgusting smells. The proposed site is totally unsuitable for Brightlingsea, this is a small town and has no through road to any other destination. The B1029 is narrow, winding and totally unsafe for the amount of traffic already using it. EWD skip lorries, massive recycling lorries, earth moving</p> | <p>I believe there is a site already being used for the disposal of waste off the A120, this is a far more suitable and convenient site for further development.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>lorries from the sandpit. It's not an A road and the weight and size of heavy vehicles have flatten the verge sides by at least an extra 2ft each side, lives will be lost if this road is abused further. Samsons Road is NOT the place to build a concrete recycling plant. My house is less than 200 metres away from the proposed site, and this will affect considerably the value of my property. Other homes are closer. The site is less than 100 meters from the secondary school boundary with 1200 students. The site is less than 50 metres away from a Fiveways food store. This road is residential and has been since the 1930's, just because there is an empty field does not mean it is suitable for more industry. I have witnessed a concrete crusher at work and it's the most horrific ear deafening sound imaginable. This is not going to be silenced enough by putting a building around it. What happens when the weather gets hot? The doors will be opened and the noise will then not be contained. This already happens with other industrial units at Morses Lane, even though they too are supposed to keep their doors shut at all times. Residents of Samsons Road don't want :- LORRY TRAFFIC DIRT SMELLS NOISE POLLUTION More heavy Industry will damage this town</p> | |
| 1061893, 258 | No | <p>Having read all of the other comments I could just say that I agree with them all. The road into Brightlingsea is not suitable for even more traffic that it has at the moment. In the event of an incident or accident, however small, the road can be blocked for some time. The addition of more heavy traffic vehicles can only to the risk of more incidents and accidents. The site is too close to retail outlets</p> | <p>Position the new facility away from existing residential and retail properties and somewhere more suitable to traffic access.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>and a school. There are residential properties nearby too and for them it would be a nightmare. The industrial estate appears to have grown in recent years which are good for business in Brightlingsea but it should be kept to less intrusive, smaller businesses. We already have waste plants at both ends of Brightlingsea - this should be the perfect reason to disagree with this proposal. The effect on Brightlingsea is enormous and possibly damaging to the health and wellbeing of its residents. It is not clear what the details are for the operation of the site. I have no personal knowledge of how the planning process works but I am told that the details are managed after the approval is given. If this is the case then it is unacceptable to foist something with such a huge potentially damaging effect onto a small town.</p> | |
| 1061912, 264 | No | <p>i strongly disagree that the amount of extra vehicles and pollution levels are going to be acceptable in a rural area immediately adjacent to a food facility and school along with housing along main route</p> | <p>my considered opinion is that this will never be an appropriate site to house a new waste plant.. Considering the amount of green belt being approved for housing, surely an area closer to a dual carriageway clear from any built up residential areas would be a better proposal. My personal objection also comes from the fact that i will have to deal with the amount of pollution and traffic on a daily basis as i live in the immediate vicinity.</p> |
| 1061927, 275 | No | <p>Due to the extreme decline in bird populations in the UK, this development has the potential to impact on the valuable habitat found in this Special Protected Area for breeding bird species and winter gatherings of wildfowl. The potential impact could be in air</p> | <p>It does not seem possible for the plant to go ahead without impacting on these areas even with the modifications</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>pollutants, water runoff, exhaust fumes, coastal squeeze and disturbance. Any assessment would therefore need to be extremely thorough and any possibility of impacting nationally important SPA's should render the development unsuitable and an unsustainable development. The same rigorous assessments should be carried out on the potential health and wellbeing effect of the nearby school, supermarket, industrial area and residential area. I would question how these impacts could be given adequate assessment given the dangerous proximity of the plant to residential areas and an SPA.</p> | |
| 1062016, 316 | No | <p>This objection is related to Morses Lane proposed waste site in Brightlingsea. I cannot believe that anyone who has given serious consideration to this site has looked stood at the top of the corner of Church Hill Brightlingsea. To see what happens when to large articulated lorries meet each other from opposing direction. There has already been several near misses to major accidents and apart from the obvious loss of life involved should an accident happen. There is also the fact of that is the only way in and out of Brightlingsea. This Road would be closed whilst that major incident is being cleared up. How would ambulances, fire engines or any other emergency services get through!!! That aside how could anyone consider putting that waste development right next to the Largest Supermarket in Brightlingsea, one of the Best Ofsted School, and also Green Belt land and all the other things associated with this Major upheaval to Develop this site. I cannot believe any person who supposedly knows their job!! Would consider building a development like that on a road to a small</p> | Build it somewhere where there is an in and out to the site!!! |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | village (how much disruption and traffic would there be just building it) Absolutely Ludicrous Idea!!!!!! | |
| 1062073, 320 | No | <p>Please accept this as my complete disagreement to any proposed plans to site this major recycling centre in Brightlingsea. The roads to Brightlingsea are just not suitable for this kind of added traffic. If approached from the A120 at Frating, the roads become narrower and wind back and forth for approx. 6 miles, there is a main line rail track with unmanned gates, 4 roads converge at this point and it is already under strain from traffic already using this route. When approached from Colchester it is 2 lane traffic all the way to Brightlingsea Church Hill, the only road into and out of Brightlingsea is not physically wide enough to take two 32 Ton lorries at the same time. The lorries servicing the quarry already cause a slow down as they have to turn right, over the oncoming traffic on the very crest of the hill which has a sharp turn to the left. We also have the waste lorries from the existing waste site in Morses Lane. We have had many fatal and life changing accidents on Church Hill over the years. The fact that we already have a recycling centre in Morse's Lane, very close to a senior school & college with over 1400 pupils, should not be a reason to build another site here. Our local five ways CO-OP store is sited very close to the area in question and they already suffer from the awful stink of rotten veg which permeates the whole front of the store from the Eastern Waste Disposal site. There are great empty swathes of land on the A120 just before Frating Grid reference 604894E, 226884N where there is already a waste bulking transfer site, would this not be a much more accessible site and</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>one which would cut down on the carbon foot print that all the extra mileage to get to us would cause. I haven't mentioned the many other reasons why this proposal W31 should not even be considered for Brightlingsea, the above road issues are reason enough. Brightlingsea is an ancient Cinque Port, Please don't turn it into a Stink Port. I strongly oppose all plans for any more waste sites of any kind in Brightlingsea, Essex, CO7</p> | |
| 921602, 339 | No | <p>I am against the proposed planning for the site at Morses Lane, Brightlingsea. I live less than 200 meters away and this will be a disaster for the residents of Samsons Road. My house will be significantly affected if this plan goes ahead as well as my health. Already there is a horrendous amount of lorry traffic from EWD. The smells from there are so bad some days I am unable to open my windows for fresh air. The amount of dust is affecting my health and my house and car are covered with thick dirt all the time. The B1026 is not wide enough and has many dangerous corners not suitable for the volume of traffic it has now, let alone more heavy plant and lorries using it. I am very concerned about the site being in such close proximity to residential homes, a large secondary school and a food supermarket. I believe the best place to situate a development like this is as far away from a town or village. The already used recycling plant on the A120 would be far better.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1062149, 342 | No | <p>We are writing to you regarding the above mentioned proposal although we have already written to you to express our considerable concern. It would appear that none of these have been considered seriously hence our further email. Points to note:</p> <p>A). Brightlingsea only has one road as access to our town. This road is about 2 miles from the A133 roundabout and is a B road which was not designed to carry heavy traffic. We counted the large heavy lorries on our journey out of Brightlingsea on Monday this week and it totalled 15 in about 6 minutes. Today it was 12! We also counted the bends in that road which totalled 12 most of which are at 45 degrees! I think Essex County Councillors should come and see the logistics of this application for themselves. We wonder how any Council can even consider this heavy traffic on a one road system let alone what is classed as B roads. Unless the Councillors concerned come to see for themselves they will also have no idea what speed these lorries go at. It is certainly not 30 miles an hour and we doubt its 40! B) What would happen if a vehicle broke down or there as an accident? We are pretty sure that in some parts it would be impossible for a fire engine or ambulance to get through. Although there is a cycle path to the right of Church road coming up the hill into Brightlingsea invariably true cyclists won't use it choosing rather to take the road up because the hill is more of a challenge. We have seen vehicles (large lorries) having to back up so the oncoming vehicle can get round some of the bends. There are no passing points either! The size of the traffic is staggering - some of these huge lorries are doubled up with a trailer of the same size! It's inconceivable that any concerned Councillor can agree this proposal in any way.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Nobody can say this would be feasible or safe for any resident or visitor to Brightlingsea. C) As you come along the B1039 at Thorrington before the gates coming to Brightlingsea we assume you are not aware of some cottages which have no path or garden in front so their fascias are actually all most on the road. Has anyone considered how dangerous this is for the occupants or their visitors? There are often cars parked outside them in the road. D) Going back to Church Road on the left before the Church on the right coming into Brightlingsea there is a steep earth bank holding up lots of trees. There is no path between that bank and the traffic. It doesn't much imagination to see what could happen with the size and level of traffic that could use that road. Another point to factor in is that visitor's cars to the Church are very often parked on the left and round the corner where there is an entrance to a commercial concern. There is no crossing which is another area of concern. E) As regards the specific colour coded criteria we understand that all of the judgements for the Brightlingsea proposal are now red. Surely that means this application should be rejected immediately without any further waste of time and money. F) Our main concern is not only the traffic and the problems that it will pose to our community but also the environmental issues which can drastically impact on Brightlingsea's residents seriously affecting their quality of life. The site is near a major senior school, a large supermarket with a growing residential housing area around. There obviously would also be lots of other issues which will become apparent if this scheme goes ahead which will have to be dealt with as well. In the meantime we cannot understand why a more suitable site cannot</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>be found and at least one that can be accessed via a main dual carriageway not a one way road such as the one into Brightlingsea. Please please reconsider in the light of the above comments and make sure that you don't make a decision you will come to regret in the future.</p> | |
| 1062151, 343 | No | <p>I live opposite the proposed mineral waste site. I am very concerned about the impact it is going to be to not only myself but all the residents in Brightlingsea. At Present the EWD lorries go past my house all day from a very early hour, till late, causing noise pollution and fumes from the hundreds of lorries. The road into Brightlingsea narrows at the church where there is a sharp bend in the road. As a driver myself it is quite scary when one of those humongous vehicles come steaming round the corner. There has been several accidents on that bend which in turn cuts Brightlingsea off until cleared as we only have one road in and out. The site will be directly opposite the Colne school and the fumes would directly affect the pupils and staff. The coop superstore would also be affected and I would imagine the dust and possible pollution would affect their customers. There has got to be other places out of Brightlingsea away from mostly elderly residents who would not cope well with the pollution this would cause. We are a small town and I for one and my husband strongly object to this application. Not only for health reasons but this would ultimately affect our house prices. After all who wants to live opposite a tip? No No No to this application.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1062217, 369 | No | <p>I write to you to express my deep concern with regard to the proposed waste disposal plant in Brightlingsea. Having lived in Brightlingsea for over twenty years I have been aware of a considerable rise in the number of vehicles entering the town via a narrow, twisting road. In this time there have been many accidents on this stretch of road, some of them fatal. In one incident a motorist was killed when a lorry shed its load while negotiating one of the notoriously dangerous bends. The town already has to support a large number of heavy vehicle movements due to the activity on the wharf, Eastern Waste Disposal and the aggregate company. To consider increasing the heavy traffic even further for a small, one road town seems ludicrous. Further to this it would appear that the development will be very close to a supermarket, school playing fields and extremely close to a private residential property. I live roughly a mile away from the EWD plant and can hear lorries reversing under certain wind conditions. I cannot imagine how much noise will be generated by a plant of the proposed nature but no doubt it will be considerable. Why could not a plant of this nature be located at the site of the previous waste disposal facility on the Clacton road which is now unused? Brightlingsea has a reputation as an attractive holiday and recreational seaside town but is=t does not need a reputation as a dumping ground.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1062280, NEEB, 384 | No | <p>MC1: Schedule of Modifications Page 71 Appendix 14 Table 14 Morses Lane, Brightlingsea</p> <p>RESPONSE: NEEB Holdings requests alterations to the proposed wording</p> <p>DETAIL: It is requested that: It is expected that operations would be enclosed within an appropriate building. Be changed to: Operations will be required to be enclosed within an appropriate building. It is requested that: The configuration and operation of the proposed facility shall have regard to impacts on neighbouring land uses, including the potential impacts on the adjacent retail use. Be changed to: The configuration and operation of the proposed facility will be required to comprehensively address, limit and mitigate any impacts on neighbouring land uses, including the potential impacts on the adjacent retail use.</p> | |
| 1062486, 386 | No | <p>I have with the help of others taken note of the modifications, but I am still concerned that the transportation of the waste with its pollutants created by this i.e. diesel fumes, which only recently has been headline news as to the damage this can cause to our health that no mention has been made of looking into this. I also would like to know how the amount of lorries in and out of our road system will not cause problems, now at times when on the local bus to Colchester there can be problems of sudden braking as</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | lorries from other areas do not always appreciate the bends or narrowing of the road, the bus drivers know where this may occur and obviously are ready for this, but lorries when new on the road of when weather is bad will only have to make one error of judgement and an accident could happen blocking the only road in or out for the whole of the town, for hours. I have experience of this when an accident occurred on the road when I worked in London and it took four hours to clear, this was a lorry which shed load on road and a car with loss of life, so I know only too well this could happen and the traffic movements were nothing like what is proposed. I do hope something will be done on this matter as I and many of the elderly here moved from London and suburbs to get away from pollution (as I was told to get the good sea air and fresh air in your lungs) I suffer with asthma. | |
| 1060915, 388 | No | I am objecting to the proposed waste recycling centre proposed in Brightlingsea. My major concern is the increased traffic on narrow, winding roads. This related not only to the road from Thorrington into Brightlingsea- the only road into the town, but also the even more winding road from the A120 from Frating to Thorrington. I am also very disappointed about the very poor consultation with people in the town. I have only today read about the proposal in the local free paper. I did attempt to use the consultation via the ECC website as mentioned in the newspaper but it was not lay person friendly | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1062680, 389 | No | <p>In last week's local paper, delivered on Sunday, it was reported that four acres of Brightlingsea was to be designated for a recycling site. This was the first time we were made aware of this. We already have recycling going on here. There is only one road in or out of Brightlingsea and any further heavy traffic (lorries) will increase further the risk of accidents and pollution. Just one accident on the Brightlingsea road can cause a total stoppage in and out for many hours. There are many dangerous bends particularly at the top of the hill should two large vehicles meet at the same time. The traffic leaving Brightlingsea road early morning is often sold at the junction going to either Colchester or Clacton. What with the extra houses being built here is will get even worse. There are 12,000 vehicles currently driving along the Brightlingsea road daily. We came here to be near the coast for retirement. We don't intend to spend most of our time at the Doctors something we have never done. We have always kept ourselves very fit. We trust some consideration will be given to the people that already live in Brightlingsea. People need who live here either to go to work or leave the area to visit other parts of Essex and a road that can be blocked for a long time and no one can get out for any reason should have some consideration</p> | |
| 1062700, 390 | No | <p>The volume of traffic to and from Brightlingsea will be increased enormously. Traffic in and out of the town is already appalling. 12,000 vehicles were counted coming in and out of Brightlingsea on one day. This is in itself disastrous; to contemplate increasing this amount beggars belief! Brightlingsea because of the large building developments being planned and</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>built by Tendring district council and passed and endorsed by Essex County Council. And fact that the infrastructure in the town is non-existent and is not being taken into consideration is more than enough for the residents to bear. To add to this the noise, pollution, dust and the debris which will inevitably be dropped from the lorries is unthinkable. Eastern Waste Disposal cause enough dust and noise already without adding to it. Of the risk to health of the residents and the pupils of the Colne Community School there is no doubt. The increased traffic in Church Road and the hill going up towards All Saints does not bear thinking about. These vehicles will be carrying heavy loads and the risk to the foundations of All Saints need to be considered as a matter of urgency. The church is very ancient and it was not built to withstand the increase in vibrations from the increased number of heavily laden lorries. The hill is already used by double decker buses and very large vehicles also the school buses going to and fro each day; this is more than enough without adding to it. A survey of All Saints should be carried out by civil engineers to assess the risk to the foundations before a definitive decision is made. Yet again Brightlingsea has been made a dumping ground for this Waste Recycling Centre which other areas surrounding Brightlingsea have refused to entertain. This town is fast becoming a large carpark because of all the building developments in the town. We should not be subjected to any more disruption to our roads than we already have to put up with. All the roads are in a disgusting state of repair which cannot be blamed on the winter weather alone. The enormous amount of traffic now in the town is unbearable and untenable and we don't</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | want any more traffic to add to it. Basically the residents of Brightlingsea have had enough of their town being a dumping ground. I trust my concerns and the serious concerns of the residents in the town will be considered, in particular the risk to the fabric of All Saints church. | |
| 922608, 392 | No | What about the word no do you not understand. Too close to residents, would you like it a few metres from your lounge window, near a supermarket and school. Very populated residential area and roads that won't take the extra traffic. Brightlingsea is not suitable stop telling us what we want and listen to the facts and the people who live here. Better still why don't you have it where you live. Please, please think again. | |
| 297987, 397 | No | We would like to strongly object to the proposed Inert Waste Recycling Centre at Morses Lane, Brightlingsea. Brightlingsea is a small coastal town with only a single narrow road accessing the village. The constant passage of heavy lorries in and out of our town causes exponential wear and tear on the road surfaces and the lorries often leave dangerous debris on the roads. At peak time there are already queues forming to get in and out of the town without the addition of more traffic. These large noisy lorries also have to drive close to houses along a primary residential road. If the waste centre is to have an anaerobic digestion power and heat plant, surely this will pollute the air? The site is located very close to a popular food store a large secondary school with open playing fields within 200metres and dense residential housing/. Surely not an ideal location in anyone's imagination for a | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>noisy air polluting industrial use. Amendments to the proposal on the consultation document comment that it is expected that operations would be enclosed with an appropriate building are a gross understatement. We would ask that ECC should make this a specific requirement and strictly impose that any storage use or recycling on this site should only be carried out within a suitable sound insulated building that has been discretely designed to a high standard to fit into the rural surroundings and that no polluting anaerobic power plant should be allowed. We would ask the ECC should de select this option, or at the very least impose very strict controls upon the operator to control noise and air pollutions at the very least.</p> | |
| 1062787, 415 | No | <p>I would like you to reconsider your decision to allow this expansion of Eastern waste disposal site in Morses Lane. As I have explained in previous emails, I am extremely concerned about the extra vehicles that will be using the surrounding roads, the current EWD staff drive at speed when leaving the site, not taking into consideration other road users, there have been many near misses at the Morses lane junction. This will only get worse. My parents own the property immediately next door to EWD I understand my Father has invited you to visit his home to show the effect this expansion would have on his property ,nobody has responded to his invitation .It does feel that ECC are not showing any thought for the residents of Brightlingsea, I am sure there would be a different outcome if the staff dealing with this proposal lived locally</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1062798, 421 | No | <p>I would like to strongly object to the nature of the development that has been proposed on the adjoining land. The development being only 16 metres from the house will have an unquantifiable negative effect on both the house and garden. My parents have owned this house for over 45 years and have made it a Hub for the family with 5 children 16 grandchildren and 2 great grandchildren. There is always activity and frequent visitors. The garden has held endless birthday parties, Camping weekends, 6 wedding receptions, 4 christenings and 3 golden weddings. Additionally 3 garden fetes have been held for charity raising in excess of £15,000. The small woodland has been successfully managed to encourage as much wildlife as possible. I know all these things are of little interest, a but I hope they do paint a picture as to how a development of this nature would not only have a negative impact on the value and appeal of the house, but would also pollute the SOUND, LIGHT and AIR having a detrimental effect on so many people and wild life. I know my father has suggested a site visit to the house so you could truly see the devastating effect the proposal would have and as yet he has received no response. I would also like to invite you on behalf of my family and look forward to a response.</p> | |
| 1062832, 434 | No | <p>This is my parents' property and it immediately adjoins the proposed earmarked location, it is the only immediate residential property neighbouring the site and feel has been completely overlooked by planners. With this in mind I would like to raise a number of major concerns: 1) Noise, light, dust, fumes, vermin, smells, etc., 2) The height of the building/buildings 4) Hours of</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>working 3) Devaluation of Oakwood On plan it may not be obvious just how close Oakwood is to the boundary and the impact it would have. This is causing great concern for my elderly parents and there is a great need for them to be directly consulted. We would welcome a visit from you. I look forward to hearing from you.</p> | |
| 1062886, 436 | No | <p>We learn from the local paper that Morses Lane is still being considered a suitable site for a waste processing plant. It is extremely difficult to understand why.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many other co-respondents have pointed out the negative effects such a development would have on the town, its proximity to the school and supermarket, and the inaccessibility of the road to Brightlingsea. • If, in spite of all advice to the contrary, these changes are permitted please take every care to minimise the impact on the surrounding area. • My parents' house in Samson's Road is the nearest dwelling. Can you assure us that they will not be affected by noise and dust? • They are not "sensory receptors" but people. | |
| 988628, 446 | No | <p>Further to the amended details for the planned recycling plant in Brightlingsea, I wish to say I still feel there must be better situated sites in Essex. There is still one road in and out with many heavy vehicles using it. There is also a school/college and supermarket in the vicinity which surely would be affected by noises and dust</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|---|--|
| | | fallout. | |
| 1062925, 451 | No | The proposed area is unfit for purpose. Moved to this area of Brightlingsea 95% people of retiring age, disabled and breathing problems majority are bungalows % of housing are affordable pollution increases noise, heavy vehicle movements, school & retail business wildlife, include owls, woodpecker, bats. Road infrastructure unsuitable lives have been lost. | |
| 1063382, Tendring District Council, 484 | Yes | Within modified Policy 3 (Strategic Site Allocations) of the RWLP the Morses Lane site remains promoted as a site for inert waste recycling despite this Councils previous comments. Within modified Policy 12 (Transport and Access), an additional criterion has been drafted: Where access to the main road network in accordance with (b) and (c) above is not feasible, road access via a suitable existing road prior to gaining access onto the main road network will exceptionally be permitted, having regard to the scale of the development, the proximity of sensitive receptors, the capacity of the road and an assessment of the impact on road safety. This helps to address the first part of our second objection. Within modified Table 14 (Morses Lane Brightlingsea), two additional bullet points have been added to the explanatory text. This state: It is expected that operations would be enclosed within an appropriate building. And The configuration and operation of the proposed facility shall have regard to impacts on neighbouring land uses, including the potential impacts on the adjacent retail use. The above modifications to the supporting text to Table 14, along with the modifications to Policy 12 address TDCs second | Given the above proposed modifications, TDC consider the Replacement Waste Local Plan Schedule of Modifications to be sound. TDC also recommends continues involvement of its members, land owners and town councils in the waste local plan process to ensure its deliverability. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M17? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | objection. We therefore no longer object to the to the proposed site at Morses Lane and withdraw our objection accordingly. | |
| 1063440, Natural England, 500 | Yes | We note that this site will be subject to further HRA screening due to the proximity with European and internationally designated sites. | |

Modification M18 – Newport Quarry

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M18? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|--|---|
| 922465, Needham Chalks (HAM) Limited, 1 | No | With regard to the second bullet, the first sentence includes the modified wording careful consideration of the environmental and visual impacts will be necessary particularly if a proposal relates to already restored areas. Justification given for the modified wording is to strengthen the intended protection of local amenity to address the concerns of local residents. However, looking back through comments from local residents, i.e. Newport Parish Council, concerns were expressed regarding a number of matters but no mention was made of visual impacts. | To remove the words and visual impacts from the second bullet as it doesn't accurately reflect residents' concerns. |
| 953880, Widdington Parish | Yes | Widdington Parish Council supports the modifications within the consultation Appendix 16 - table 15 - Newport Quarry, and reiterates the importance of vehicles only accessing the quarry from the B1383 and not going through Widdington village unless | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M18? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Council, 52 | | servicing a Widdington address. | |
| 1599, Newport Parish Council, 423 | Yes | Newport Parish Council supports the modifications within the consultation Appendix 16 - Table 15 Newport Quarry and emphasises the importance of vehicles only accessing the quarry from the B1383 and not going through Widdington village unless servicing an address in Widdington. | |
| 1063440, Natural England, 501 | Yes | We previously wrote on 16 November 2015 that we had no specific comments regarding the addition of Newport Quarry (our ref: 168966) as an allocation. We welcome the additional detail on restoration type (to lowland calcareous grassland priority habitat) as this fits the context of the South Suffolk and North Essex Clayland National Character Area in which Newport Quarry sits. | |

Modification M19 – Rivenhall

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1053830, 3 | No | Rivenhall site has been refused Environmental Licence by the Environmental Agency, therefore should be excluded from the document. | Table 16 Rivenhall should be excluded from the document. |
| 1053830, 11 | No | ECC have removed geographical restrictions in import of waste to the site. Therefore this site may potentially not process any | Table 16 Rivenhall and any mention of Rivenhall site should be removed from the Waste Plan. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | waste from Essex as this will be dependent on legal fair tender, by which non-county providers may outbid Essex providers for waste management. | |
| 609943, KTI Energy Limited, 13 | No | Objection to Rivenhall incinerator These criteria were not available to Essex County Council when the developer of the Rivenhall approached the County Council for planning consent. With no competing project on offer at the time, the County Council offered that developer every assistance notwithstanding the claim for the project to be CHP is highly suspect. Information in the public domain suggests the project is designed to de-ink waste paper. Making comparison with the electricity and heat demand of the much larger Kemsley paper mill, probably a 3-4MWe gas turbine would suffice with its exhaust passing through a Heat Recovery Steam Generator to provide necessary heat. However, the Schedule of Modifications No 19 proposes increasing delivery of waste to Rivenhall from 360,000 t/a to 595,000 t/a placing the project on a par with the Allington incinerator in terms of 40-45MWe electricity output. Essex County Council hence proposes that by the Rivenhall project using 2.5MWe electricity and 2.0MWth heat in-house, while exporting minimum 36MWe electricity to the grid, a gullible public is expected to accept that the project is good quality CHP and not an incinerator. | |
| 1057930, Kelvedon Parish Council, 29 | No | The planning committee noted the Consultation period (open for comments for six weeks until 16 February) and wished to make the following observations: Modification No. 19 Indicative Facility Scale: Anaerobic Digestion 85,000tpa -> 30,000tpa Combined Heat & Power 360,000tpa -> 595,000tpa Kelvedon Parish Council objects to the changes on the basis that the 90% increase in the amount of material burnt is not sustainable development as the pro rata increase in emissions, materially increases the environmental impact and the health effects on the local community. In addition, Kelvedon Parish Council feel that it is unnecessary to implement such an increase, when there are | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | other sites in close proximity i.e. Basildon and Ipswich, which are currently operating under capacity. Kelvedon Parish Council would prefer that these are both fully utilised before any further increase is agreed at other sites. | |
| 985065, 41 | No | THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT QUESTION OVER WHETHER THE PROPOSED RIVENHALL SITE WOULD STILL BE CLASSED AS CHP FOLLOWING THE S73 PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED BY ECC IN EARLY 2016. THE INCINERATOR CAPACITY WAS INCREASED BY 65% BUT THE PRIMARY USER OF HEAT THE ON-SITE PAPER PULPING UNIT CAPACITY WAS REDUCED BY 53%. GIVEN THAT AT THE PREVIOUS TONNAGES (360,000 TPA FOR BOTH CHP AND THE PULP UNIT) THE SITE WAS SAID TO USE ALL THE HEAT PRODUCED, IT IS NOT CLEAR HOW THE SAME WOULD BE TRUE AT 595,000 TPA FOR THE INCINERATOR AND 170,000 TPA PULP. FURTHERMORE, THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE IN DECEMBER 2016 PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE BY GENT FAIRHEAD TO DEMONSTRATE BAT FOR THE INCINERATOR/CHP UNIT. | |
| 1059617, 56 | No | I oppose the change to table 16 Rivenhall airfield as the indicative scale is changed from 369,000 tpa to 595,000 tpa combined heat and power (CHP) | Should the Rivenhall site still be classed as CHP following this change which also questions the S73 planning permission granted by ECC in early 2016? The incinerator capacity was increased by 65% but the primary user of heat the paper pulping unit capacity was reduced by 53% therefore excess heat would be unused. Furthermore the environment agency refused a permit due to failure to demonstrate BAT for the incinerator/CHP unit in December 2016. |
| 983638, 67 | No | In the S73 Planning Permission granted by ECC in 2016 the incinerator capacity for Rivenhall was increased by 65%, whilst the primary user of heat (the on-site paper pulping unit capacity) | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | was reduced by 53%. The previous tpa quote of 360,000 was said to use all the heat produced. Therefore, how can this still be true for the new figures of 595,000 tpa for incineration/170,000 tpa for pulp? As the environment agency has refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site, due to BAT for this incinerator and CHP unit, it is difficult to see how the proposed Rivenhall site can be classed as CHP. | |
| 1060507, Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee, 83 | No | THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT QUESTION OVER WHETHER THE PROPOSED RIVENHALL SITE WOULD STILL BE CLASSED AS CHP FOLLOWING THE S73 PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED BY ECC IN EARLY 2016. THE INCINERATOR CAPACITY WAS INCREASED BY 65% BUT THE PRIMARY USER OF HEAT THE ON-SITE PAPER PULPING UNIT CAPACITY WAS REDUCED BY 53%. GIVEN THAT AT THE PREVIOUS TONNAGES (360,000 TPA FOR BOTH CHP AND THE PULP UNIT) THE SITE WAS SAID TO USE ALL THE HEAT PRODUCED, IT IS NOT CLEAR HOW THE SAME WOULD BE TRUE AT 595,000 TPA FOR THE INCINERATOR AND 170,000 TPA PULP. FURTHERMORE, THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE IN DECEMBER 2016 PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE BY GENT FAIRHEAD TO DEMONSTRATE BAT FOR THE INCINERATOR/CHP UNIT. | |
| 477311, 92 | No | THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT QUESTION OVER WHETHER THE PROPOSED RIVENHALL SITE WOULD STILL BE CLASSED AS CHP (Combined Heat and Power) FOLLOWING THE S73 PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED BY ECC IN EARLY 2016. THE INCINERATOR CAPACITY WAS INCREASED BY 65% BUT THE PRIMARY USER OF HEAT THE ON-SITE PAPER PULPING UNIT - CAPACITY WAS REDUCED BY 53%. GIVEN THAT AT THE PREVIOUS TONNAGES (360,000 TPA FOR BOTH CHP AND THE PULP UNIT) THE SITE WAS SAID TO USE ALL THE HEAT PRODUCED, IT IS NOT CLEAR HOW | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | THE SAME WOULD BE TRUE AT 595,000 TPA FOR THE INCINERATOR AND 170,000 TPA PULP. FURTHERMORE, THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE IN DECEMBER 2016 PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE BY GENT FAIRHEAD TO DEMONSTRATE BAT FOR THE INCINERATOR/CHP UNIT. | |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 135 | Yes | Support the principle of increasing the CHP capacity as it helps to ensure other Essex areas share the burden of waste related development and ensures the plan is based on up to date information. | |
| 987897, 171 | No | I do not think it appropriate to assume that the proposed Rivenhall site can be classed as a combined heat and power site. In early 2016, ECC granted permission by way of a S73 variation to the original permission for this site, such that the incinerator capacity was increased by 65%. However, the primary user of heat, i.e. the on-site paper pulping facility was reduced by 53%. It is no longer clear how the heat generated with the now planned 595,000 tonnes per annum incinerated material could be used, given the reduction in proposed pulping. Note also that the environment agency has refused the permit application for this site in December 2016, largely because of the applicant's failure to demonstrate Best Available Technology for the incinerator. | |
| 1061659, 178 | No | THERE HAVE BEEN CHANGES TO SIZE AND SCALE OF THE SITE AND OUTPUT WHICH SEEM TO CONFLICT EACH OTHER. THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT QUESTION OVER WHETHER THE PROPOSED RIVENHALL SITE WOULD STILL BE CLASSED AS CHP FOLLOWING THE S73 PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED BY ECC IN EARLY 2016. THE INCINERATOR CAPACITY WAS INCREASED BY 65% BUT THE PRIMARY USER OF HEAT THE ON-SITE PAPER PULPING UNIT CAPACITY WAS REDUCED BY 53%. GIVEN | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | THAT AT THE PREVIOUS TONNAGES (360,000 TPA FOR BOTH CHP AND THE PULP UNIT) THE SITE WAS SAID TO USE ALL THE HEAT PRODUCED, IT IS NOT CLEAR HOW THE SAME WOULD BE TRUE AT 595,000 TPA FOR THE INCINERATOR AND 170,000 TPA PULP. FURTHERMORE, THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE IN DECEMBER 2016 PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE BY GENT FAIRHEAD TO DEMONSTRATE BAT FOR THE INCINERATOR/CHP UNIT. | |
| 1061682, 196 | No | In early 2016 the s73 planning permission granted for a CHP plant. As the incinerators capacity has increased by 65% but the main heat user the onsite paper pulping unit been reduced by 53%, previous tonnages were 36,000tpa for both chip and pulp unit the site was to use all heat produced. I don't know how this could be the case as tpa has increased to 595,000 for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp. As Gent Fairhead could not demonstrate bat for the incinerator/CHP unit they were refused a permit from the environment agency. | |
| 1061711, Goslings Granary, 210 | No | A change is required to the Replacement Waste Local Plan Appendix B Allocated Sites: Development Principles Table 16 Rivenhall - Estimated Availability- "Can be implemented immediately." Should be deleted and replaced with "Will require further planning permission and an Environmental Permit." The justification for this proposed change is to be 'effective' and 'positively' prepared the Plan must reflect the best available data." | |
| 1059617, 226 | No | A change is required to the Replacement Waste Local Plan Appendix B Allocated Sites: Development Principles Table 16 Rivenhall - Estimated Availability- "Can be implemented immediately." This must be deleted and replaced with "Will require further planning permission and an Environmental Permit and to tender successfully for the contract." The justification for | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | this proposed change is in order to present the current situation and best possible practise. Would the proposed Rivenhall site be classed as a CHP following the S73 planning permission granted in 2016 with the incinerator capacity being increased by 65% but the primary use see of the heat- the onsite paper pulping capacity being reduced by 53%? Further still the Environment agency refused an environmental permit in December 2016 as Gent Fairhead failing to demonstrate BAT for the proposed incinerator/CHP unit. | |
| 988283, Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council, 233 | No | There is a significant question over whether the proposed Rivenhall site would still be classed as CHP (combined heat and power) following the s73 planning permission granted by ECC in early 2016. The incinerator capacity was increased by 65%, but the primary user of heat the on-site paper pulping unit - capacity was reduced by 53%. Given that at the previous tonnages (360,000 tpa for both CHP and the pulp unit) the site was said to use all the heat produced, it is not clear how the same would be true at 595,000 tpa for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp. Furthermore, the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 primarily because of the failure by Gent Fairhead to demonstrate BAT for the incinerator/CHP unit. | |
| 1061886, 253 | Yes | I have recently picked up a leaflet from PAIN, an organisation which opposed the building of the Rivenhall incinerator. I think the incinerator is an excellent idea as long as it is modern and efficient. We produce far too much rubbish anyway, and a lot of it cannot be either recycled or composted. The choice is either burning it or letting it accumulate. The heat produced by incineration can be a used to generate electricity and it could be a useful source of local employment. I hope very much that you will not stand in the way of this project. | |
| 1062089, Coggeshall | No | We believe there is a significant question over whether the proposed Rivenhall site would still be classed as CHP following | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| Parish Council, 325 | | <p>the s73 planning permission granted by ECC in early 2016. The incinerator capacity was increased by 65% whereas the on-site paper pulping unit capacity was reduced by 53%. Given that at the previous tonnages (360,000 tpa for both CHP and the pulp unit) yet the site was said to use all the heat produced, it is not clear how the same would be true at 595,000 tpa for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp with no increase in energy produced and a significant increase in CO2 outputs thereby questioning the energy from waste element aspect.</p> <p>Furthermore, the changes in proportions are not reflected in the accompanying Environmental impact reports (these use the 2010 proportions). The new proportions for the plant are not clearly explained, evaluated and the required stack height changes negate ALL the air quality modelling, the receptor positions and the associated data acquired. All this supports the environment agency permit refusal for the Rivenhall site in December 2016.</p> | |
| 1062112, 334 | No | <p>Allocating Rivenhall airfield to receive Essex waste from Basildon and waste from London post 2026 is not a minor change. The distance from Basildon to Rivenhall is between 30 and 40 miles by doing this ECC would not be minimising HGV distances when there are closer sites. This would not be minimising CO2 emissions and protecting the air quality.</p> | |
| 1062131, Marks Tey Parish Council, 340 | No | <p>Last night, the PC passed the resolution below, which relates to M19, which we oppose: " The PC notes that the Rivenhall plant will be expected to take 300000 tpa of waste for anaerobic digestion (which was originally 830000 tpa) and 595000 tpa of waste for combined heat & power breakdown, which is over 200000 tpa more than originally planned, & has three objections: 1. Burning the waste on this scale will be environmentally damaging & lead to increases in emissions, & a decline in the air quality locally. This will be potentially dangerous to many & particularly to older people. 2. As there are alternative sites locally, at Basildon & Ipswich, with surplus</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | capacity for these kinds of waste, they should be used before other sites are considered" 3. The PC remains concerned about the increased traffic, and believes some of this could be reduced by a junction on the proposed A120" | |
| 1062747, 398 | No | It is with some surprise that subsequently to the adjournment of the Public Hearings at the end of October, no mention of the rejection of an Environmental Permit for the Rivenhall IWMF (Dec 16th) | |
| 743809, 455 | No | WOULD THE PROPOSED RIVENHALL SITE STILL BE CLASSED AS CHP FOLLOWING THE S73 PLANNING PERMISSION (GRANTED BY ECC EARLY 2016)? THE INCINERATOR CAPACITY WAS INCREASED BY 65% BUT THE PRIMARY USER OF HEAT IS ONLY THE ON-SITE PAPER PULPING UNIT THE CAPACITY FOR WHICH WAS REDUCED BY 53%. GIVEN THAT AT THE PREVIOUS TONNAGES (360,000 TPA FOR BOTH CHP AND THE PULP UNIT), THE SITE WAS SAID TO USE ALL THE HEAT PRODUCED, IT IS NOT CLEAR HOW THE SAME WOULD BE TRUE AT 595,000 TPA FOR THE INCINERATOR AND 170,000 TPA PULP. THE APPLICANT NEEDS TO BE ASKED FOR DETAILS ON THIS PLEASE NB THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY HAS ALREADY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE (2016) PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE BY GENT FAIRHEAD TO DEMONSTRATE BAT FOR THE INCINERATOR/CHP UNIT. | |
| 1062948, 462 | No | I live Kelvedon and I am very concerned about the ever changing plans for the Rivenhall incinerator. They have changed quite considerably compared to their original planning application making it bigger and with little information about waste and local contamination to the local waterways. The bigger scale also would increase air pollution to the local area and effect our environment. Initially I was under the understanding that the incinerator would only take local waste. | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | Why is there the possibility of also taking waste from /Basildon and London? (Mod 5 main policy 3 clause 3 updates). This will also increase HGV transportation costs and pollution...therefore I feel this is not a minor impact. Please take seriously our concerns and relook at this planning application and its implications to the surrounding population and environment. | |
| 618724, 510 | No | THERE IS A QUESTION AS TO WHETHER THE PROPOSED RIVENHALL SITE WOULD STILL BE CLASSED AS CHP FOLLOWING THE S73 PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED BY ECC IN EARLY 2016. ALL THE HEAT AND THE MAJORITY OF ELECTRICITY WAS TAKEN WITHIN THE PLANT AND NOT PRODUCED FOR DISTRICT BENEFIT IN THE ORIGINAL CONSENT. NOW THE INCINERATOR CAPACITY HAS INCREASED BY 65% TO 595,000 TPA IN THE S73 CHANGE BUT THE PRIMARY USER OF HEAT THE ON-SITE PAPER PULPING UNIT CAPACITY - WAS REDUCED BY 53%. GIVEN THAT AT THE PREVIOUS TONNAGES (360,000 TPA FOR BOTH CHP AND THE PULP UNIT) THE SITE WAS SAID TO USE ALL THE HEAT PRODUCED, IT IS NOT CLEAR HOW THE SAME WOULD BE TRUE AT 595,000 TPA FOR THE INCINERATOR AND 170,000 TPA PULP. FURTHERMORE, THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE IN DECEMBER 2016 PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE BY GENT FAIRHEAD TO DEMONSTRATE BAT FOR THE INCINERATOR/CHP UNIT. THE PLAN MAY NEED TO BE AMENDED IF RIVENHALL IS NO LONGER CHP. | |
| 911132, Cressing Parish Council, 520 | No | There is a significant question over whether the proposed Rivenhall site would still be classed as CHP (combined heat and power) following the s73 planning permission granted by ECC in early 2016. The incinerator capacity was increased by 65% but the primary user of heat the on-site paper pulping unit - capacity was reduced by 53%. Given that at the previous tonnages (360,000 tpa for both CHP and the pulp unit) the site was said to | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | use all the heat produced, it is not clear how the same would be true at 595,000 tpa for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp. Furthermore, the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 primarily because of the failure by the applicant to demonstrate BAT for the incinerator/CHP unit. | |
| 988001, 540 | No | I understand that the application by Gent Fairhead, for the Rivenhall IWMF, to the Environment Agency was rejected and that they intend to resubmit their application shortly. I write to: - (i) fully endorse the views expressed in the letter sent to ECC by Peter Kohn on behalf of the Coggeshall Neighbourhood Planning team (ii) comment further on the intention, by Gent Fairhead to submit a new application with ECC to vary the permission on the stack height from 37m to 85m. As I understand it, the maximum stack height was fixed at 37m and the arguments for this limit fully rehearsed in discussions and in subsequent planning documents. An increase of almost 137% in the proposed height represents a material change in the plan, not a minor amendment. The I trust that Gent Fairhead will be required by ECC to re-submit their entire plan, which will then proceed via the normal process, with all the necessary scrutiny and consultation before a final decision is reached. The thought of a tower 37m high, looming over the Essex countryside, spouting toxic fumes and polluting land of all kinds: agricultural and forestry, lightly and heavily populated, is not one anyone would relish. The visual impact alone of increasing the tower height by 48m (well over double the height) would be hugely detrimental to the outlook from all directions. It should be noted that planned developments in Kelvedon, West Tey, etc. (all within range of pollution from the incinerator), would in all probability, raise the number of people affected by perhaps 50,000 to 80,000. The reason for limiting the stack height to 37m, are as valid now as they were when planning permission was granted. I hope they will be vigorously applied when the | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M19? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | new application is considered. | |

Modification M20 - Sandon

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M20? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 136 | Yes | Support the principle as it helps to ensure other Essex areas share the burden of waste related development and ensures the plan is based on up to date information. | |

Modification M21 – Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 496468, David L Walker Limited, 9 | Yes | Tarmac support the main modification 21 with the inclusion of C&D recycling within the plant site area for site L (i) 5, subject to a few comments on the issues and opportunities which are detailed on the form attached. No further comments are presented in respect of the remainder of the main consultation document. Please find attached completed response form covering the comments on Appendix 17 above, covering details | The focus of the modification is agreed, save for the following:- 1. Instead of using the current site access, Tarmac proposed to establish a new access into site L(i)5, which site W36 would also benefit from. The proposed access point has been |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>for site L(i)5 (table 19). We note the new assessment profile in document MC2 for site W36 (as a replacement for site W13) Tarmac agree with the majority of the assessments apart from question 3D of site W36, where we do not believe that 66 sensitive receptors are within a 250m radius of the site. The plan extract attached only shows a handful of properties to the east of the proposed allocation within a 250m radius. As such the site should be scored Amber 1.</p> | <p>selected and designed within the appropriate consideration of traffic flow and speeds along the B1027. Details of the design and speed will be provided as part of any planning application. The opportunities and issues list should be amended as such.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The entirety of site L(i)5 is allocated for minerals extraction, under which the site also benefits from a flagship status under the biodiversity SPG which supports the minerals plan. It is therefore suggested that the first sentence of the 6th bullet point should be deleted. 3. The specific issues on site 1 are agreed. 4. However under the specific issues on site 2, Tarmac question the need for bunding along the southern perimeter of the proposed recycling area, as an established hedgerow is already present and effective. It is suggested that the western perimeter would be more in need of bunding to restrict views off the B1027 into the site from the west. |
| 1060282, 75 | No | <p>Birds Farm is an established Holiday Cottage business and residential property, 150m to the north of the proposed Inert Waste Recycling operations at site 2. 1) We object to the specific location of site 2. It appears to have been chosen because it's likely to offer an alternative access onto the B1027, not only for site 2, but also for Site 1 operations. 2) Why isn't a</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>more central location within L (i) 5 being considered, perhaps adjacent to the western boundary? It's closer to the haul road access and away from the properties to the north and east. 3) MC1, appendix 17,page 74 states for site 1, that a minimum of 100m standoff is to be provided for all residential properties and effective screening provided to screen views of the site. Why does site 2, not have to comply with the same criteria? 4) What are the specific requirements going to be at site 2, to mitigate the noise and dust pollution?</p> | |
| 1059253, 99 | No | <p>Our property seems to have been totally overlooked in connection with the RWLP. Your letter of 03/01/2017 is the first notification to have been seen. This very small and insignificant property was purchased in the summer of 2014 and has remained empty till we engaged in building works to convert it into a substantial family house with non-polluting amenity value and uninterrupted views of the countryside. This was to have been a residence with long term potential. These works are now almost completed but would never have been undertaken in the light of what we now know. The works would have enhanced its value considerably. On review the whole RWLP project seems to be gathering momentum beyond what was originally set out. Site 2 has been added in and the term extended from 8 through to 17 years and not only that but Tarmac is now asking for a new site access.</p> | <p>1. New Site 2 is not to go ahead at all as impacting on the unspoilt setting of Rosedean and others and as such diminishing the investment and added value applied to it. Visual , noise ,and dust pollution issues as well as diminution of property value will be impacted. I would suggest bunding would not overcome these very real concerns. 2. Any new plant and machinery that is needed for site 1, if it is , to be placed out of mind and sight of all residential property. It could easily remain where it currently is or if necessary be placed on the western edge of the site along where the current access road links to it. 3.Any access / haul road / site access change to be opposed. There is no reason at all why the current facility can't remain. Altering it would impact on neighbouring property as well as the busy B1027. 4. Surely the length of time the project is set to run could be reined in. Have pity on the resident population. What is proposed now is more than double</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | the initial plan. |
| 1059221, 112 | No | <p>I would question the validity of the whole of the RWLP document as it exists as it is so sparse in detail. Furthermore it seems to be gaining momentum without clarification of its full context. Quite clearly local parishes and residents are unaware of what is afoot. The notification only just received (seen for the first time on receipt of the letter dated 03/01/2017) is wrapped up in ECC policy type wording and difficult to understand. It would seem that new site 2 proposed is to be used for the processing of recycling material for use both on site and at other sites too. This presents highways issues--products being transported both in and out. Properties to the east have been dismissed as insignificant by Tarmac in their fresh submission. It has been established policy that a 250m boundary is maintained when developing such schemes which should surely apply without exception. Prevailing weather /wind would tend to in the direction towards north /east which would enhance the pollution concerns of noise and dust etc. for residences to the north and east of the site. Footpaths currently enjoyed by many must be maintained. The original 8 year period has now become 17. This has further impact on quality of life and unspoilt countryside with its views and inherent ecology.</p> | <p>Site 2 should not be used as proposed at all--no need -- only use current access routes on the site together with existing screening, grading, crushing, plant facilities. Ensure a minimum 250m boundary is maintained around the site wherever residential property happens to be regardless. Reduce the time scale back to what was originally proposed. Fully protect residents from visual , noise , dust pollution etc. That properties that stand to be impacted the most be fully compensated. That all trucks keep to clearly defined and enforced routes on the highway. At present they go whichever way they please.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 984607, 118 | No | <p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this consultation. As the property owner of Rosedene, I am strongly opposed to the amendments suggested, in particular the addition proposed of site 2. Having recently developed this property and look forward to a long term quality of life here. My property backs directly onto site 2 and would have hugely detrimental impact, including but not limited to the following: - Movement and crumbling of house foundations due to movement in the ground nearby from equipment and digging out the ground. - Severe noise pollution from nearby machinery - Severe dust pollution with potential health issues due to contamination in the air and breathing in dust and dirt - Severe water and soil contamination from machinery fuel and oil and potential health issues through drinking water, and potential impact on environment and property landscaping, and wildlife in surrounding area - Increased road traffic on the B1027, an already very very busy road with a minimum of 11,000 cars day, causing danger for both entering and exiting the property - I am highly opposed to the clear proposal from David Walker Associates (acting on behalf of Tarmac) of an additional entrance to the left of my property Rosedene directly on to the B1027, on to the site due to limited visibility and the fact that the B1027 is unable to cater to the addition traffic from HGV's and severely detrimental impact this will have to me as owner of Rosedene, and locals in the surrounding villages - Extreme danger for cyclists and young children on the B1027 from the large tipper lorries, in particular young children when at my property Rosedene - Damage of surrounding view both day and night - Adverse and detrimental</p> | <p>I consider it of highest importance that Site 2 is eradicated from the suggested proposal for the above mentioned reasons and that no equipment is moved within this area at all. The existing entrance should be maintained as originally laid out, meaning that the existing equipment can continue to be utilised, as it currently is. A minimum of 250m boundary must be maintained around my property, and all other residential properties. Reduce the timescale back to 8 years maximum Proper bunding to be implemented around the whole site 1, where there is any potential impact to any property Fully methodology and proposal to protect all residents from visual, noise, dust pollution, damage to property foundations, water contamination, and soil contamination Full compensation to property owners in the area such as myself who are directly impacted All HGV's and commercial vehicles to adhere to defined routes on the highway, rather than short cutting across country.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | effects to property value - Overall impact on quality of life severely adverse, particularly in relation to health implications mentioned above I am also very concerned as to the limited information and notifications that have been distributed, as very few seem to be aware what is happening, and on looking into, very little information is provided as needed. | |
| 1061998, Alresford Parish Council, 302 | No | Alresford Parish Council has looked at your proposed modifications intently and has some observations and comments that they would like to make you aware of. 1. The lack of information regarding these modifications is concerning, another concrete crusher is apparently required which has not been stated on the paperwork. It is apparently to be positioned close to a residential garden (site 2). If this is the case why is it not possible to use the existing concrete crusher? 2. We are concerned about the amount of dust and inconvenience noise from the Crusher and the high pitched noise from Diggers and Lorries when reversing, especially for those residents that back on to Colchester Main Road. 3. Why was this location chosen, the council are perplexed at this as it is not a logical location there are other places this could be located. 4. If it is the case that the entrance and exit will be on to the B1027 we strongly object to it, due to the fact it is a very busy road and going by your map your drivers will be exiting and entering on a blind bend. 5. The whole situation needs a rethink. What have not been taken into consideration is ' People ' and their lives above their own Business Model. We have got to live and work together for 15 years on this project. Why can't we live in some | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | sort of harmony? Overall the council objects to your proposed modifications. | |
| 1061210, 411 | No | <p>Thank you for your letter of notification dated 3 January 2017. (Your Ref RWLP/Modifications) I have lived in my present house for over 25 years in the knowledge that the field, your Site1 adjoining my garden, would one day become a gravel pit. I accepted this fact knowing that protest would be futile and that gravel has to come from somewhere. It wasn't until I received your letter and plan that I learned that it was highly likely that the a gravel processing plant .and an inert waste recycling plant was being proposed for the field shown as Site 2. I get the impression that this is to make it more convenient, and thus economic, for the operators by not having to use the existing Wivenhoe site. This was a bit of a bombshell as it means that we are now highly likely to be seriously affected by noise and dust generated at this Site 2.(We are on the leeward side of the site) This would be detrimental to our quality of life and would detract from the value of our property. Screen planting and a bund would only hide the site from view it would not stop noise & dust. I thus object to the proposed modification to the plan. Site 1 is large enough for the processing plants to be situated in the centre where intrusion into homes would be minimised by distance from the plant. One other point I would make. Site 2 is so close to the B1027 road that it would only be a matter of time before a very short haul road was pushed from Site 2 directly onto the B1027. How convenient for the contractors balance sheet and detrimental to users of this already accident prone</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | part of the road. Thank you for considering our views. | |
| 1020371, Colchester Gospel Hall Trust, 450 | No | This is my response to your current consultation. I object to your proposal for site 2 for the following reasons: - Backing on to residential property Noise Pollution Impact on outlook No plan provided of where machinery equipment will be located Lorries parked in approach road In addition, I consider the proposal incomplete due to lack of any information regarding a new access intended by Tarmac. Other comments:- General lack of awareness of the proposals in the neighbourhood Unwillingness to attend a site meeting in order to gain better first-hand knowledge of the site and the surroundings | |
| 1063382, Tendring District Council, 485 | Yes | Within modified Policy 3, The Council notes the proposed extension to the site at Sunnymead near Elmstead Marked. Within the Pre-Submission draft RWLP the site was previously proposed for inert landfill only, The extension to the site proposes Inert waste recycling in a new section to the northwest of that larger site previously identified. At modified Table 19 (Sunnymead Elmstead), an extension to the site is proposed, as detailed above. The table identifies the relative areas of the two sites which form the Sunnymead site. 63 hectares of inert landfill with continues to be proposed from the Pre-Submission draft RWLP, an additional 7 hectares of inert waste recycling is now also proposed. A new criterion to the landfill site (Site 1) requires 100m standoff from residential properties. For the inert recycling site (Site 2) two new bullet points have been added: - Bonding is required on north, east and south sides to | Given the above proposed modifications, TDC consider the Replacement Waste Local Plan Schedule of Modifications to be sound. TDC also recommends continues involvement of its members, land owners and town councils in the waste local plan process to ensure its deliverability. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>screen the site. - To demonstrate that it could not have an adverse effect on European sites through HRA. Most likely potential impacts would be caused by disturbance. These modifications appear to be acceptable in terms of protecting residents, the landscape and designated areas. The County Council is of course aware of the two large scale residential planning applications which have been approved recently. Both approvals were allowed at appeal and are relatively close to the proposed landfill site at Sunnymead. The development for the erection of 60 dwellings (APP/P1560/W/16/3149457) at land to the north of Cockaynes Lane Alresford was allowed on the 1st December 2016. On the south side of Cockaynes Lane a development for 145 dwellings (APP/P1560/W/15/3124746) was allowed on the 1st June 2015. The closest development to the landfill site is that to the north of Cockaynes Lane which is located some 230m to the southeast of the waste site.</p> | |
| 1063440, Natural England, 504 | No | <p>While we agree on the issues to be addressed for Site 2, this allocation should be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment in order to demonstrate that it would not have an adverse effect on European sites. Therefore the modification added appears to be extraneous given the extant fourth bullet point "To demonstrate that it could not have an adverse effect on European sites through HRA ".</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 604622, 517 | No | <p>I am very concerned about a proposal that has come to my notice at the last minute M21 We have an excellent situation in Ardleigh (second reservoir works), with trucks accessing the A120/A12 junction without interference with domestic/personal lives. Safety first, I would say, and hope you agree. I have had a guided tour of the site in Ardleigh, and it is well planned for safety. I have had a good look at the proposals and plans for Alresford/Elmstead and my comments are as follows: - Lack of information well in advance of plan, this definitely is not acceptable for such a massive and long drawn out proposed operation for 17 years. Noise level from trucks and machines, also producing dust near residential property. Site 2 should not be utilised as to its proximity to residences. Heavy goods vehicles exiting on to a narrow dark spine main road between Colchester town (where we live and work) and villages east (where we often go). It's a catastrophe about to happen. Therefore I do not support this proposal and would like you to accept my objection as genuine.</p> | |
| 1064243, Historic England, 529 | No | <p>We welcome the requirement to investigate gravels for archaeological deposits as part of the Environmental Statement. Whilst Palaeolithic deposits are of significant interest in this part of the world and the policy wording is well intentioned, we have some concern that the policy would exclude similarly important archaeological remains from other periods of human activity. As written, the investigation would not be required to establish the potential for Mesolithic human activity for example, which we do not think is the intention of the Inspector. We strongly request</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | substituting Palaeolithic with archaeological, which would cover all periods of human activity. | |
| 1064274, 532 | No | I was very surprised to learn that the ECC are planning to extend the current recycling facility in Elmstead so as to encroach on numerous, at present undisturbed residential properties. This shows a distinct lack of consideration for others for the following reasons: 1. Information on the extent of the new facility has been very paltry and failed to make residents aware of the full scope of what is proposed. 2. The noise, dust and general disturbance will directly impact a number of residential properties. 3. The residents should not have to tolerate the consequential noise, dirt and loss of air quality associated with such an operation. 4. The access would appear to be off a blind bend and this will pose a serious hazard for other motorists. I therefore oppose the scheme in its current format and would ask the Council to go back to the drawing board and have a complete rethink in view presenting a scheme that considers for the neighbourhood and shows consideration for those that live in close proximity to the operation. | |
| 1064276, 533 | No | It concerns the extension of the recycling facilities in Arlesford/Elmstead and we would respond as follows. 1. Has any consideration been given to the residents of the Arlesford/Elmstead villages' just think how much dust and dirt the new proposal will cause especially for those with respiratory problems. 2. We understand there is a proposed new entrance to the site which is on a narrow main road this road is already | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>very dangerous with little or no lighting and very difficult in the dark and fog another entrance where you propose is just asking for a serious accident. 3. There would be more heavy goods vehicles on a country road which a lot of cyclists use and the noise level would be unacceptable near residential properties. 4. Site 2 is in total disregard of a house (newly done up) being right on their boundary this would totally devalue the house and the site would cause immense distress to the residents of it. 5. We are also surprised that this consideration was put forward with very little chance of the residents, etc. being able to respond; not knowing anything about it this is also a very bad practise. We would, therefore, be glad if you could re-consider your plans and we would like to say we do not support your proposals and really do object to what you have in mind. We trust you will look on our comments favourably and have some consideration for neighbours in the villages of Alresford and Elmstead and indeed the community as a whole.</p> | |
| 1064282, 534 | No | <p>Following my previous letter to you I have further considered this information that has been sent to me and I respond further as follows as it definitely affects many residents in Alresford and has much wider implications than my situation in Cockaynes Lane. The environmental bearing on residents must be taken into account in any of these proposals. My further comments are as follows: 1) I am very surprised at the lack of details being submitted in this proposal. It just seems to us as it is a foregone conclusion that this has to go ahead at any cost. 2) This site 2 that has suddenly appeared is in the most offensive position</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>you can possible think of. Totally inconsiderate of adjacent residents and if it is in view of access to the B1057 it is just lunacy. This road is a night mare at all times and is just asking for further fatal accidents and congestion. I strongly oppose this as even if this whole site goes ahead there are many other areas that could be used for Recycling and using the same access to the site at Keelers Lane. If it takes longer for the lorries to do their job, TOO BAD. It is the inconvenience of the companies that are benefitting from this not the Residents.</p> <p>3) Further to this point Site 2 would create noise, dust, and other environmental issues for Residents and is totally unacceptable. 4) If the general proposal for this site goes ahead, we must have guarantees that the 250 Meter boundary between the site and all developments and Residential Property be secured legally. I would also recommend they reduce the Boundary of this site extensively. 5) For any proposal going forward there also needs to be guaranteed bunding to the perimeter of the site which needs to be grassed and evergreen hedges planted at the base of it. This must also be maintained properly at all times. COST of all this is not an issue, it is all part of the implementation of the proposal and is mandatory to be fair to the community. I submit these comments respectfully, but with urgency that this matter is adjusted to be fair to the local community of which we all have part in maintaining and being a welcomed area for other residents in the future.</p> | |
| 1064294, 535 | No | At this late hour I have just learnt about this unsolicited proposal, in deed due to lack of public awareness/consultation | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>the date for representations concerning the Modifications has been extended from Thursday 16th to Monday 20th February. I ask please: That due to lack of public awareness/consultation given by ECC to make sure the community is now given the chance for a fair hearing. That all plant and machinery access is kept at the present site off Keelers Lane. That modification Site Two behind Rosedene residential property is cancelled. That between Site One and all residential property and existing developments there is a 250 metre boundary made. That a maximum size embankment with established evergreen hedge around the circumference together with deciduous trees is put in place before commencement of the Site One project to provide an attractive landscape to shield from the works. That trucking routes are stipulated and adhered to. I would urge you to have the courage to re-think and terminate the Modifications proposal; have the implications, which would be obnoxious for the local residents, particularly for Rosedene, really been taken into account? I really wonder if ECC have made themselves familiar with the area, would any of them mind a Mineral/Recycling facility being placed on their door-step? Before the inspector issues her final report I appeal to her to visit/revisit Rosedene to see how physically near the property is to the proposed Modification Plans and the new access on the B1027, also that Rosedene is nearing completion of renovation which enhances the property and the area, whereas the said Modification Plans will be detrimental. The concerns of Alresford and Elmstead Parish Council are valid and need to be taken on. Although in a different context, as we are concerned with the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>effect on the local community rather than businesses, I thought I would finish of by including the following quote which seemed applicable: - 2/18/2017 Planning is Essential, Plans are Useless #FridayLessons minimoko</p> <p>http://minimoko.com/planningisessentialplansareuselessfrida/1/1</p> <p>December 3, 2010 0 PLANNING IS ESSENTIAL, PLANS ARE USELESS I remember vividly from my university days, when I was introduced to this concept. A similar quote has been attributed to both Winston Churchill and Dwight D. Eisenhower. Winston Churchill said that Plans are of little importance, but planning is essential. and Dwight Eisenhower said that In preparing for battle, I have always found that plans are useless but planning is indispensable. This lesson is something that I always keep in mind when preparing for the future. The important part is actually doing the plan, when it comes to executing it a lot of things will change that you cannot predict. The importance is that only through planning you will really understand what you are trying to do, how you will do it, what resources you will need, etc. Whether you are starting in business, or have already started you know how important planning is. You need to spend time to create a business plan, a marketing plan, operations plan and the list goes on. Of course in 2 years' time, you will probably be doing things differently than how you originally set out to do them, but you need to have something to begin with. So next time you set out to do something, create a plan. You might end up not using it, but the exercise of creating it will be of huge advantage.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1064303, 537 | No | <p>As a local resident I am concerned as to the apparent lack of awareness as to the implications of this mineral/recycling facility on the local community. There has been a lack of consultation from the Essex County Council and the detail as to the scheme surrounding site 2 and I feel that this should not go ahead without consideration for the residents neighbouring the site. I feel very strongly that;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access is kept at the present site off Keelers Lane for all plant and machinery. 2. That a minimum of 250 metres boundary is made between the site and all developments including residential properties. 3. That extensive bunding is put in place prior to works starting, and planted with substantial evergreen hedging around its base with some deciduous trees in the mix to provide an attractive landscape scene. 4. That trucks are kept to defined routes. 5. That the operator is responsible for with keeping mud and dust off the surrounding roads. 6. That dust is damped down in dry weather. <p>The proposed project will undoubtedly be a major inconvenience for the local community for many years, and the ECC have a responsibility to minimise this as much as possible.</p> | |
| 1064366, 539 | No | <p>I wish to make you aware of my strong objections to the above mentioned plan. These modifications entail levels of noise; dust and large plant traffic which far exceed what can be tolerated by the local community and will be a downgrading of the area. There will also be a worrying increase of road danger. I wish you to seriously address the following: - Do not allow access to B1027 Keep all plant & machinery at present Keelers Lane site.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Ensure a minimum 250m boundary from any other properties/sites. Put in place extensive bunding screened by substantial planting. Ensure trucking routes are defined & enforced. Do not use the proposed site 2 to rear of Rosedene, a property recently undergone major extensive improvement. This site 2 Plan could not be reasonably tolerated by occupants of this property. I would add that ECC have been behind in providing sufficient & timely awareness of these plans and it is essential that they now re-consider before proceeding any further.</p> | |
| 1064384, 542 | No | <p>My involvement with the proposed landfill and aggregate extraction is twofold; Firstly, the Bradshaw's moved from suburban London around the early 80s, and Ross was born in 94, soon to become closely knit with our six children. Moving on, he now has a considerable investment in an attractive property, on the very edge of your proposals. Secondly, whilst employed in ready mix concrete for 27 years, I supplemented my income by preparing schematics of plants, silos, wash-out pits, and generator rooms etc. which in turn were used by the development manager, often successfully. The following three points we beg your careful consideration a) Working hours b) Stink and noise, and c) The impact of heavy traffic</p> | |
| 1064672, 543 | No | <p>It has come to my notice over the weekend that there is a proposal for a large scale mineral/recycling facility in Elmstead/Alresford. Why has this not been made clear to those of us resident in the area before this? I have had no</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>communications from ECC at all, despite living in Elmstead. The lack of communication is upsetting. Looking at the plan, I cannot understand why Site 2 needs to be included as there is a huge amount of space in Site 1, which is unused. At the very least, plant and machinery should not be moved here, as Area 1 is more than sufficient. I feel strongly that this plant and machinery should be kept in its existing work area of Keelers Lane, as this is not impacting on any residents. In accordance to ECC rules, a minimum of 250mt must be kept between this type of site and any residents properties. To maintain this boundary is common courtesy to residents, and a screen of evergreen trees should be grown around its base to keep residents privacy and outlook, aside from the impact of noise and dust. As to the plan to have the access on the B1027, this is extremely dangerous. This is a blind bend on a busy road, and it makes no sense to endanger the public in this way. Trucking routes must be clearly defined and enforced; there is already an access to the site, why not simply use this one? To have slow moving lorries pulling out onto the B1027 on a blind bend is an accident waiting to happen. It seems to me that the whole plan has been badly thought out, and completely ignoring the views of the public whose lives will be actually impacted by the proposal. To deliberately move a stone crushing plant right next to a residential area is astounding, especially when there is an existing plant in use very closes by, and ample space in Site 1 to use if the plant really has to be relocated. As a resident, I would urge the council to rethink this proposal and come up with</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | a plan which takes note of ALL residents' points of view. | |
| 1064674, Elmstead Parish Council, 544 | No | The new site 2 within L(i)5 and W36 identified for inert waste recycling as a replacement for site W13 is not in an appropriate position within site 1, being close to residential and established business properties. The noise and air pollution is highly likely to impact on the health and wellbeing of those living and working in these properties. This amendment will also cause loss of amenity to the neighbouring property Rosedene. The 100m buffer zone proposed around the boundaries is less than the established agreed 250m. We are also concerned about the lack of information provided regarding traffic movements which would be generated, and feel it is imperative that the access road as shown on the plans is maintained as the only access to this site. | Site 2 should be moved to a different part of Site 1 so as to be as far as possible from residential and business properties, with a 250m buffer zone specified. |
| 1064690, 546 | No | I have lived in Elmstead Market for 12 years now but have only just become aware of your plans for a major large scale mineral/recycling operation in Sunnymead Farm close by. I find this lack of awareness quite perplexing especially as the size of the project is so large. In the light of what is immersing I would question whether the whole thing has been thoroughly thought through especially as regards its impact on the local scene and indeed the boroughs both of Tendring and Colchester. Also the time frame has gone up to 17 years from the original 8 as per M21 in your modification document. Knowing the area intimately and after having done some research into the matter, I would request that it is imperative that all plant and machinery and | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>access routes are kept where they currently are and a 250M boundary is placed between it and all residences prior to any works in accordance with established policy. Surely the proposal I notice - rear of Rosedene for instance, should not go ahead due to what would be substantial loss of amenity. Plentiful bunding and suitable planting must be in place around the whole of the perimeter prior to works starting. Additional truck routes and movement would need controlling "currently they run all over both boroughs some routes of which are left with copious deposits of mud right now "so what will an increase in site use generate "has any one looked at that? It would also be of utmost importance that clearly defined trucking routes are not only put in place but are controlled "currently they seem to go anywhere leaving extensive muddy tracks. Lastly the current access off Keelers Lane should be retained. In view of the very real concerns expressed I would suggest the project is parked and reassessed "I can't see any other way forward.</p> | |
| 515360, 547 | No | <p>I have become aware of a very large scale mineral/recycling facility in Sunnymead Farm close to where we live in Cockaynes Lane, Alresford. This is all very worrying due to the scale of its impact on neighbouring property. In particular it will include placement of screening, grading, and recycling equipment in the field now labelled as site 2 which has not been referred to before plus a new access onto the already busy B1027. All this is new and an additional time frame up to 17 years from the original 8 added in as well, as per M21 in your modification document. There seems to have been a great lack in the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>consultation process with residents and others in the immediate area. Not even parish and district councillors being in the know. The first plea would be that all plant and machinery and access routes are kept where they currently are using the current Keelers Lane access. Surely the site 2 at the rear of Rosedene should not be used- immediately behind a new substantial family residential property. Secondly that a 250m boundary is made between the site and all residential property around its perimeter in accordance with established County Council policy. Thirdly that extensive bunding, with appropriate planting is put in place prior to works starting. Fourthly it would also be of utmost importance that clearly defined trucking routes are not only put in place but are controlled currently they seem to go anywhere leaving extensive muddy tracks. Lastly the current access off Keelers Lane should be retained. I would suggest the whole proposal needs reassessment.</p> | |
| 1064724, 548 | No | <p>Regarding the above mentioned amendment application please consider the following concerns very carefully; The B1027 is a fast, busy road and already heavily used for construction traffic it would be totally unsustainable for the road to cope with any further entrances for such a huge proposal. The locals residents are hardly even aware of the amendment proposed a well-advertised public meeting should have been offered by ECC to all affected residents. The proposal is unreasonably close to residential properties there should be at least a clear 250m boundary created between any residential property and the proposed site it will have a massive impact on the resident's</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | quality of life. I strongly object to the amendment and believe that TDC should do all they can to protect the area and refuse the application. | |
| 1064733, 549 | No | <p>I write regarding the proposed M21 modification to the ECC Joint Replacement Waste Plan. Having studied the amended plan carefully, my concerns are the following: Site access there should be no extra site entrances off the B1027 this is already a busy, fast road and is a main route to popular coastal towns. Site entrances of this nature are busy, dirty and unsightly do TDC/ECC want to attract tourists or deter them? Solution keep all site access in Keelers Lane at its present site. Location the proposal is far, far too close to residential properties both on B1027 and the edge of Alresford town. Solution remove site 2 off the plan altogether and create at least a 250m boundary away from the road, plus any other residential boundary. This boundary must be extensively bunded and well screened with evergreen vegetation to provide all year round screening.</p> <p>Awareness ECC have been very remiss in creating awareness to the affected residents surrounding the proposal. They need to seriously consider the impact it will have on the local resident's lives, along with the house values, not to mention enduring the traffic, noise and dust for a long period of time. Please can TDC do all they can to refuse the proposed amendment?</p> | |
| 1064753, 550 | No | Firstly the lack of information provided for public awareness is of great concern. I object to the site proposed as it would back on to residential gardens (Site 2) and would request that the | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>present site off Keelers Lane be used or that it could be located elsewhere. Also of concern is the dust and noise that will arise from the Crusher, Lorries and Diggers especially to the surrounding residents. The B1027 is a busy road and it would seem that the Entrance/Exit would create a dangerous situation. If used, then a 250m boundary be made with suitable evergreen landscape to act as a screen. Finally, an appeal that the people are closely concerned be considered and that the whole situation be reviewed.</p> | |
| 1064756, 551 | No | <p>Thank you for agreeing an extension to the consultation to allow further comment, and I hope you can get this included too. I have relatives with property directly affected by the proposals and therefore my enjoyment of their amenities! Some brief comments on the amended proposals: Communication and Community awareness: I have seen the letter sent out 3 January 2017 to neighbouring properties and the communication has been very poor to say the least. Very little information is provided in the letter as to what the intended amendments involve. It requires quite a bit of digging around the ECC website and a fair understanding of planning procedures and terminology to discover what is actually involved. This should have been spelt out in simple English including the new access and the type of machinery and operations being proposed especially for site 2. Protection of resident's amenity is a massive planning consideration, and I do not feel the suggested proposals provide this. Site 2 where the recycling plant is proposed is too close to the rear of residents. Harm to</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>amenity includes noise of vehicles (reversing beepers, crushers, general construction noise), loss of air quality from the dust raised, and enjoyment of a green outlook and feeling of openness. The proposed new access on the B1027 apart from the obvious highways problems associated with being very close to a blind bend, is also harmful to the amenity of nearby houses with the noise of extra lorry movements and muddy roads. To mitigate the above, I strongly request the following: Site 2 is not included in the scheme. All plant and machinery to be kept at present location. A minimum distance of 250metres is kept between the site and all residential properties with proper bunding, substantial evergreen hedge planting in place and other attractive plants to give an attractive landscape scene Current access to be kept and no new access point on the B1027. I trust these comments and suggestions are accepted and the amendments are given the needed changes to make them acceptable to the local and wider community.</p> | |
| 1064771, 552 | No | <p>This new proposal comes as a shock not knowing the project beforehand and object strongly to this proposal. To have to live through this for an extended period of 17 years is bad enough. The impact on residences bordering sites 1&2 should be stated clearly. Clunky, whining and revving of machinery and dust which finds its way into every crevice all add up to a lower quality of life. This project would devalue properties bordering the site. The entrance to the site (viewing the map) only seems possible on the bend of a busy road. Clearly too little consideration has been given to the residents. A continuous</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | beam of soil with plantings of shrubs and trees would reduce noise and dust. | |
| 1064779, 553 | No | I apologise for sending this in late, but hope that you will listen and sympathise with my concerns relating to the above named project. The reason for raising my concerns is not because I live close by, but because 1) I use the B1027 very regularly and am concerned about the proposed new entrance in/out of the site and 2) it is completely unreasonable to expect someone to live next door to a recycling plant with concrete crushing machinery. When we send in notes like this it feels like they disappear into oblivion, and cannot be sure that they even get read or taken note of but would sincerely hope that you will consider this and ask yourself the question would I be happy for a recycling centre with heavy, noisy machinery to be placed next door to my house? Please can you reconsider your proposal and for the lives of the residents that will be directly affected. | |
| 1064785, 554 | No | I am writing to you regarding the above proposal. We understand that you are under pressure to provide for the future needs of the region. That said, I am surprised at the lack of publicity regarding application especially as it has a large impact on those who live in the immediate area, and in the light of that I would sincerely ask that you respect and consider the view and requests of the neighbours. Having used B1027 for many years, and I am surprised that you would even consider a new entrance in the particular location suggested. This section of the B1027 is extremely dangerous as it is on a small hill and blind | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>bend. I would therefore request that the existing access off Keelars Lane be retained as the main access for all plant, machinery and vehicular access. This access has been used for many years and will have minimum impact on traffic and residents. Site 2 of the proposed plan, would have significant impact on the houses that border on this portion of the site. The social impact will be significant caused by the noise, dust and vibration which could cause health issues and potential damage to the structure of the neighbouring property. There would also be a financial impact caused by the devaluing of property because of impact of the proposed use. Therefore from a neighbourly perspective would sincerely recommend that part 2 of the application doesn't go ahead. In view of minimising the impact to residents adjacent to the site can we ask that a 250m boundary between the back of these properties and site 1 along with extensive bunding be specifically mentioned in any planning conditions? The bunding should be at the widest possible width prior to works starting. This bunding must have a substantial evergreen hedge planted around its base with some deciduous trees in the mix to provide an attractive landscape scene. Finally the impact of additional road movements will have a significant impact on the area, and therefore I would ask that any routes and restrictions made should be enforced. Again I would ask that these points are considered and reflected in any plan that you decide to go forward with.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1064790, 555 | No | <p>I understand the consultation re these pits etc. is now closed, but Cllr Carlo Guglielmi has assured me that it is still open to Monday February 20th for the Elmstead parish council, and also for me as the district councillor for Elmstead Market. If the proposed recycling plant with a concrete crusher is allowed to be built on Site 2 at Sunnymead, which is right behind houses, the amenity of these residents will be severely disrupted. This will be due to the noise, the dust and the aerial spraying, which will be used to try to keep the dust under control. This is just not acceptable as the lives of the families who live there will be made complete hell. There is no information about traffic movements. I understand that Tarmac wants to move the access to this site near to Englishes Farm on the B1027 in front of the proposed Site 2. This is also not acceptable, especially as this will now include lorries carrying recycling materials. The access to the site should stay where it currently is at Keelers Lane. I drove along the B1027 past Keelers Lane last week and noticed all the sand and gravel lorries leaving at this exit. The road on the left hand side was simply covered in thick mud for a considerable distance, because the majority of these lorries left the site and turned towards Colchester. This mud covering of the road was to the extent it could be dangerous if traffic needed to stop suddenly, and could cause an accident. Why would it be sensible to spread this mud which is constantly on the road further on, and also disrupt the lives of people living near Englishes Farm? On the map I have seen it appears to show that the when the lorries drive into the current sand and gravel pit using Keelers Lane, they then turn to the east to get into the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M21? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>pit half way down this lane. It would be perfectly easy I would have thought to extend this access into the proposed Site 1. The recycling plant should then be in this area or further south into the pit. I understand the proposed new Site 2 pit is going to be only 100 metres from the back of the houses on the B1027. This is not right as it was originally proposed by ECC that all such pits should be 250 metres from houses at least. There should also be a wide band of planting including evergreen planting, with a substantial high bund as well. The planting should not be on top of the bund as this always dies. There is already an example of this happening in Elmstead Market on the bund surrounding Whitings scrap metal yard. I hope ECC will reconsider the plan to put the recycling plant in Site 2 and also to move the access to the sites to the area of Englishes Farm.</p> | |

Modification M22 – Wivenhoe Quarry Plant Area

No Comments Received

Modification M23 – Dollymans Farm

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 138 | No | The Council objects to Modification 23 and the linked Modifications 1 and 5(4) as set out on page 77, which concern Land at Dollymans Farm, Wickford/Rawreth. The Council has held a long standing position against the creation of new and/or expanded waste management facilities in the Basildon Borough. It does not accept that further waste related development should be accommodated in the Borough as a matter of principle, and that the rest of Essex and Southend on Sea should accommodate a greater share of waste development needs in the future. | Dollymans Farm should not be allocated for any waste related development or land use in the Replacement Waste Local Plan. |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 139 | No | <p>If however the Planning Inspector continues to be minded that the site at Dollymans Farm continues to offer a suitable location for inert waste disposal, the Council would seek the following changes to the Plan policies to address how the site operates and how its traffic movements could otherwise affect local communities through additional HGV movements through Wickford.</p> <p>Object to Table XX Appendix 18 and description Access Via private road adjoining A130 Reason: This is misleading as Doublegate Lane (the private road) does not adjoin the A130, rather it terminates at a junction with the A129.</p> | The table should be reworded to state: Access via Doublegate Lane, off A129. |
| 735401, Basildon Borough | No | If however the Planning Inspector continues to be minded that the site at Dollymans Farm continues to offer a suitable location for inert waste disposal, the Council would seek the following | The policy should be reworded to state: All HGV access into the site should be from the A129, via the A1245. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Council, 140 | | <p>changes to the JRWLP policies to address how the site operates and how its traffic movements could otherwise affect local communities through additional HGV movements through Wickford.</p> <p>Objection to All access should be via the A129. Reason: Given highway capacity issues currently experienced in Wickford and Shotgate and to provide policy assurance that residential amenity in Wickford and Shotgate will be protected from the passage of HGVs using the site, the policy should stipulate instead, that access will be via the A1245/A129, preventing HGV access from the west.</p> | |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 141 | No | <p>If however the Planning Inspector continues to be minded that the site at Dollymans Farm continues to offer a suitable location for inert waste disposal, the Council would seek the following changes to the JRWLP policies to address how the site operates and how its traffic movements could otherwise affect local communities through additional HGV movements through Wickford.</p> <p>Objection to Restoration of the site through this allocation provides the opportunity for biodiversity, landscape and visual enhancement. Reason: Does not reflect historical monument value.</p> | The policy should be reworded to state: Restoration of the site through this allocation provides the opportunity for biodiversity, landscape and visual enhancement and historic asset preservation. |
| 735401, Basildon Borough | No | If however the Planning Inspector continues to be minded that the site at Dollymans Farm continues to offer a suitable location for inert waste disposal, the Council would seek the following | Reword to say Retain trees and shrubs to screen plant and materials from the vantage points of the A130 and railway line. Consider additional planting and bunding, |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Council, 142 | | <p>changes to the JRWLP policies to address how the site operates and how its traffic movements could otherwise affect local communities through additional HGV movements through Wickford.</p> <p>Objection to Retain trees and shrubs to screen plant and materials from the road. Consider new planting and bunding to screen views into the site. Reason: this needs strengthening to ensure any new planting and bunding, screens views into the site, prior to the landfill operation commencing to mitigate visual amenity as far as possible.</p> | prior to commencement of development, where existing vegetation is not adequate. |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 151 | No | <p>In respects of evidence collated for the emerging Basildon Borough Local Plan. from a historic perspective, the Basildon Borough Historic Environment Characterisation Assessment 2014 http://www.basildon.gov.uk/article/4946/Evidence-Base---Design-and-Historic-Context does not reveal anything of particular interest, except the WWII monuments, which need safeguarding in situ given they are not statutorily protected, but are part of the cultural history of the Borough and are of local value.</p> | Additional wording should be added to the policy to conserve the monuments. See Comment ID: 141 for suggested wording. |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 153 | No | <p>The Council can confirm that the element of the site in the Basildon Borough is not part of a Critical Drainage Area for the management of surface water flooding, as set out in the South Essex Surface Water Management Plan 2012 http://www.basildon.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=5316&p=0 , but that the watercourse to the west of the site is identified as a</p> | Must ensure that in accordance with national policy, the correct flood risk criteria are included in the allocations policy to enable adequate flood risk mitigation during the sites detailed planning stage and operation. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Critical Ordinary Watercourse in the South Essex Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>http://www.basildon.gov.uk/article/4947/Evidence-Base---Water-Cycle-Flood-Risk-and-Surface-Water-Management</p> | |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 154 | No | <p>The element of the site in the Basildon Borough has been evaluated as part of the Green Belt Landscape Capacity Study 2014 http://www.basildon.gov.uk/article/4948/Evidence-Base---Landscape-and-Green-Belt to determine if it has any capacity to accommodate any development; alongside a the Basildon Borough Green Belt Study 2015 http://www.basildon.gov.uk/article/4948/Evidence-Base---Landscape-and-Green-Belt which has reviewed whether it continued to fulfil any of the purposes of the Green Belt. The former considered it to have low capacity for development given its role in helping to prevent the coalescence of Wickford and Thundersley and given it formed an important role as part of a strategic green corridor connecting the Thames Estuary Marshlands to the south, with the Crouch and Roach Estuaries to the north east. It also noted that the qualities of the area for safeguarding in the future included the mature vegetation along the railway line and watercourse, the rural landscape character and the WWII local monuments north of the railway line. In addition, there are recommendations to improve the public rights of way in the area.</p> | <p>Provisions should be incorporated into the allocations policy that adequately protect the mature vegetation along the railway line and watercourse, the rural landscape character and the WWII local monuments north of the railway line; as well as assist in making improvements to the public rights of way in the area.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 487944, Rochford District Council, 80 | Yes | <p>Rochford District Council would firstly like to take this opportunity to thank Essex County Council and Southend Borough Council for the joint briefing session for Rochford District and Basildon Borough Members which took place on 4 January 2017. We would also like to thank you for the opportunity to respond to this further consultation. The Councils response focuses on the proposed allocation of Dollymans Farm on the borders of Rochford District and Basildon Borough for inert waste disposal i.e. for the landfilling of construction/demolition/excavation waste (predominantly Main Modifications 1, 5 and 23). It is noted that this site has been promoted for a number of years, and was subsequently assessed as part of the plan-making process but ruled out as it is allocated Green Belt land. It is also noted that the existing landscape in this location is as a result of its former use as a mineral extraction site, but it was not restored to its former character. There are a number of concerns that were raised by Rochford District Council Members at the briefing session, including impact on highways, flooding and pollution. These issues are considered in turn below.</p> <p>Highways The proposed Development Principles for Dollymans Farm would require that all access is from the A129. The A129 however is a significant stretch of road which provides a key route through the town of Rayleigh in Rochford District as well as Wickford in Basildon Borough. Any additional traffic movements arising from this site, should it be allocated, should not go through any residential areas particularly Rayleigh. It would be preferable for traffic to access the site via the A129 from the A1245 (providing access from the north and south of the County). Although</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>reference is made to a Transport Assessment in the proposed Development Principles for Dollymans Farm, further consideration should be given to the extent of the A129 itself. Specific reference should also be made to junction improvements as there are concerns about enabling vehicles turning right to safely exit the site onto the A129 given the current speed limit in this location. It should be noted that in Basildon's draft Local Plan (2016) Basildon Borough Council proposed a new road to connect the A127 with the A130, which would extend into Rochford District in close proximity to the proposed allocation at Dollymans Farm. Whilst this is the case, it should be noted that this proposal for a new road is not within Rochford District Councils current local development plan, and discussions with Basildon Borough Council on this and other strategic issues are ongoing as part of the Duty to Co-operate. Furthermore Essex County Councils Transport Strategy and Engagement Officers have advised that any new road in this location would not extend into the proposed allocation at Dollymans Farm. Flooding At the Member briefing on 4 January 2017 Rochford District Council Members raised the issue of flooding, and the potential option of using the low lying area at Dollymans Farm (the area identified for landfill) for storing surface water from the Fair Glen junction on the A127 to the south east of Dollymans Farm. Essex County Councils Transport Strategy and Engagement Officers, however, have advised that this would not be a suitable location for storing surface water from this junction as significant costs would be incurred piping the water such a distance, and there are more suitable sites</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>being explored nearer to the Fair Glen junction. Options have also been tested around Rawreth Brook (and North Benfleet Brook) to the north / north east of the proposed allocation at Dollymans Farm to alleviate flooding in this area. The proposed allocation however does not form part of the potential flood alleviation scheme for this watercourse (appended to this response). Part of the proposed allocation is also within flood zone 3, and the site assessment for Dollymans Farm notes that the Sequential and Exceptions Test would need to be demonstrated. The flood zone element should be acknowledged within the proposed Development Principles for Dollymans Farm and appropriate flood mitigation measures required, as necessary, to protect properties further up/downstream. Pollution</p> <p>The Councils Environmental Health Officer has highlighted the key issues in relation to pollution should this site be allocated for inert waste disposal: Air quality issues as a result of additional traffic movement to/from the site There are no particular concerns in this regard from an environmental health perspective, provided that an appropriate traffic management plan is agreed at the planning application stage, and implemented. This should include sheeting vehicles and wheel-washing. Air quality issues (specifically dust) as a result of inert waste disposal The prevailing south westerly wind could disperse dust towards residential properties over 250 metres from the site. An Environment Agency permit would need to be sought for this site in addition to applying to Essex County Council for planning permission, which would consider this issue and require appropriate mitigation measures, if granted. The</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>reference to dust mitigation measures and limits on duration (hours of operation) in the proposed Development Principles for Dollymans Farm is therefore welcomed. Noise issues as a result of inert waste disposal Due to the prevailing south westerly wind, noise could be an issue affecting nearby properties although it is noted that there are few residences in close proximity to the site. The potential impact on those further away from the site, and nearby businesses, should be carefully considered, for example along the A129 between the Carpenters Arms roundabout and the A130. The reference to noise standards and limits on duration (hours of operation) in the proposed Development Principles for Dollymans Farm is welcomed. However this could be strengthened to specifically refer to monitoring and noise mitigation measures such as bunds, if appropriate. Lighting issues as a result of operations on the site An appropriate lighting scheme would need to be agreed and implemented as part of the planning permission for this site, if allocated. This consideration should be included in the proposed Development Principles for Dollymans Farm. Other considerations The reference to archaeology and, in particular, the sensitivity around the war memorials on the site is welcomed. It should be noted that a Gypsy and Traveller site has been allocated in the Councils Allocations Plan (2014) at Michelins Farm, Rayleigh, which could potentially be within 450 metres of site when delivered. Conclusion On balance Rochford District Council does not have any overriding objections to the allocation of this site; provided that the Inspector is satisfied that adequate mitigation measures can be applied at the planning application/</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | Environment Agency permit stage. SEE ATTACHED - Rawreth Brook Flood Alleviation Feasibility Study (July 2016). | |
| 1055067, 4 | No | <p>The Dollymans farm site is Green Belt Land and as such was not allocated at pre-submission stage. The reasons given for changing this to 'allocated' are not convincing. This area of green belt is in a densely populated area and extensively used for leisure activities such as walking and horse-riding. It should be protected and removed from the plan. Please note that the Dollymans farm area is heavily used for leisure by walkers, dog walkers and horse riders. It has several Bridleways (BWs) running through it and comprises a locally unique circuit regularly used by horse riders in the area. This circuit includes the Pegasus crossing that we use to cross the A129, we then ride along BW 17 past Dollymans farm, and along BW55 (Doublegate Lane) to Rawreth Barns and across the Rawreth Barn Bridge over the A130 back to cross the A129. The proposed temporary road divides BW 17 from BW55 and would have to be crossed by walkers and riders to enable them to use this circuit of Bridleways that we use daily to avoid the busy roads that circle the area. The hazard and noise of the many and regular heavy trucks filled with waste that would be using the temporary road and the increased heavy traffic on the A129 and the turn off from the A129 (very close to the Pegasus crossing that we use) would make the route very unpleasant and hazardous for walkers and totally unsuitable for riding safely. We could not disagree more</p> | Change the Dollymans farm site from allocated back to non-allocated |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>with the landowners comments on the pre-submission consultation on the waste local plan (2016) that the site is of poor quality, particularly in terms of visual amenity. We also take issue with the LVIA conducted by Liz Lake Associates that states; The existing landscape amenity of the Site has been assessed to offer a Limited to Negative contribution to the Local Landscape Character of the District. As one of the people who use and love the countryside that is affected by this proposed site we beg to differ. We do not have the means to employ consultants to produce reports in our favour but we do actually use the land in our day to day lives. For us, this is an attractive and hugely valued oasis where we can ride safely and enjoy the countryside in a local area that offers little other access to green fields and BWs for horse riding. It may not be on a par with Cumbria but it is of no less value to the local people who use it to escape the urban areas that surround it. Its despoilment by this proposed waste facility would be an enormous loss to the community. It is also stated in the landowners comments on the pre-submission document 2016 that: The allocation of Dollymans Farm would not compromise the objectives of the Green Belt and in the medium to long term once restored would likely result in an improvement to the landscape character. This indicates that the area would actually be improved by this proposed use but this is highly unlikely. It seems to my friends and I that once this Green Belt land is allocated then it is likely to be the thin end of the wedge. Evidence of this is clear in the statements from the report below. The attached Site Layout Plan is indicative of the areas of the site proposed for the respective uses. However, the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>landowners have indicated that they are amenable to increasing the amount of inert landfill subject to Essex County Councils requirements, and would also be willing to consider accommodating other waste streams to include non-inert and non-hazardous waste. In addition, while the proposed use of the site is for waste transfer and inert landfill, the landowners are willing to take a flexible approach to prospective uses and to discuss the possibility of locating alternative or additional waste facilities on the site including composting, recycling and energy from waste uses. The landowners and Strutt & Parker would be more than happy to enter into discussions with Essex County Council in this regard. Importantly the following statement is telling: If an allocation for the site for a waste use is forthcoming, we intend to enter into detailed discussions with a number of interested operators in the area. This Green Belt land would not be safe and is highly unlikely to be restored to us. The report goes on to state: The proximity of the site to the Shenfield to Southend Victoria line, which forms the southern boundary of the site and links directly to London Liverpool Street, could also provide the opportunity for a siding off of the railway line as part of a future waste development on the site, and allow for the importation of waste from London. This does not sound to us as if the area would ever be returned to, by local standards, a quiet place to walk and ride and enjoy access to the countryside. Allocating this site in this plan and allowing a breach of the Green Belt here would, in the short, medium and long term ruin an area well-loved and utilised by the community and set a precedent for the future that we fear. This site is not some kind of</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | ugly deserted piece of land. It is highly valued Green Belt and needs your protection. Please restore it to its previous non-allocated status. | |
| 923962, Northumbrian Water Property Solutions, 7 | Unrelated | Having examined our records, we can confirm that Northumbrian Water (which covers both Northumbrian Water and Essex & Suffolk Water) has no owned assets within the search area of your enquiry detailed in the reference/location provided. | |
| 923598, GTC Plant Enquiry Service, 8 | Unrelated | Thank you for your enquiry concerning apparatus in the vicinity of your proposed work. GTC can confirm that we have no apparatus in the vicinity but please note that other asset owners may have and ensure all utility owners have been consulted. | |
| 978664, Energetics Design & Build, 10 | Unrelated | Based on the information provided, I can confirm that Energetics does not have any plant within the area(s) specified in your request. | |
| 1057600, 17 | No | I am writing to object to the Dollymans site being used for a waste disposal site. I stable my horse at Rawreth Equestrian in Church Road, Rawreth. I regularly ride my horse and walk my dog with my daughter and friends through the bridleways that run through this site. I am concerned that the new road and waste disposal site would render them effectively unusable for horses. Please note that the Dollymans farm area is heavily used for | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>leisure by walkers, dog walkers and horse riders. It has several Bridleways (BWs) running through it and comprises a locally unique circuit regularly used by horse riders in the area. This circuit includes the Pegasus crossing that we use to cross the A 129, we then ride along BW 17 past Dollymans farm, and along BW55 (Doublegate Lane) to Rawreth Barns and across the Rawreth Barn Bridge over the A130 back to cross the A129. The proposed temporary road divides BW 17 from BW55 and would have to be crossed by walkers and riders to enable them to use this circuit of Bridleways that we use daily to avoid the busy roads that circle the area. The hazard and noise of the many and regular heavy trucks filled with waste that would be using the temporary road and the increased heavy traffic on the A129 and the turn off from the A129 (very close to the Pegasus crossing that we use) would make the route very unpleasant and hazardous for walkers and totally unsuitable for riding safely. We could not disagree more with the landowners comments on the pre-submission consultation on the waste local plan (2016) that the site is of poor quality, particularly in terms of visual amenity. We also take issue with the LVIA conducted by Liz Lake Associates that states; The existing landscape amenity of the Site has been assessed to offer a Limited to Negative contribution to the Local Landscape Character of the District. As one of the people who use and love the countryside that is affected by this proposed site we beg to differ. We do not have the means to employ consultants to produce reports in our favour but we do actually use the land in our day to day lives. For us, this is an attractive and hugely valued oasis where we can</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>ride safely and enjoy the countryside in a local area that offers little other access to green fields and BWs for horse riding. It may not be on a par with Cumbria but it is of no less value to the local people who use it to escape the urban areas that surround it. Its despoilment by this proposed waste facility would be an enormous loss to the community. It is also stated in the landowners comments on the pre-submission document 2016 that: The allocation of Dollymans Farm would not compromise the objectives of the Green Belt and in the medium to long term once restored would likely result in an improvement to the landscape character. This indicates that the area would actually be improved by this proposed use but this is highly unlikely. It seems to my friends and I that once this Green Belt land is allocated then it is likely to be the thin end of the wedge. Evidence of this is clear in the statements from the report below. The attached Site Layout Plan is indicative of the areas of the site proposed for the respective uses. However, the landowners have indicated that they are amenable to increasing the amount of inert landfill subject to Essex County Councils requirements, and would also be willing to consider accommodating other waste streams to include non-inert and non-hazardous waste. In addition, while the proposed use of the site is for waste transfer and inert landfill, the landowners are willing to take a flexible approach to prospective uses and to discuss the possibility of locating alternative or additional waste facilities on the site including composting, recycling and energy from waste uses. The landowners and Strutt & Parker would be more than happy to enter into discussions with Essex County Council in this</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>regard. Importantly the following statement is telling: If an allocation for the site for a waste use is forthcoming, we intend to enter into detailed discussions with a number of interested operators in the area. This Green Belt land would not be safe and is highly unlikely to be restored to us. The report goes on to state: The proximity of the site to the Shenfield to Southend Victoria line, which forms the southern boundary of the site and links directly to London Liverpool Street, could also provide the opportunity for a siding off of the railway line as part of a future waste development on the site, and allow for the importation of waste from London. This does not sound to us as if the area would ever be returned to, by local standards, a quiet place to walk and ride and enjoy access to the countryside. Allocating this site in this plan and allowing a breach of the Green Belt here would, in the short, medium and long term ruin an area well-loved and utilised by the community and set a precedent for the future that we fear. This site is not some kind of ugly deserted piece of land. It is highly valued Green Belt and needs your protection. Please restore it to its previous non- allocated status.</p> | |
| 1057643, 22 | No | <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this Green Belt land immensely. My three horses reside on this plot of land, and I hack around the land frequently, my 4 and 6 year old nieces ride their pony around the farmland and along the bridleways, I also walk my dogs on the land</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>too. We already have a lot of lorries and buses to contend with whilst out riding, and the dangers will only increase with further inflow of traffic and lorries. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride safely. The development requires a new road and all the dirt noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up area so please, please protect this area.</p> | |
| 1057854, River Crouch Conservation Trust, 26 | No | <p>I and other members are very concerned and against this application, for the following reasons: Right at the south west corner of the pit runs the upper part of The Chichester Brook, which connects to the Rawreth Brook under Church Road Bridge, which in turn runs straight into the River Crouch. There is a very strong risk that toxic substances will leak into this watercourse over time, even the smallest possibility is a NO! Indications will show the source very quickly. The River Crouch at this junction is tidal so both upstream and downstream would be affected. At the start of Brandy Hole there are large areas of clam and mussel beds which are farmed and sold to the public. Our main function of The River Crouch Conservation Society is to clean, preserve and protect the river and its wildlife which is thriving. I have prosecuted, many times, successfully, against pollution, even in The Royal Courts of justice. We really do not want to do this again! We are passionate about preserving The River Crouch, please visit our website,</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | www.rivercrouchconservationtrust.org.uk See attachment - 'Map of Dollymans - district boundaries' | |
| 1715, Rayleigh Town Council, 28 | No | I am writing on behalf of Rayleigh Town Council regarding the above mentioned consultation. Rayleigh Town Council members supports Essex County Council's objections on the following grounds: Flooding Increased heavy traffic on local roads The need to conduct management of these heavy vehicles regarding mud and debris on local roads and to ensure specified routes are followed Inappropriate use of Green Belt Land. Our Town Cllrs are due to attend your Parishes meeting on 6th February 2017 and I will contact you again if further comments need to be made. | |
| 924142, National Grid, 30 | Unrelated | Part 1 Assessment - Affected Apparatus The National Grid apparatus that has been identified as being in the vicinity of your proposed works is: Electricity Transmission overhead lines Above ground electricity sites and installations We have assessed your enquiry and are writing to let you know that you can proceed using normal safe systems of work. See attached - National Grid letters and maps | |
| 924142, National Grid, 31 | Unrelated | Part 2 Assessment - Affected Apparatus The National Grid apparatus that has been identified as being in the vicinity of your proposed works is: Electricity Transmission overhead lines Above ground electricity sites and installations We have assessed your enquiry and are writing to let you know that you can proceed using normal safe systems of work. See attached - | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | National Grid letters and maps | |
| 1058260, 34 | No | <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans Farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this Green Belt land and walk my dog and ride my horse in the area and along the bridleways. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride in safety. The development requires a new road and all the dirt, noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up area so please protect this area.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1058259, 35 | No | <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans Farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this Green Belt land and walk my dog and ride my horse in the area and along the bridleways. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride in safety. The development requires a new road and all the dirt, noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up area so please protect this area.</p> | |
| 1059688, Rawreth Parish Council, 49 | No | <p>Rawreth Parish Council have many concerns regarding the inclusion of land at Dollymans Farm in the plan being prepared by Essex County Council and Southend Council for waste disposal up to 2032. Council note, having read the consultation documents the fact that the site was not originally included in the prepared plan and they believe this should stand, Council base this decision on the following facts. A plan was prepared by Essex County Council in 2016, it included 18 sites allocated for waste disposal, other sites were looked at one of which was Dollymans Farm however, it was decided not to include this site as it lies within the Greenbelt. This decision was questioned by the landowner who made representations as to why they thought part of their land should be used for the disposal of inert material</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>from construction sites. Subsequently and following the landowners representations the prepared plan has been examined by a government inspector who is concerned about a probable lack of capacity for the disposing of construction waste from 2026 -2032 and as such agreed that the site should be included and that the plan was unsound without it. One of the reasons given by the inspector is that there is an unfilled hollow left when earth was removed for building the A130, therefore the land wouldn't be raised above its previous level. Rawreth Parish Council feel there are more sound reasons to exclude it from the plan than there are to include it. The land at Dollymans Farm is all that remains of a very thin slither of green belt between Shotgate and westward creeping Rayleigh. Council believe the decision to ignore this fact may have been influenced by comments and reports commissioned by the landowner where it is stated that the fact that the land lies within the Greenbelt should not be a considered as relevant, the owner further states in the pre-submission consultation on the waste local plan (2016) that the site is of poor quality, particularly in terms of visual amenity, in addition the LVIA conducted by Liz Lake Associates states, The existing landscape amenity of the site has been assessed to offer a limited to negative contribution to the local landscape character of the District. This area of Greenbelt land is used daily by walkers and horse riders, it offers an area of attractive open countryside where members of the public can walk and ride in safety, something that is limited in an area that offers little other access to green fields and bridleways. Dollymans Farm offers several bridleways and</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>footpaths running across the land and offers a very unique and much used facility for horse riders in the area. The circuit of bridleways includes a Pegasus crossing that is used to cross the A129, Bridleway 17 which runs past Dollymans farm, Bridleway 55 which runs from Doublegate Lane to Rawreth Barns and across the Rawreth Barn Bridge over the A130 back to the A129 and footpath 19. The use of the land for waste would curtail the use of these bridleways as the proposed entry to the site from the A129 is very close to the Pegasus crossing and the access road runs parallel to Bridleway 17. Having an access road in such close proximity will cause danger, noise and dust from the heavy lorries, in addition Council are further concerned by the years of disruption this site will cause to residents along London Road. The landowner also states that The allocation of Dollymans Farm would not compromise the objectives of the Greenbelt and in the medium to long term once restored would likely result in an improvement to the landscape character. This is highly disputed by the Council as this would indicate that the area would actually be improved by the proposed use, however the loss of the current land far outweighs any possible improvement to the landscape and this is supported by the fact that the total quantity of infill waste would be around 500,000 tons, equal to fourteen 20 ton lorries per day for 5 years. Council are further concerned by the years of disruption this site will cause to residents along London Road. The access to the site would be from the A129, with a road then running southwards through the farm to the site. Council have very grave concerns that there is a very real threat of leaching from the site into the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>North Benfleet/ Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook. This leaching could undo some of the recent improvement to the water quality in the River Crouch. In addition unless the site is strictly controlled with what is dumped there much noxious material under the guise of building waste can find its way under the radar. The Site Layout Plan indicates the areas of the site proposed for the respective uses, however, the landowners have also indicated that they are amenable to increasing the amount of inert landfill subject to Essex County Councils requirements, and would also be willing to consider accommodating other waste streams to include non-inert and non-hazardous waste. In addition, while the proposed use of the site is for waste transfer and inert landfill, the landowners are willing to take a flexible approach to prospective uses and to discuss the possibility of locating alternative or additional waste facilities on the site including composting, recycling and energy from waste uses. The landowners and their agents, Strutt & Parker have stated they would be more than happy to enter into discussions with Essex County Council in this regard, and state If an allocation for the site for a waste use is forthcoming, we intend to enter into detailed discussions with a number of interested operators in the area. This offers little support that the Greenbelt land would remain as such and that it would be restored to its former status. The site offers very close proximity to the Southend Victoria to Liverpool Street line, this lies on the southern boundary of the site and could also provide the opportunity for a siding off of the railway line as part of a future waste development on the site, and allow for the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>importation of waste from London and further afield. There are also two very important War Memorials on the land, one of which will fall within the proposed site. The Memorials are dedicated to two Airmen and are of great historic and local interest and are both the subject of funding to restore them over the coming year. Council feel that not enough local knowledge has been gained by the inspector in considering this proposal and including the site within the plan. Both Rawreth and Shotgate are prone to flooding and with approved plans in both areas for new housing developments more investigations need to take place with regards to the impact this site could have with regards to flood risk. The void on this site could become a vital part of a flood prevention scheme to mitigate the pressures of the future developments to the East and the West; this could provide a haven for wildlife with creative planting, a scheme far more in keeping with the use of Greenbelt land.</p> | |
| 1059690, 50 | No | <p>I fully support the Council and Parish Councils view that this should not be approved. The road infrastructure is strained now and this would make it unbearable.</p> | |
| 1059689, 51 | No | <p>I wish lodge my objection to the proposed use of the Dollymans Farm site for landfill. I believe this site to be located too close to local housing, and I believe the local infrastructure is unable to cope with additional volumes in traffic, particularly heavy loads. Traffic on the surrounding roads are already frequently at standstill in peak hours, and roads are already frequently damaged by the vehicles accessing the business park. This will</p> | <p>I don't believe the issue can be resolved, as it's a fundamental concern around the suitability / scale of the site and proximity to residential areas.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | be a further degradation of the little remaining green belt land in the area, and will inevitably lead to increase pollution. | |
| 1060019, 59 | No | As a resident of Shotgate I am deeply concerned about the proposed plans for the site at Dollymans farm quite apart from the proximity of this site to large residential areas my most pressing worry is for the safety and welfare of my young daughter who attends the day nursery adjacent to the proposed site. The risk to the health of many very young and vulnerable children is not acceptable. The risk of dust pollution, noise and the number of heavy vehicles moving in close proximity to a Forestry school which takes these children out of the nursery and uses the road to access footpaths and the Brook nearby as much as twice a day is utterly unacceptable. The risk of leaching into the Brook is bad enough without the knowledge that children are around the area on a daily basis. The fact that anyone would consider it appropriate to put young children at such risk is highly objectionable. | This is not something that can be resolved |
| 1060218, 60 | No | In relation to the above I wish to respond against the plan as follows: The area to be developed is in greenbelt. It is very close to an important war memorial. It encloses another important war memorial. It would spoil the country views I enjoy whilst walking on a footpath in the area. I fear the likelihood of increased pollution in the area. I fear the various types of waste which will be transported to this proposed site. I fear potential water pollution from the run-off from this site into a local brook. I fear the effect this proposed waste site will have on the proposed 400 | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | new properties adjacent to the proposed consultation waste area. | |
| 1060235, 61 | No | <p>I have received a flyer from Shotgate Parish council notifying me of the consultation process regarding the proposed siting of a landfill and recycling plant at Dollymans Farm. I am extremely concerned that a project like this is being considered without giving nearby residents any advance notice. If or had not been for the Parish Council's flyer the residents of Shotgate would have been completely unaware of this proposal! The consultation period closes on 16 February which only gives me 12 days to review the myriad of documents relating to the proposed installation which is hardly sufficient. Like most other people in the area I am not an expert on planning or environmental matters and must rely on common sense arguments when raising my objections to the proposal. In the time that I have spent researching this matter I have seen several comments which give me much cause for concern e.g. 1. That the proposal would result in 14 20 tonne lorries on the A129 per day for 5 years. What hell will that be for local residents? 2. The site is very close to existing housing. The noise pollution of the lorries and the operation of the site would be unacceptable for residents. 3. The potential for dust and other pollutants in the air would be considerable. No doubt Essex County Council will seek to reassure residents that there will be restrictions on the type of waste being handled on the site but we all know that companies will often include prohibited items either deliberately or accidentally. This risk is not acceptable when there are so many</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>people in close proximity to the site. 4. There are two war memorials in our adjacent to three proposed site. I consider these to be sacrosanct and should not be affected by these plans. 5. The area of the site is much used by local residents for leisure activities. I am particularly concerned for the many horse riding enthusiasts who use the area as a safe place to enjoy their hobby. I hope my objections will be taken into consideration when considering the proposal.</p> | |
| 1060268, 70 | No | <p>I would like to lodge an objection to the proposal of waste disposal at Dollyman's farm. I have just enrolled my daughter in the pre-existing forestry nursery that is on the site. I hardly think it's conducive to the forestry ethos of being at one with nature to be near an area of waste disposal, not to mention the potential risk an increased volume of traffic would pose to children who have been told they can walk in the area from the nursery. Can you give me some information about this please?</p> | |
| 1060275, 72 | No | <p>I wish to state my opposition to the proposed waste facility at Dollymans Farm. The reasons are as follows, It is in the greenbelt, It will undoubtedly lead to an increase in commercial traffic, including refuse vehicles, There is a high possibility of pollution and ground contamination, At this present time the types of waste are an unknown, There is a small brook/stream that runs adjacent to the area and this may be contaminated. In addition to the above there is the possibility of odours. We already have a foul smell that reaches us daily from the waste</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | facility adjacent to the A127. | |
| 1060277, 74 | No | <p>I am writing to outline my objections to the proposed land fill site at Dollymans Farm, Rawreth, and Essex. Apart from the obvious objections about a beautiful site which is used by many local people, my objections relate to the nursery which has not long opened being on the same site as a landfill. Treehouse forestry nursery is an outstanding and innovative nursery whose whole ideals are based on the children being outside, with nature. The point is they learn about their surroundings by being outside for at least 3 hours of day. Children who have previously been to a Forrest nursery or preschool start Infant school with a clear advantage over the other children. This is the first full time provision of forestry nursery in Essex and the greenest eco-friendly nursery provision in the Wickford area. "Our nursery encourages being outdoors which allows babies to fill their lungs with clean air and use all of their senses to appreciate the colours, different noises, the sense of space and of scale. The outdoor nursery environment offers experiences that babies simply cannot have indoors. The outdoor environment supports busy movement, which helps to strengthen children's muscles, hearts and lungs. Exposure to the outdoor environment may also foster nursery children's health via strengthened immunity, more regular sleeping patterns and a sense of well-being."- Treehouse club Website I'm sure it is it obvious to anyone that a nursery that is based on these philosophies cannot operate with a landfill</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | next to it! | |
| 1060325, 76 | No | I personally object to this site on the bases of excess volume of traffic in the area, contamination via water run of being likely to get into the water system via a brook which runs fairly close to the site and the likely hood of pollution and rubbish in the area. (as the case of the site near the station at Pitsea fly over and the A13) | |
| 1060328, 77 | No | Main points of Concern: Restriction of access to Bridal paths for both pedestrians and horses a much cherished local facility plus heavy vehicles and horses a problem mix Approaching the farms entrance from Carpenters Arms immediately under the bridge the slow moving vehicles pulling out from the farm are extremely likely to end in a collision a lot of near misses occur now when drivers get surprised turning the bend and a very visible slow down warning sign would be essential. Because of the very gridlocked history of the A129 especially during the commuter period particularly the early rush hour a time restraint to exclude this period would be .(between 0730 -0900 the road into Wickford is total jammed. The local housing plan for Shotgate is for 400 new houses plus a large increase for the Rochford area will this should also be taken into account for the effect on the roads | |
| 1060330, 78 | No | I wish to lodge my objection to the proposal to include Dollymans Farm as a waste dump. I object to the use of green belt land for this purpose and, like many others, value this land to walk my | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | dog and ride my horse. The area known to us as the bowl field is used for retired or unfit horses. We are really short of safe areas like this and it would be so sad to see it go. | |
| 1060640, 100 | No | I personally object to this site on the bases of excess volume of traffic in the area, contamination via water run off being likely to get into the water system via a brook which runs fairly close to the site and the likelihood of pollution and rubbish in the area. (as the case of the site near the station at Pitsea flyover and the A13). | |
| 1060674, 101 | No | As a local resident, I would like to object for the following reasons:- - increase in traffic on local roads (particularly A127/A1245/A129). This traffic is already expected to increase with the additional house building planned - eg 500 houses in Rayleigh West and the 3,000+ houses planned for the Wickford area. Basildon Council also proposed allowing the construction of 400 new houses opposite the proposed waste area. - the land proposed is in the greenbelt. - Likelihood of pollution within the area. This could come in the form of burning of waste and also the leaching from the site into the North Benfleet / Rawreth Book system. I believe a survey has determined that the natural drainage from the site is directly into the brook. - there are two important war memorials on the land, of which one falls within the proposed site. I feel that serious consideration should be given as to whether it is appropriate to allow this development so close to important memorials. | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1060862, 106 | No | <p>I wish to oppose the proposed site for waste disposal for the following reasons With the amount of flooding in this area this site would be ideal as a balancing pond to regulate the flow of flood water from the A130 and the surrounding area which will only increase with the new developments in the area. The local water courses i.e. Benfleet brook and Chichester brook and onwards to the River Crouch would become contaminated with pollutants leaching from the proposed site. The A129 is already a very busy road with several serious accidents occurring nearby to the entrance to Dollymans farm (the junction of Old London Road and the A129) and with the anticipated increase in heavy vehicles the problem can only get worse. This is another intrusion into the Green Belt in this area which will, in the near future, be covered in new developments and is already saturated with football pitches on land owned by the applicants of this proposal. If the proposed site was used as a balancing pond it would be an asset to the area and attract wildlife back into the area. No doubt, if this development is passed, Rochford District Council will have a whole list of conditions to the planning consent but going on past experience over the last 12 years the applicant will ignore these conditions and RDC will not enforce them as has happened on numerous occasions in the past of which have a great deal of proven evidence. For these reasons I wish to oppose the application.</p> | |
| 1060863, 107 | No | <p>I would like to object to the building of a waste collection site on the Dollymans farm area. This will produce additional traffic</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | volume and possible extra pollution. | |
| 1060879, 109 | No | The position of Dollymans Farm in the green belt should make this proposition unacceptable to all. You only have to think of the traffic implications, pollution and the closeness to residential properties to realise this. This area was left off the original plan for a reason and that is the way it should stay. | The inspector should take a fresh look at this proposition because something must have been overlooked more consultation with local people and organisations is definitely required. |
| 1060891, 111 | No | As a local resident living in Shotgate I would like to object for the following reasons; The increase in traffic on local roads is the A127, A1245 and A129. These roads are already busy as it is without the proposed building of 500 plus houses in Rayleigh West, the possible building of 3000 plus houses in Wickford and the proposed 400 houses opposite this proposed waste site. This land for the waste site is on greenbelt. pollution levels will rise within the area with waste being brought in to this area, not only from lorries bringing it in but the disposal of this waste whether by burning or other means. there are a couple of important war memorials on the land, serious consideration should be given to whether this site should be allowed as I believe the impact to the environment and health is seriously going to be impacted on. | |
| 1060894, 113 | No | This site will impact on the entire area, creating more traffic, destroying green belt, possible water contamination, air pollution to surrounding properties and destroys war memorials, footpaths and bridleways. If this is a landfill site why has planning permission been sought for burning waste and a scrap yard. | This proposal needs to be reconsidered and sited elsewhere as the local roads are not able to cope as it is and this would gridlock the area during rush hour. No consideration has been given to air pollution or noise. The green belt would be compromised and water could |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>There is nothing in the application to ensure that once filled the hole would be landscaped and the facility would close. House prices could be affected. There has been no proper consultation with residents. This proposal is a disaster for both Wickford and Rayleigh as we already have a facility close by.</p> | <p>be contaminated with run off from the site. A large number of new houses are to be built close to the site. The application goes far beyond just a landfill site - why? This must be reviewed by an independent assessor - not the original one as is proposed.</p> |
| 1061073, 119 | No | <p>The proposed site is within a designated Green Belt Area. It should continue to be protected as such. The field in question is rented by a local equine centre and is "home" to a number of retired horses who are seeing out the last days of their lives there. I see the horses daily and they are very settled here, as many before them have been over a number of years. I have grave concerns over the pollution to the river network this waste site would cause. There are streams surrounding the field and I echo the comments made by River Crouch Conservation Trust (Roy Hart) (ID: 1057854) . There are two war memorials that would be effected by the proposed plans, one of which (I believe) has already been moved once for the provision of the new A130. It is grossly unfair that it should be subject of movement once again. The plans would make visiting the memorials almost impossible and at best, extremely unpleasant. Poppies are placed on the memorials throughout the year and are visited on Armistice Day. One of the memorials is also a Geo-cache site, the whole point of which is getting families out into the country - not to visit a waste tip! There will obviously be a heavy increase in road traffic on a network that is barely able to cope as well as</p> | <p>The only change you can make that would be acceptable is to remove Dollyman's from the list of proposed sites. It wasn't on there in the first place for very good reason.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>the pollution that goes with it. I would also like to echo the comments of Katie Dawes (ID: 1060277) . I walked past the field just the other day and saw six of the children from the nursery on a walk up to see the horses in the field. This is a wonderful and safe countryside environment for the children from Treehouse Forestry Nursery who would be so adversely effected by the proposed plans. Any waste tip brings problems with it. Apart from the stench that will undoubtedly reach properties within the vicinity, it will also attract scavengers, rats and seagulls in hordes. Should these plans be approved, a heavy reduction in housing value in the surrounding area would undoubtedly occur, if that indeed hasn't already started. The perimeter of this field is used daily by horse riders, dog walkers and children. It is an area that should be protected, not destroyed.</p> | |
| 1061229, 127 | No | <p>Greenbelt land: This is on greenbelt land, which is now only very small between that of Shotgate and the ever expanding Rayleigh. This is used daily by walkers and horse riders offering an area of open countryside where people can walk and ride safely. The access to green fields and bridleways is already limited in the area, however Dollymans farm offers several across its land. In a world where health is of paramount importance, surely we should be encouraging people to get out in the fresh air. If this is turned into a waste landfill, what options will local residents have but to get in their cars (creating more pollution) to find an area of open unpolluted countryside. Historic : There has been inadequate consultation, investigation and</p> | <p>Dollyman's Farm should be removed from the list of potential waste landfill sites. It was not on the original proposal for obvious and valid reasons. It is not a viable option.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>respect given into how this will impact the historic and cultural aspect of the area. There are two very important War Memorials on the land, one of which will falls within the proposed site. These are dedicated to two airmen are of great historic and local interest. People visit this site and place poppies regularly throughout the year. This would be of great disrespect to have to move AGAIN. Traffic : The proposal lends itself to traffic issues with an increase on local roads such as the A127, A1245 and A129. The infrastructure and quality of these roads currently serving the area already cannot cope with the lorries coming into the business park, let alone another fourteen 20 ton lorries every day. Furthermore if the additional 400 houses (opposite the proposed waste site) are built. This will ultimately result in gridlocks. These are country roads built for suburban living. Air Pollution: Undoubtedly pollution will rise as a result of the waste being brought into the area. Dust from construction waste such as concrete and from the lorries bringing the waste to the site. There is no clarity of how the waste will be monitored to ensure that there will be no hazardous materials (i.e. asbestos) hidden under tons of rubble. Water Pollution: There is no confirmation or assurances that this will not leach into the North Benfleet / Rawreth Brook system, as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook. Limitations: . I would highly dispute the suggestion that once restored the site would likely result in an improvement to the landscape character. Firstly, there is nothing in the application to ensure that once filled, the hole would be landscaped and the facility would close and secondly there is nothing limiting the site to waste landfill. The landowners have</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | openly stated that they would be open to additional discussions regarding the disposal of future waste on other part of the land | |
| 1061390, 134 | No | <p>The proposed site is in a designated green belt area and it should stay as this. It is home to the newly opened Treehouse Forest nursery, which specializes on outdoor play in the natural environment. Which is the best education for children, this won't be able to continue if the waste plant is built here. Who in their right mind would send their children to a Forest nursery where the children are unable to use the outside area as it's become a waste site! The site is also rented by a local equine centre and where a number of retired horses live, if the waste site goes ahead you will be leaving the horses without a home, how would you feel if someone came and ripped your home out from beneath you? The two war memorials at the site will be effected by the proposed plans. They were put there to honour those who fought for our country and lives, poppies are placed on the memorials throughout the year and are visited on Armistice Day. These plans would make them impossible to visit and it is disrespectful to move them. Road traffic will increase, which the roads already are unable to cope with and cause strain on existing amenities such as drainage. The pollution, smell and obvious vermin that goes with waste sites will reach our homes and will devalue our properties. This site and the surrounding area is used by cyclists, horse riders, dog walkers and children. We should be protecting our countryside, not destroying it and should be setting a good example to our children by teaching</p> | Dollymans Farm needs to be removed from the list of proposed sites and for this waste plant not to go ahead!! |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | them about the countryside and its importance to everyday life! | |
| 1061564, 148 | No | <p>Why should the landowner be able to question Essex County Council after they have decided that Dollymans Farm was not to be included in plans for a waste disposal site? Do they, who are local landowners but not living near this area, have some influence over the council or have they seen that this could be a massive money making exercise? The Parish Council have put together very good reasons why Dollymans Farm would not be a suitable site and these should be thoroughly considered. Having been a resident in Wickford for very many years and seen the changes, for good or bad, that have taken place to what was once a village and the lack of infrastructure to cope with what is now an ever growing town, to yet have little of what is left of open spaces for the local community taken away from us is quite appalling. I appreciate that with an ever growing population waste disposal is of importance and nobody wants it to be on their doorstep but Dollymans Farm certainly has many reasons why it is not suitable and very big concerns to the local residents are pollution, noise, traffic etc. all of which and more have been highlighted by the Parish Council. I really hope that the Council will reconsider their decision to include Dollymans Farm in their plans.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 923503, A H Philpot & Sons, 152 | Yes | <p>Modification 23, which consists of a new table to set out the parameter for Dollymans Farm, Basildon/Rochford (L(i)16) for inert landfill is supported in planning terms. The proposed site area and allocation of Dollymans Farm for the disposal of approximately 500,000 tonnes of inert waste is supported and accords with our estimation of the borrow pit void capacity. The estimated availability commencing in 2017 is strongly supported. As discussed at the Examination in Public, the applicant is committed to the early delivery of this site. It is the intention, following adoption of the Waste Local Plan to work up a full planning application for submission to Essex County Council. This will enable the site to meet the required and existing needs for inert waste disposal from nearby centres of population, especially Basildon, Wickford, Rayleigh and Chelmsford. In terms of the detailed criteria as set out within the policy, the applicants are in agreement that access to and from the site should be via the A129. It is the applicants' intention to access the site via the private road, named Doublegate Lane onto the A129. The applicants are also happy with the policy criteria that seeks to provide landscape and biodiversity enhancements upon restoration. This will include the early restoration of the land adjacent to the A130 and planting of a tree buffer. As referred to at the Examination in Public and as set out in our previous representations, the current site is of very poor amenity value and currently detracts from the surrounding landscape. It is considered that the allocation of this site, will allow and enable improvements to the landform of the site. Due consideration will be given to new planting during the restoration to provide</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>landscape benefits. The applicants also confirm that relevant desk based archaeological work and dust and noise information will be prepared to accompany the planning application. These are all matters of detail that can be adequately addressed at planning application stage. It is likely that at planning application stage, the application will also be for a proposed inert waste recycling centre in conjunction with the inert waste disposal. In this regard due consideration will be given to the policy criteria as set out within Appendix 18. In particular adequate consideration will be given to detailed landscape screening. Whilst it would have been the preference of the applicants for the inert waste recycling centre to be allocated at this stage, it is understood that following the Examination in Public, that this is matter that will need to be assessed in further detail at planning application stage. Overall the modification as set out in Appendix 18 is supported.</p> | |
| 1061217, 156 | No | <p>This is green belt land and I can see that the owner states he will plant trees when the plot is filled in with other people's rubbish but we will have to wait years for that to be complete, if he wants to plant trees plant them now. The transport infrastructure is already stretched and the A129 is the diversion route when the A127 is closed which it often is this road cannot take further traffic. Lorries are slow to accelerate and particularly when turning right out of Dollymans Farm they will pose a hazard to traffic on the road including pedestrians as there is no footpath, cyclists and buses as this is a bus route. If the lorries turn left and then turn around using the Hodgson Way roundabout they</p> | Leave the green belt land alone. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>will further destroy the surface of the roundabout which is in a poor state with several potholes already. Flooding is a problem locally already, this cannot be ignored. Both the Carpenters Arms roundabout and the Rayleigh Spur flood when we have heavy rain. The field that is to be filled in has lying water in it as I type this he we have not heavy rainfall. If this is filled in where will that water go? I cannot believe flooding will lessen because of this plan, and further I do not believe that has been considered properly. Monitoring of the waste cannot be guaranteed and there may be waste in the site that should not be in there which could leach into the water course. The brooks locally support a lot of wildlife and they run alongside the bridal paths where people walk with dogs that run in and out of the water. This all leads into the river Crouch which runs past Memorial Park and out to Battlesbridge and there are now fish in that water. I come back to the fact that this is green belt and there are very few areas left in Wickford with bridal paths and tracks available to the public. The bridal paths in this area are used daily by horse riders and dog walkers including myself. This will adversely affect my quality of life by taking a beautiful walk away as it will be too dusty and full of rubbish to use with my dogs and it will devalue my house. Life is not just about making money I would like to point out that part of the woodland on this farm has already been demolished despite there being no planning so that a paintball area could be created. Only after it had all been dug up were council notices put up saying this could not be done. This land owner cannot be left with responsibility for what is</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | going to end up in this site. | |
| 1061576, 157 | No | As a local resident I would like to object against using Dollymans Farm as a site for a waste facility for the following reasons: It is green belt land The local roads cannot cope with the high volume of traffic now without the increase this would cause There are 2 war memorials on the site It is very close to local housing and the stench will be disgusting The pollution to the river network | Remove Dollymans Farm from the list of proposed sites |
| 1061576, 158 | No | As a local resident I would like to object against using Dollymans Farm as a site for a waste facility for the following reasons: It is green belt land The local roads cannot cope with the high volume of traffic now without the increase this would cause There are 2 war memorials on the site It is very close to local housing and the stench will be disgusting The pollution to the river network | Dollymans Farm should be removed from the list of proposed sites |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1061577, 159 | No | <p>I strongly disagree with the Dollymans Farm site being considered in this proposal for several reasons. First and foremost is the fact that this land is GREENBELT. The land at Dollymans is all that remains of a thin slither of green belt between Shotgate and the every growing Rayleigh. The landowner states that "the site is of poor quality, particularly in terms of visual amenity". I want to let the inspector know that this so called "poor quality land" is used on a daily basis by horse riders, dog walkers and walkers and we do not consider it of poor quality. This greenbelt land has several bridleways and footpaths running across the land and offers an unique and much used facility for residents of the area. Secondly I am concerned by the increase in the volume of traffic on what is already an over stretched road network in the area. This would cause years of disruption for residents of this area who already battle through overcrowded roads on a daily basis. Thirdly, the potential threat of leaching from the site into North Benfleet/Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook. In addition to the above concerns there are also two War Memorials on the land. One of these falls within the proposed site. The memorials are dedicated to two WW1 Airmen and are of historic and local interest. We should be honouring these men not disturbing these sites with tonnes of landfill. The local parish council has funding to restore both sites over the coming year. These sites are visited regularly something we will no longer be able to do if the landfill site goes ahead. Both Shotgate and Rawreth are prone to flooding and both have approved plans for new housing developments it is</p> | remove the Dollymans site from the proposal |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>unknown what impact this proposed site will have on these developments. Lastly a new Forest Nursery has recently open on the Dollymans Farm site. The Nursery's ideals are based on children being outside, with nature, where they learn about the natural environment. They are outside at least 3 hours a day. This Nursey is the first full time provision of a forestry nursery in Essex and the greenest eco-friendly Nursery provision in Wickford. The following extract is from the Nursery website.....</p> <p>"Our Nursery encourages being outdoors which allows babies to fill their lungs with clean air and use all of their senses to appreciate the colours, different noises, the sense of space and of scale. The outdoor nursery environment offered experiences that babies simply cannot have indoors. The outdoor environment supports busy movement, which helps to strengthen children's muscles, hearts and lungs. exposure to the outdoor environment may also foster children's health via strengthened immunity, more regular sleeping patterns and sense of wellbeing" They won't be able to do all this and experience the benefits of the outdoors with a landfill next to it. The children walk daily around the footpaths and bridleways.</p> | |
| 1061583, 160 | No | <p>I disagree because of pollution and environmental issues Lorry and traffic issues council already don't repair roads in shotgate pot holes and Kirbs broken to be filled with Tarmac which lasts five minutes for hole to re appear</p> | <p>I disagree just look at my road I live path and road is terrible this will only get worse with heavy lorries and destroy the environment put it in pitsea with the other waste disposal sites</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1061588, 161 | No | <p>I strongly disagree with the Dollymans Farm site being considered in this proposal for several reasons. First and foremost is the fact that this land is GREENBELT. The land at Dollymans is all that remains of a thin slither of green belt between Shotgate and the every growing Rayleigh. The landowner states that "the site is of poor quality, particularly in terms of visual amenity". I want to let the inspector know that this so called "poor quality land" is used on a daily basis by horse riders, dog walkers and walkers and we do not consider it of poor quality. This greenbelt land has several bridleways and footpaths running across the land and offers an unique and much used facility for residents of the area. Secondly I am concerned by the increase in the volume of traffic on what is already an over stretched road network in the area. This would cause years of disruption for residents of this area who already battle through overcrowded roads on a daily basis. Thirdly, the potential threat of leaching from the site into North Benfleet/Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook. In addition to the above concerns there are also two War Memorials on the land. One of these falls within the proposed site. The memorials are dedicated to two WW1 Airmen and are of historic and local interest. We should be honouring these men not disturbing these sites with tonnes of landfill. The local parish council has funding to restore both sites over the coming year. These sites are visited regularly something we will no longer be able to do if the landfill site goes ahead. Both Shotgate and Rawreth are prone to flooding and both have approved plans for new housing developments it is</p> | <p>take Dollymans off of the list we do not have the roads to cope with more traffic.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>unknown what impact this proposed site will have on these developments. Lastly a new Forest Nursery has recently open on the Dollymans Farm site. The Nursery's ideals are based on children being outside, with nature, where they learn about the natural environment. They are outside at least 3 hours a day. This Nursey is the first full time provision of a forestry nursery in Essex and the greenest eco-friendly Nursery provision in Wickford. The following extract is from the Nursery website.....</p> <p>"Our Nursery encourages being outdoors which allows babies to fill their lungs with clean air and use all of their senses to appreciate the colours, different noises, the sense of space and of scale. The outdoor nursery environment offered experiences that babies simply cannot have indoors. The outdoor environment supports busy movement, which helps to strengthen children's muscles, hearts and lungs. exposure to the outdoor environment may also foster children's health via strengthened immunity, more regular sleeping patterns and sense of wellbeing" They won't be able to do all this and experience the benefits of the outdoors with a landfill next to it. The children walk daily around the footpaths and bridleways. It will end up with us having no outside space for any of us to use We are building houses wherever possible so that means more traffic but no extra roads to accommodate this we cannot cope with this as well</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1061600, 162 | No | <p>I strongly disagree with the Dollymans Farm site being considered in this proposal for several reasons. First and foremost is the fact that this land is GREENBELT. The land at Dollymans is all that remains of a thin slither of green belt between Shotgate and the every growing Rayleigh. The landowner states that "the site is of poor quality, particularly in terms of visual amenity". I want to let the inspector know that this so called "poor quality land" is used on a daily basis by horse riders, dog walkers and walkers and we do not consider it of poor quality. This greenbelt land has several bridleways and footpaths running across the land and offers an unique and much used facility for residents of the area. Secondly I am concerned by the increase in the volume of traffic on what is already an over stretched road network in the area. This would cause years of disruption for residents of this area who already battle through overcrowded roads on a daily basis. Thirdly, the potential threat of leaching from the site into North Benfleet/Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook. In addition to the above concerns there are also two War Memorials on the land. One of these falls within the proposed site. The memorials are dedicated to two WW1 Airmen and are of historic and local interest. We should be honouring these men not disturbing these sites with tonnes of landfill. The local parish council has funding to restore both sites over the coming year. These sites are visited regularly something we will no longer be able to do if the landfill site goes ahead. Both Shotgate and Rawreth are prone to flooding and both have approved plans for new housing developments it is</p> | find an alternative. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>unknown what impact this proposed site will have on these developments. Lastly a new Forest Nursery has recently open on the Dollymans Farm site. The Nursery's ideals are based on children being outside, with nature, where they learn about the natural environment. They are outside at least 3 hours a day. This Nursey is the first full time provision of a forestry nursery in Essex and the greenest eco-friendly Nursery provision in Wickford. The following extract is from the Nursery website.....</p> <p>"Our Nursery encourages being outdoors which allows babies to fill their lungs with clean air and use all of their senses to appreciate the colours, different noises, the sense of space and of scale. The outdoor nursery environment offered experiences that babies simply cannot have indoors. The outdoor environment supports busy movement, which helps to strengthen children's muscles, hearts and lungs. exposure to the outdoor environment may also foster children's health via strengthened immunity, more regular sleeping patterns and sense of wellbeing" They won't be able to do all this and experience the benefits of the outdoors with a landfill next to it. The children walk daily around the footpaths and bridleways.</p> | |
| 1061606, 163 | No | <p>I'm a local resident and I would like to object against using Dollymans Farm as a site for a waste facility for the following reasons: It is green belt land The local roads cannot cope with the high volume of traffic now without the increase this would cause There are 2 war memorials on the site It is very close to local housing, the stench will be disgusting and noise pollution</p> | Find another site! |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | will increase The pollution to the river network | |
| 1061607, 164 | No | Simply put the landfill site should not be built at Dollymans Farm | 1 - The land is Green Belt and therefore should be protected and not built upon. 2 - Potential of toxic fumes being released too close to residential communities 3 - Increase in volume of HGV and other vehicles on roads which will contribute to the poor state they are already in and in dire need of repair 4 - Risk of safety to residents with increased traffic and air quality 5 - Only benefit appears to be in favour of the land owners of Dollymans Farm and whoever palms have been greased on the council to put this site forward. There lies the problem in its entirety! |
| 1061611, 165 | No | I strongly disagree with the Dollymans Farm site being considered in this proposal for several reasons. First and foremost is the fact that this land is GREENBELT. The land at Dollymans is all that remains of a thin slither of green belt between Shotgate and the every growing Rayleigh. The landowner states that "the site is of poor quality, particularly in terms of visual amenity". I want to let the inspector know that this so called "poor quality land" is used on a daily basis by horse riders, dog walkers and walkers and we do not consider it of poor quality. This greenbelt land has several bridleways and footpaths running across the land and offers an unique and much used facility for residents of the area. Secondly I am concerned by the increase in the volume of traffic on what is already an over stretched road network in the area. This would | Waste should be kept away from residential areas and small side roads |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>cause years of disruption for residents of this area who already battle through overcrowded roads on a daily basis. Thirdly, the potential threat of leaching from the site into North Benfleet/Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook. In addition to the above concerns there are also two War Memorials on the land. One of these falls within the proposed site. The memorials are dedicated to two WW1 Airmen and are of historic and local interest. We should be honouring these men not disturbing these sites with tonnes of landfill. The local parish council has funding to restore both sites over the coming year. These sites are visited regularly something we will no longer be able to do if the landfill site goes ahead. Both Shotgate and Rawreth are prone to flooding and both have approved plans for new housing developments it is unknown what impact this proposed site will have on these developments. Lastly a new Forest Nursery has recently open on the Dollymans Farm site. The Nursery's ideals are based on children being outside, with nature, where they learn about the natural environment. They are outside at least 3 hours a day. This Nursey is the first full time provision of a forestry nursery in Essex and the greenest eco-friendly Nursery provision in Wickford. The following extract is from the Nursery website.....</p> <p>"Our Nursery encourages being outdoors which allows babies to fill their lungs with clean air and use all of their senses to appreciate the colours, different noises, the sense of space and of scale. The outdoor nursery environment offered experiences that babies simply cannot have indoors. The outdoor environment supports busy movement, which helps to</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | strengthen children's muscles, hearts and lungs. exposure to the outdoor environment may also foster children's health via strengthened immunity, more regular sleeping patterns and sense of wellbeing" They won't be able to do all this and experience the benefits of the outdoors with a landfill next to it. The children walk daily around the footpaths and bridleways. | |
| 1061608, 166 | No | The site proposed is too close to residential areas it also has a preschool one site which should not be situated next to a waste disposal site. Traffic leading to and from the site would be too much for our roads to take and would cause congestion in and around our town, which already struggles to deal with the level of traffic at peak times of the day. The proposed site is green belt land There are 2 war memorials on the site It is very close to local housing and the stench will be disgusting The pollution to the river network | Find an alternative site away from a residential area, that does not have traffic issue already. |
| 1061626, 167 | No | i disagree with this land being used for this purpose as it is green belt land, it's some of the only green land we have left round here. The traffic and pollution this will cause is also problematic. | Find somewhere else to put it, away from the build-up of residents who use it to walk dogs, cycle and walk. |
| 1061616, 169 | No | 1) This is Greenbelt land. 2) War Memorials and a brook close by. 3) Already too much traffic in this area with the industrial estate nearby. This is adding more lorries. The road will be in disrepair faster and more frequently. 4) I live nearby, I'm sure the smell of this waste site will not be pleasant. 5) There is a | To take the waste site elsewhere. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | children's nursery which has just opened on this site!! | |
| 1061647, 172 | No | I would like to object to the proposed land fill site at Dollymans Farm , Rawreth, Essex. - increase in traffic on local roads. With the planned new housing being dumped on West Rayleigh you now want a land fill and the extra traffic that comes with this. - the land is in the greenbelt. - eyesore - this is the entrance to Rayleigh from the a127. - pollution. extra traffic, smell, dust, waste spillage into local drainage. | move it somewhere else |
| 1061643, 173 | No | There is very little green land left in and around Wickford/Shotgate/Runwell and the surrounding areas. a landfill site is really not appropriate so close to houses and shotgate & Rayleigh, this would in effect join both the towns together. If the landfill doesn't get permission and houses are built, this too would be ridiculous. There really is by enough infrastructure and I feel like our small towns & villages will soon be like built up cities | Leaving the land as green land & not building on it |
| 1061618, 174 | No | We are left with very little green belt land now in Wickford. With every inch of grass being claimed for housing, we don't have much left. My Children friends and family love walking over this area. So i object to you taking this away to replace with landfill, which is clearly to close to housing, to close to a preschool with young children that should be safeguarded any way. The lovely wildlife we have over there also need their natural homes. Lastly traffic whilst a lot have people have mentioned the traffic on the A127 being bad but the actual road, Cranfield park road is not | Put it somewhere else! |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>wide enough to pass a waste truck and cars safely. I drive my children to school in Rayleigh and drive down this 4 times a day because i also work on Cranfield park road. On a Monday which is waste collection day, I have to pass the waste truck of a morning, it is very dangerous with the tight bends, with high bush so you can't predict what's coming around that corner especially when a truck is then adding further blind spot. I am practically driving in the ditch to avoid being hit. Also to point out on this road alone most morning there is a car in a ditch/bush because the road is so dangerous.</p> | |
| 1061653, 177 | No | <p>Dollymans Farm is in greenbelt. Will cause an increase in traffic, with large vehicles in the area. Pollution to area.</p> | <p>Find a viable alternative!</p> |
| 1061590, 179 | No | <p>Impact on Traffic, pollution from extra traffic. Impact on landscape. Impact on local infrastructure.</p> | <p>Nothing. I along with most Wickford, shotgate and Rayleigh residents are completely against any site in the local area being used for ANY kind of landfill. The local infrastructure cannot handle it just the same as the new housing developments that are being built without upgrading roads and amenities properly.</p> |
| 1061661, 185 | No | <p>This plant should not be given the go ahead this is the last of green belt left in this area. We do not want this as the smell would be terrible and the amount of lorries would raise noise levels so close to our only park and the roads within the area wouldn't cope with that amount of heavy vehicles, This needs to be in an area further out from residential living.</p> | <p>Before such things are put in place better infrastructure for the area needs to be looked at, Dr's, Schools and better outdoor facilities for the people living the proposed area.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1061645, 188 | No | lorries to heavy for our roads ,possible flooding , devaluation of our properties , we live in the area for the greenbelt , you keep building on the green land animals and farm land will disappear . | Put it away from built up areas |
| 1061672, 189 | No | it has recently been brought to my attention that there is a consultation regarding disposal of waste at Dollymans farm, Shotgate, Wickford. I find it astonishing that living so close to the proposed site that I have not been approached by the authorities regarding the proposal. This is unacceptable in my opinion. I am now in the position of hurriedly responding as there is so little time to assess the proposal. On my first looking at the proposal, I would object to the proposal on several grounds: It is in the green belt. It will affect walkers and horse riders. There will be a large increase in heavy lorry movements for many years. There will be traffic issues on an already very busy road that I use to commute on a daily basis. There has been insufficient assessment of the impact on the wildlife in the area. Please can my views be taken into consideration. | |
| 1061650, 191 | No | There is very little off road safe riding in this area and having very large, heavy, noisy lorries driving along side and across the bridleway would make the bridleway basically unusable for all. It would also affect the walkers who also use the bridleway for exercising their dogs. | Don't have the waste site at Dollymans |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1061668, 192 | No | <p>Firstly, this proposal seeks to take over an area of Greenbelt and no doubt will set a precedence for the future in that whilst the plan states is for 5-10 years, will never be given back. This is an area regularly used by horse-riders, dog walkers etc. and there is a forest pre-school that uses the site. Also, the site has an historical importance with WWII memorials there. Secondly, whilst the proposal states building rubble what preclusion is there to stop plasterboard and the like being dumped there with the potential to cause asbestos-like powder being released. This is why several other boroughs/counties no longer use landfill, but opt for incineration instead. The increase in traffic will be horrendous and on roads that are already heading towards sink-hole territory. This will only worsen with heavy loads regularly using them. The impact on the housing in Shotgate and Rawreth will be huge and not in a pleasant way. There is also the likelihood of an increase in flooding if this proposal is given the go-ahead again causing huge issues for the existing residents.</p> | <p>The adaptation of this particular site needs to be abandoned and either sited in an area far away from residential homes or further thought given to incineration which again, needs to be away from residential homes.</p> |
| 1061657, 195 | No | <p>I disagree with this because it would increase HGV traffic in our densely populated area with schools and children. Also it will impact on the maintenance of green belt and having seen the impact of Pitsea and surrounding areas as far as South Benfleet the foul smells omitted from these landfill sites creates an unhealthy and unpleasant smell that carries for miles and would seriously affect a densely populated community.</p> | <p>Put it somewhere that is situated no nearer than 5 miles from any community.</p> |
| 1061685, 203 | No | <p>I disagree with this because of the amount of traffic, disruption</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | to area & pollution it will cause. | |
| 1061695, 204 | No | <p>I have just received news of the above and am utterly disgusted that this is even being considered. As a resident of Shotgate for over 40 years, the pollution levels have noticeably increased in the last 10 years. The A130 by pass already impacts on the pollution levels, both noise and fumes due to the high volume of traffic using it. The factory units in Shotgate have increase, again more cars and pollution. The housing has increased, with a proposed plan for further 400 properties which will also add to the traffic pollution and congestion. We already have a waste plant at Basildon which is within 1 mile of the suggested plan. The fumes and waste emitted from this chimney are visible for miles and a blot on the landscape. The suggested site is greenbelt and has been used as farming for years until more factory units were allowed to use the farm. There is no need for more traffic [refuse vehicles using the Southend road and A127]. There is no need to pollute the atmosphere. There is no need for Mr Philpot to make more money at the expense of those around his farm land suffering health problems. There is a need to protect local residents and wildlife. The surrounding land contains fishing lakes and all natural habitats relating to these ponds. I have crested newts in my garden so there are bound to be more near the farm area. All the natural pongs were destroyed when the Council built houses at the back of Fanton Chase and Fourth Avenue so most wildlife would have reverted to the farmland and greenbelt. There is a need to support the environment globally. Please, please, please consider the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | information proved and bear in mind that Basildon Council and Essex Council have already refused permission for this and Mr Philpot has found a loop hole to get his own way. | |
| 1061694, 205 | No | I objection to this proposition. It is on green belt land and there is a possibility of leeching of contamination into the local brook system, an increased volume of traffic in an already stretched road system on the A129/A1245 and the movement of two WW1 war memorials to airmen. | |
| 1061688, 207 | No | I strongly disagree with the Dollymans Farm site being considered in this proposal for several reasons. First and foremost is the fact that this land is greenbelt which we should be protecting not building on. The land at Dollymans is all that remains of a thin greenbelt between Shotgate and the ever growing Rayleigh. It is correct that a section of the land is of poor quality, mainly due to the landowner having a large fire on it a few years back, this should be cleaned up not used as an excuse for development. There are still large sections used by hikers, dog walkers etc. which are still appreciated. All the development in Wickford and surrounding areas on Green Belt land is making it more and more difficult for kids to safely go outside and for families to go on walks etc., just look at all the green belt lost to the barnhall area alone. I am concerned by the increase in the volume of traffic to the A129, A130 and surrounding roads to what is already an over stretched road network in the area. This would cause years of disruption for residents of this area who already battle through overcrowded | Whilst I accept new waste sites are required for increasing to meet future requirements, This development should not go ahead at this proposed location, it is far too close to existing and new proposed residential schemes which will be greatly affected by traffic and environmental pollution (smells, dust and noise) and further ruins our ever decreasing Greenbelt land. We should be trying to improve peoples' quality of life, not making it worse, and promoting healthy living including exercise and walking. This scheme does not help with either. A new site should be found located further away from residential locations, not on a war memorial site and not on precious greenbelt. No doubt as per usual the decision to build has already been made and our comments and views will be ignored. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | <p>roads on a daily basis due to a lack of investment in infrastructure by ECC. In addition to the above concerns there are also two War Memorials on the land. One of these falls within the proposed site. The memorials are dedicated to two WW1 Airmen and are of historic and local interest. We should be honouring these men not disturbing these sites with tonnes of landfill. These sites are visited regularly something we will no longer be able to do if the landfill site goes ahead. I am concerned about the level of dust and the smells that will come from the site effecting neighbouring residential areas especially located in Shotgate and on the Wick estate This site is far too close to existing and proposed future housing schemes which will affect people's quality of life and the environment.</p> | |
| 908048, Essex Bridleways Association, 212 | No | <p>The inclusion of this site within the WLP for inert waste will have a detrimental impact on the Rights of Way network around the proposed site; the access road that is proposed to be used from the A129 is a Definitive Bridleway and users of this will be greatly affected with noise and dust generated from numerous HGV's accessing the site 6 days per week. There are also likely to be issues with safe road crossing on the A129 for non-motorised users of the bridleway with the proposed increase in HGV traffic.</p> | The site should be removed from the WLP. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1061734, 213 | No | <p>I am writing to outline my objections to the proposed land fill site at Dollymans Farm , Rawreth, Essex. Apart from the obvious objections about a beautiful site which is used by many local people, my objections relate to the nursery which has not long opened being on the same site as a landfill. Treehouse forestry nursery is an outstanding and innovative nursery who's whole ideals are based on the children being outside , with nature. The point is they learn about their surroundings by being outside for at least 3 hours of day. children who have previously been to a Forrest nursery or preschool start Infant school with a clear advantage over the other children. This is the first full time provision of forestry nursery in Essex and the greenest eco-friendly nursery provision in the Wickford area. "Our nursery encourages being outdoors which allows babies to fill their lungs with clean air and use all of their senses to appreciate the colours, different noises, the sense of space and of scale. The outdoor nursery environment offers experiences that babies simply cannot have indoors. The outdoor environment supports busy movement, which helps to strengthen children's muscles, hearts and lungs. Exposure to the outdoor environment may also foster nursery children's health via strengthened immunity, more regular sleeping patterns and a sense of well-being."- Treehouse club Website I'm sure it is it obvious to anyone that a nursery that is based on these philosophies cannot operate with a landfill next to it!</p> | |
| 1061715, 214 | No | Originally not considered as it's green belt, part of a very small and reducing strip of green belt between Wickford and Rayleigh. | Stage 2 1 x RED - this site was excluded in the original plan as it was green belt - what has changed that it is no |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | Continue like this together with the housing already planned and there will be continuous housing and industry from Wickford high street all the way to Rayleigh high street. | longer green belt? Nothing that I can see. Stage 3 3 x Amber 1's 4 x Amber 2's and 2 x Amber 3's - what are the detailed plans to address all of these Amber issues? This proposed site adjoins a watercourse along one side, what failsafes are in place to protect the water course and wildlife? What failsafes will be in place to ensure only inert and nontoxic waste is put to this landfill? There have been too many incidents around the country of these failing to protect the residents and environment. This proposed site is too near housing and another waste treatment plant, local resident's health and wellbeing are at risk from cumulative effects of treatment plants and this open air inert waste site with all the dust, noise and traffic that will be associated with it. What would be the plan for the site after the 500,000 tonnes of waste have been put there? What is the plan for the redistribution of the flood waters that would be normally be on this site? |
| 1061726, 216 | No | I'm a local resident and I would like to object against using Dollymans Farm as a site for a waste facility for the following reasons: Possibility of long term pollution to land or waterways. The site proposed is too close to residential areas for a waste disposal site. Traffic leading to and from the site would cause congestion in and around our town, which already struggles to cope with the level of traffic at peak times of the day. There are too few open spaces in Shotgate and the proposed site is green belt land and would deprive us of another one. There are 2 war | Locate the site in a less populated area. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | memorials on the site. | |
| 1061716, , 217 | No | <p>I disagree with the proposed siting of Landfill site at Dollymans Farm that is situated on green Belt Land with the entrance off of the A129. This is already a very busy road with traffic from the A1245 and A130 turning off to go to Wickford Town Centre and Shotgate Industrial Estate. When an accident occurs on the A127 or the A13 the A129 becomes completely blocked with traffic trying to go through Wickford to bypass the accident. With the amount of lorries going to the site everyday these will only add to the problem especially as the A129 is a single carriageway. In the Proposed Basildon Plan there is also an area opposite the site for 400 houses that again will add to the traffic on the A129. The various types of proposed waste going to the site could cause problems with leaching into the surrounding fields and water course and there seems no one permanently employed on site to vet the waste going to the infill. The site is also situated next to the main London to Southend railway line with no guarantee that a siding could be installed enabling waste from London. Dollymans Farm has numerous Bridleways that are used by Walkers and Horse Riders that and offers an attractive countryside area. The use of land for the site would curtail the use of these Bridleways. With the amount of notice given to the residents regarding this application it does appear that planning of the site has already been agreed.</p> | <p>The proposed Dollymans Farm site is on Green belt any Waste Disposal site should be sited on a Brownfield site of which there are many in the Essex area.</p> |
| 1061637, 218 | No | I wish to express my concerns and objections to the proposed | I believe the proposed landfill at Dollymans Farm should |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>landfill at Dollymans farm. 1. The increase of HGV traffic to the area. 2.The impact this will have on wildlife at this particular site. For example many birds use this area for nesting i.e. Buzzards, Kestrels, (Hedge Sparrows, which have been on decline due to loss of habitat being destroyed).Egrets, Owls, Gold Finches and many more species of birds, mammals, and insects-all of which will lose habitat. 3 This site is a Greenbelt area which is gradually being reduce over time. A large number of residents use this area and bridle paths for many leisure activities i.e. dog walking, horse riding etc. 4 I have run an equestrian centre in Church Road Rawreth with my family for the last 22 years and we employ and provide employment for 8 people within the business. I hold a Riding School Licence with Rochford District Council and we have 36 disabled riders who ride at the centre each week (Riding For The Disabled Charity). We also care for around 30 horses that are on livery at our centre. The owners of these horses ride on the local bridle paths around Dollymans Farm, some of which are public bridleways. The only bridle paths accessible on horseback in our area are on Dollymans Farm. I have many concerns that the loss of these areas would have a direct impact on our business, which might cause the liveries at our yard to move their horses to other locations where there is safe off-road bridle paths. This could result in the closure of our centre and could cause loss of employment for 8 people. It could also mean 36 disabled riders with nowhere to ride, which would be a very sad loss to the Riding For The Disabled and Rochford District Council.</p> | <p>be refused due to the impact it would have on the local area</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1061746, 219 | No | <p>Firstly, this proposal seeks to take over an area of Greenbelt and no doubt will set a precedence for the future in that whilst the plan states is for 5-10 years, will never be given back. This is an area regularly used by horse-riders, dog walkers etc. and there is a forest pre-school that uses the site. Also, the site has an historical importance with WWII memorials there. Secondly, whilst the proposal states building rubble what preclusion is there to stop plasterboard and the like being dumped there with the potential to cause asbestos-like powder being released. This is why several other boroughs/counties no longer use landfill, but opt for incineration instead. The increase in traffic will be horrendous and on roads that are already heading towards sink-hole territory. This will only worsen with heavy loads regularly using them. The impact on the housing in Shotgate and Rawreth will be huge and not in a pleasant way. There is also the likelihood of an increase in flooding if this proposal is given the go-ahead again causing huge issues for the existing residents.</p> | <p>The adaptation of this particular site needs to be abandoned and either sited in an area far away from residential homes or further thought given to incineration which again, needs to be away from residential homes.</p> |
| 1061755, 222 | No | <p>I have concerns about the impact to the surrounding area including, road infrastructure, green belt land, noise pollution and other facilities in the area (nursery).</p> | <p>Relocation to an alternative site that has better infrastructure in place.</p> |
| 1061752, 225 | No | <p>Concerns about the impact on the surrounding area.</p> | <p>Relocation to an area or site that has a better infrastructure in place</p> |
| 1061780, 241 | No | <p>It's on green belt land. The additional traffic from the lorries will cause bedlam, Wickford doesn't have the best infrastructure as it is. The A129 will not be able to cope. The smell and possibility</p> | <p>Move it to a more suitable site not on green belt land!</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | of the waste running in to the water ways concerns me a great deal! | |
| 1061786, Rawreth Flood Action Group, 242 | No | <p>I do hope that you take into consideration our refusal to accept the site at Dollymans Farm as land fill for inert material. There has been a lack of consultation in as much as the public are unaware of this proposed land fill site. The Localism Act should have public awareness, SC1, Public Community Involvement, Public Consultation and the council must involve the community. There has been a refusal of inert material in the local area that Basildon Council wanted to discharge onto a golf course, this had to be refused by lack of consultation. The case at Dollymans is that Bridleways and Public Rights of Way are very much present and in constant use. Rawreth Equestrian Centre in Church Road use the bridleways as do the owners of horses and other stables at this site. Large lorries and machinery could easily pose a threat to the horses and riders, and during the dry days the dust and fumes from these vehicles may also cause concern to residents locally. There are also concerns that pollutants would enter the North Benfleet and Chichester Brooks, heading to the catchment of the Rawreth Brook and into the Crouch altering our finely balanced Eco systems. The above brook have minnows, sticklebacks, newts and in places voles, egrets and herons as wells as ducks, moorhens who regularly visit to rest. There is also mullet and eels present. Our concern that the bio diversity of the complex water system could be destroyed forever and invertebrates may take a long time to regain a foothold here. There are large volumes of water from</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Castlepoint, Bowers Gifford, North Benfleet, Pitsea, Basildon, Saddlers Farm, A1245, A130 with water also being pumped to Rawreth from the Fairglen Interchange which results in flooding. For many years this has been the case and at last we have been in contact with the Environment Agency since 2015 and in discussions with Essex County Council, Rochford District Council and the Cabinet Member for Flooding Roger Hurst who said that at a later date this could quite easily resolve some of the flooding issues in the future as the Government are committed to do and that this would have been an ideal spot just outside the flood zone which is a ready and waiting site to use, this could save the Government millions of pounds in finding alternative flood alleviation sites. If filled in, we could all miss a golden opportunity that is needed in our area. There would also be an opportunity to have a nice feature where wildlife could visit instead of pollutants and methane adding to the pollution where we all live.</p> | |
| 1061784, 243 | No | <p>This is green belt and should be kept that way. The traffic and lorries that will saturate the area (A129) will be enormous. Effecting the locality and the environment with added pollution??.. ttf</p> | |
| 1061793, 244 | No | <p>We moved to wick because it is a beautiful place to live surrounded by a wonderful countryside, we do not need pollution, bad smells, more traffic... the lorries would cause extra wear and tear to the a129 which would lead to no doubt more horrendous roadworks. we have wonderful schools, parks and</p> | move it away from Wickford!! |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | rivers and do not need the pollution pouting into them! | |
| 1061742, 245 | No | Appendix 18 refers to the site as "a former mineral borrow pit." This is misleading as the original planning permission was granted 16 Oct 2001 for a one time project for the removal of clay for engineering fill in for the A130 construction, with restoration to agricultural use afterwards and within 3 years. The Essex County Council Development & Regulation document DR/040/01 submitted as the basis of the planning approval ESS/16/01/ROC / ESS/17/01/BAS allowed for the removal of 550,000 cubic metres of clay and that no waste material would be brought onto the site . Approval was recommended on the basis of exclusively for use as a borrow pit for the A130 project with 2 years to remove material and a year to restore the site. The restoration of the site was completed and is now fully reverted to green belt/agricultural land, and is regularly used by the local community as such. | The site should only be referred to as agricultural land and Green Belt. Any decision to use the site as Landfill should be made purely on the basis of its current Greenbelt situation, not its one time status. The Shotgate community has already suffered and continues to suffer the implications of having a major trunk route built on its doorstep (for the benefit of the wider Essex community). Inflicting a landfill onto the same community simply because we had the required materials to build that road should not be a justification for then disposing of unspecified "inert" material on community used Greenbelt land. |
| 1061812, 247 | No | Our roads are congested enough without the added traffic adding to it, the infrastructure around Wickford cannot cope with this, the smell, flies and vermin it will attract are totally unsuitable for a site ne to houses and schools also the risk of contamination to the nearby river | it should be built in an area with enough space around and suitable roads accessing the site |
| 1061807, 248 | No | There is already too much traffic around this area with the industrial estate. War Memorials should not be moved. We would be losing even more Greenbelt. The brook could become polluted. The sewage smells in the area. There is a children's | Find another site. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | nursery on site! | |
| 1061765, 249 | No | This is green belt and should remain as green belt. We do not need extra traffic with lorries in this area which will destroy the wear and tear on the a129 thus more roadworks which Wickford does not need! The ECC can't keep on top of repairing the roads as it is. Would be damaging to the area. We have very good schools here, parks, rivers and do not need extra pollution. We already have polluted air from the incinerator plant on the a127, Basildon. | Move it away from Wickford. Please leave our green belt land be. |
| 1061742, 250 | No | The Essex County Council Development & Regulation committee document DR/040/01 submitted as the basis of the planning approval ESS/16/01/ROC / ESS/17/01/BAS allowed for the removal of 550,000 cubic metres of clay and that no waste material would be brought onto the site . Approval was recommended on the basis of exclusively for use as a borrow pit for the A130 project with 2 years to remove material and a year to restore the site. The current proposal says "Restoration of the site through this allocation provides the opportunity for biodiversity, landscape and visual enhancement". This wording implies that the site currently offers no biodiversity and that it requires visual or landscape enhancement. This is not the case. In addition the proposals stipulate no specifics for restoration (simply that it would need careful consideration), and there is no timeline for the restoration. Given the landowners previous slow restoration of the site in accordance with the planning permission granted in 2001 - it required an enforcement notice to be issued | Any permission to use of the land for landfill should only be granted after a full consultation on any restoration works that would be undertaken to bring the site to same or better condition as it currently exists. Any restoration work should be clearly documented with both scope and timescales to implement, especially the latter given the landowners previous intransigence in fulfilling planning permission obligations. It should also be clear in the proposal that the current site does not need visual or landscape improvement since it was restored after the original works - the site is Green Belt/Agricultural land in daily use and enjoyment by the local community. If there is a question over the area lacking in biodiversity, this needs to be substantiated. Clarity is required on both the type and the volume of waste to be deposited on the site, and not the weight of the unspecified "inert" material. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>after "protracted negotiations, between the County Council and the landowner" because "the land continued to remain un-restored in early 2006" which was three years after the required restoration date. (Quote taken from Essex County Council Development & Regulation Committee meeting agenda item 7a DR/046/06). This proposal document also refers to the indicative scale of the landfill being 500,000 tonnes, whereas the original borrow pit site had 550,000 cubic meters of clay removed. Since there is not a clear correlation between the weight of unknown "inert" material to be dumped on the site and its actual volume it is unclear what the eventual landscape would look like. What is the density of the unknown landfill material vs the Essex clay originally removed.</p> | |
| 1061846, 251 | No | <p>Wickford does not need this landfill site as we are already polluted enough by the waste recycling plant which blows across from the a127. There is already too much traffic / lorries in the Wickford area with the industrial areas. The roads already can't cope and are breaking up. More lorries dumping rubbish are not needed.</p> | <p>Find a more remote area to dump this rubbish, not a site on top of housing estates.</p> |
| 1061867, 252 | No | <p>Restriction of access to Bridal paths for both pedestrians and horses a much cherished local facility plus heavy vehicles and horses a problem mix Approaching the farms entrance from Carpenters Arms immediately under the bridge the slow moving vehicles pulling out from the farm are extremely likely to end in a collision a lot of near misses occur now when drivers get surprised turning the bend and a very visible slow down warning</p> | <p>The void on this site could become a vital part of a flood prevention scheme to mitigate the pressures of the future developments to the East and the West, this could provide a haven for wildlife with creative planting, a scheme far more in keeping with the use of Greenbelt land.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>sign would be essential. Because of the very gridlocked history of the A129 especially during the commuter period particularly the early rush hour a time restraint to exclude this period would be .(between 0730 -0900 the road into Wickford is total jammed. The proposed total quantity of infill waste would be around 500,000 tons, equal to fourteen 20 ton lorries per day for 5 years. The local housing plan for Shotgate is for 400 new houses plus a large increase for the Rochford area will this should also be taken into account for the effect on the roads. The land at Dollymans Farm is all that remains of a very thin slither of green belt between Shotgate and westward creeping Rayleigh. I have concerns that there is a very real threat of leaching from the site into the North Benfleet/ Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook . This leaching could undo some of the recent improvement to the water quality in the River Crouch. In addition, unless the site is strictly controlled with what is dumped there, noxious material under the guise of building waste could find its way under the radar. There are also two very important War Memorials on the land, one of which will fall within the proposed site. The Memorials are dedicated to two Airmen and are of great historic and local interest and are both the subject of funding to restore them over the coming year.</p> | |
| 1061887, 254 | No | <p>I would like to state my opposition to the development of Greenbelt land on Dollymans Farm to an infill waste site. I have strong concerns regarding the environmental impact this would have on wildlife, the threat of pollution not only to local</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | waterways but also from the army of lorries bringing waste to the site. The A129 is a busy road at the best of times, these lorries will have a huge impact on local traffic and cause misery to local residents. | |
| 1061888, 255 | No | I do not agree on the proposal going to Dollymans Farm for a waste land. It seems to me that it wasn't included to begin with along with the 18 suggested sites as it was green belt area, but somehow the Landowner has had some sway in the decision and it now in the running. It will devalue property, cause chaos on the roads, noise, pollution, dust, and wear and tear on the roads from the heavy lorries, let alone disrupt a nice peaceful recreational area. Surely it makes sense if it wasn't considered to begin with leave well alone for others to enjoy instead of the LANDOWNER HAVING IT HIS WAY. | |
| 1061890, Rayleigh Town Museum, 256 | No | Site: Two Airmen's Memorials, whose location is adjacent to the proposed waste site and individually marked on the accompanying map. Comments: The two sites are small stone/granite memorials, both fenced, erected by the families at the end of WW1, to commemorate a double aircraft crash in March 1918 (the pilots, Messrs Kynoch and Stroud, were returning from a mission over London to intercept and destroy a German bombing attack) Both sites are of considerable local importance and have been in existence since 1918. As such the sites are of national historical significance. Both sites have been the subject of various proposals for restoration and have attracted local, national and political interest. A local historical | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>society (Rayleigh Through the Looking Glass) with considerable knowledge of the memorials, including verbal historical assurances of their protection, have indicated that plans are held which show proposals for the restoration within one year of today's date. These plans can be made available for viewing. Offers of support have been received from local organisations (with some financial assistance already available) and a number of local councillors have indicated that the sites must be protected, having received many local representations. Mark Francois, the local MP, and Patron of Rayleigh Town Museum, has interested himself in the project from a very early stage and has provided information relating to funding for the restoration via Centenary projects relating to WW1. An Expression of Interest has already been raised with the Heritage Lottery Fund and it is planned that the restorations will be completed by March 2018 (the centenary of the crash). The current owners of the land have already been consulted. It is requested that both sites be respected in the ECC plans for the proposed Waste Disposal Site on farm land belonging to Dollymans Farm and that public access be maintained in any future requests for different site usage.</p> | |
| 1061892, 257 | No | <p>I am writing with concern at the proposed Dollymans Farm site being considered for waste disposal . It wasn't originally included in the 18 sites allocated due to it being in an area of green belt. So why was it not rejected when it was NOT one of the sites considered in the first place Obviously green belt area is very important to the environments and residents. It will cause a</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | lot of upset to the community to all who use the area for their recreation. The roads in and around Rawreth and Shotgate will have more congestion. The Heavy lorries will cause danger, noise and dust. I would therefore like my comments submitted against this proposal. | |
| 1061898, 259 | No | Why on earth would anyone want a landfill on what little greenbelt land we have left around Wickford? Hazardous waste? No thank you, bad enough when then smell of waste wafts over us from the Basildon site. Do we really need more heavy lorries trundling around Wickford causing havoc and breaking up the roads that are already in disrepair? No. Wickford infrastructure will not cope with this proposal. It looks like the only people who are agreeing to this are those with a chance of financial gain if it goes ahead. Dollymans farm owner...Hang your head in shame for even thinking of this. Wickford and Rayleigh have been your neighbours for years and now you want to dump this on them. Basildon Councillors, you too should hang your heads in shame because Dollymans Farm wasn't even a consideration until a greedy man approached you. | Re-locate the landfill site to somewhere far away from residential areas. |
| 1061911, 260 | No | This landfill is far too close to residential properties and the single carriageway road feeding the site would be insufficient to support the large number of vehicles along with the development of the Rayleigh Side of the carpenters arms this is too much for the area especially in one go the site is on high ground and the smell I believe would travel to the surrounding areas causing distress to residents especially in the shotgate | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | area the land is actively farmed at the moment so there would appear to be no good reason to turn it over to this purpose | |
| 1061903, 261 | No | The road structure around Dollymans Farm will not support the increase in traffic which already struggles to cope when there are issues on the A127. This has a detrimental impact on both Shotgate and Wickford. The inevitable impact of increased traffic, pollution, and loss of green field site status will have a major negative impact on the local economy. | The proposed site needs to be relocated to an area where the impact on residents and businesses can be managed by the building of roads and services to the site. |
| 1061909, 262 | No | This site on greenbelt land is totally unsuitable both for the 5 years of dumping and the subsequent activity that the landowner wishes to pursue. Two historical monuments will be destroyed or disturbed by the work Potential pollution of water courses not properly addressed Serious traffic issues around the delivery of waste present insurmountable difficulties; in particular the junction between the site and the A129 is already hazardous and greater use would require installation of traffic lights if it is to be safe. The A129 (Southend Road) through Shotgate and Wickford is an extremely busy route with multiple junctions, crossings and provides access to several schools - the addition of heavy waste delivery vehicles to this would be unsupportable. This could only be negated by banning access from this route. The agreed future construction of c.400 dwellings north of the A129 will further make the area unsuitable for such industrial use as is proposed. | Abandon the proposal |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1061698, 263 | No | <p>This site on greenbelt land is totally unsuitable both for the 5 years of dumping and the subsequent activity that the landowner wishes to pursue. Two historical monuments will be destroyed or disturbed by the work Potential pollution of water courses not properly addressed Serious traffic issues around the delivery of waste present insurmountable difficulties; in particular the junction between the site and the A129 is already hazardous and greater use would require installation of traffic lights if it is to be safe. The A129 (Southend Road) through Shotgate and Wickford is an extremely busy route with multiple junctions, crossings and provides access to several schools - the addition of heavy waste delivery vehicles to this would be unsupportable. This could only be negated by banning access from this route. The agreed future construction of c.400 dwellings north of the A129 will further make the area unsuitable for such industrial use as is proposed. Bridle paths lost</p> | flood control projects would be a much more sensible green belt/ nature reserve project |
| 1061915, 265 | No | <p>I would like to state my opposition to the development of Greenbelt land on Dollymans Farm to an infill waste site. I have strong concerns regarding the environmental impact this would have on wildlife, the threat of pollution not only to local waterways but also from the army of lorries bringing waste to the site. The A129 is a busy road at the best of times, these lorries will have a huge impact on local traffic and cause misery to local residents. - it's on green belt, possible leeching of contamination into local brook system, increased volume of traffic in already stretched road system A129/A1245, movement</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | of two WW1 war memorials to airmen, | |
| 1061799, 266 | No | I object to proposed landfill at Dollymans farm. Roads cannot cope with huge lorries. Roads in Shotgate already very bad due to heavy lorries constantly passing. Huge cracks in roads now. Worried hazardous waste will be dumped there and fumes will travel to our homes. Nothing should be built on green belt ever! We are losing too much green. We all need to escape to green, clean air spaces. | Find somewhere else that is not green belt. Keep green belt land clear always. |
| 1061921, 267 | No | Firstly the use of the land as an inert waste site will have no benefit for Shotgate or the surrounding area. It will not add any value to the area or for those who live nearby and the house prices. The extra traffic using the A129 will pose a risk to the structure of the road and will add increasing pressure on the council to maintain and fix areas due to heavy lorries using the road daily. This increase in traffic will also cause issues for local residents and possible damage to their vehicles from potholes and lose stones. The regular tipping of lorries loads will create loud and infrequent noise to the area as well as dust. This noise and air pollution has no man made barriers in-between itself and my house to stop it travelling . This regular loud noise and dust will create unnecessary health risks which I believe I should not be subjected too. The park in Shotgate is a well-loved and used area for local residents that we feel proud of to use. With such large lorries needing to pass by, I worry that residents- dog walkers, children and others- will be put at risk when crossing the | Another site away from homes. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>road. I enjoy watching the wildlife from my house window and worry that with the pollution created by such a site, local wildlife will disappear and the area will become inhabitable for creatures that create our environment. The war memorial is something that should not be even allowed to be considered to be disturbed. We are incredibly grateful for our servicemen and destroying such a site seems disrespectful and rude. Finally the original decision by the council , who work for the good of the whole community, was the site was not acceptable for the use of waste disposal. This decision seems to now be considered for reconsideration due to the greed of an individuals need to make money. This is totally unacceptable. I ask you to reconsider for all of the above reasons and selfishly for the health of a child's instead. My child. My son who has cystic fibrosis, a life limiting respiratory condition that will be affected by the needs of one's person need to create income.</p> | |
| 1061923, 268 | No | <p>My reasons for disagreeing with the proposal include: - Wickford residents have embraced change over the years, with the development of the Wick, Runwell etc. Roads have not generally not been updated to support, with the entrance and exit to Wickford, often being totally gridlocked on all routes. - It is Greenbelt land which is used regularly by local residents and with several new build estates going up recently in Wickford, there is a significant shortage of this. - I have serious concern around the access to the site (A129) as this road is already severally congested, particularly at peak times. It is also regularly used as an alternative route by many motorists when problems</p> | <p>I feel that the only solution is for an alternative site to be used and the proposal rejected.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>occur on surrounding roads (eg. A127, A130, A13). - Our local road infrastructure is not suitable to support the high level of heavy good traffic that would be visiting the site. There is evidence of local roads collapsing under current usage which continues to be a problem. - Regardless of instructions, lorries could potentially take the route through Wickford to the site. This leaves the risk of them travelling down roads that were not designed for the weight limit or size of the vehicles. They would pass several schools and small crossings/roundabouts that could cause incidents. - Flooding, noise, wildlife disruption, contamination, devaluing of properties and potential development plans rehousing. - With the impending delivery of Crossrail, Wickford is a town of massive opportunities for commuters to live in a country style setting. I feel these plans could seriously impact people's decision to want to live here, but also equally as important the devaluing of current resident's properties is of serious concern.</p> | |
| 1061925, 269 | No | <p>My reasons for disagreeing with the proposal include: - Wickford residents have embraced change over the years, with the development of the Wick, Runwell etc. Roads have not generally not been updated to support, with the entrance and exit to Wickford, often being totally gridlocked on all routes. - It is Greenbelt land which is used regularly by local residents and with several new build estates going up recently in Wickford, there is a significant shortage of this. - I have serious concern around the access to the site (A129) as this road is already severally congested, particularly at peak times. It is also regularly</p> | <p>I feel that the only solution is for an alternative site to be used and the proposal rejected.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>used as an alternative route by many motorists when problems occur on surrounding roads (eg. A127, A130, A13). - Our local road infrastructure is not suitable to support the high level of heavy good traffic that would be visiting the site. There is evidence of local roads collapsing under current usage which continues to be a problem. - Regardless of instructions, lorries could potentially take the route through Wickford to the site. This leaves the risk of them travelling down roads that were not designed for the weight limit or size of the vehicles. They would pass several schools and small crossings/roundabouts that could cause incidents. - Two war memorials would have to be destroyed/disturbed. This is extremely rude and disrespectful to all of our war heroes and for those who bravely continue to serve. - Flooding, noise, wildlife disruption, contamination, devaluing of properties and potential development plans rehousing. - With the impending delivery of Crossrail, Wickford is a town of massive opportunities for commuters to live in a country style setting. I feel these plans could seriously impact people's decision to want to live here, but also equally as important the devaluing of current residents' properties is of serious concern.</p> | |
| 1061929, 270 | No | <p>My reasons for disagreeing with the proposal include: - Wickford residents have embraced change over the years, with the development of the Wick, Runwell etc. Roads have not generally not been updated to support, with the entrance and exit to Wickford, often being totally gridlocked on all routes. - It is Greenbelt land which is used regularly by local residents and</p> | <p>I feel that the only solution is for an alternative site to be used and the proposal rejected.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>with several new build estates going up recently in Wickford, there is a significant shortage of this. - I have serious concern around the access to the site (A129) as this road is already severally congested, particularly at peak times. It is also regularly used as an alternative route by many motorists when problems occur on surrounding roads (eg. A127, A130, A13). - Our local road infrastructure is not suitable to support the high level of heavy good traffic that would be visiting the site. There is evidence of local roads collapsing under current usage which continues to be a problem. - Regardless of instructions, lorries could potentially take the route through Wickford to the site. This leaves the risk of them travelling down roads that were not designed for the weight limit or size of the vehicles. They would pass several schools and small crossings/roundabouts that could cause incidents. - Two war memorials would have to be destroyed/disturbed. This is extremely rude and disrespectful to all of our war heroes and for those who bravely continue to serve. - Flooding, noise, wildlife disruption, contamination, devaluing of properties and potential development plans rehousing. - With the impending delivery of Crossrail, Wickford is a town of massive opportunities for commuters to live in a country style setting. I feel these plans could seriously impact people's decision to want to live here, but also equally as important the devaluing of current residents' properties is of serious concern.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1061930, 271 | No | <p>My reasons for disagreeing with the proposal include: - Wickford residents have embraced change over the years, with the development of the Wick, Runwell etc. Roads have not generally not been updated to support, with the entrance and exit to Wickford, often being totally gridlocked on all routes. - It is Greenbelt land which is used regularly by local residents and with several new build estates going up recently in Wickford, there is a significant shortage of this. - I have serious concern around the access to the site (A129) as this road is already severally congested, particularly at peak times. It is also regularly used as an alternative route by many motorists when problems occur on surrounding roads (eg. A127, A130, A13). - Our local road infrastructure is not suitable to support the high level of heavy good traffic that would be visiting the site. There is evidence of local roads collapsing under current usage which continues to be a problem. - Regardless of instructions, lorries could potentially take the route through Wickford to the site. This leaves the risk of them travelling down roads that were not designed for the weight limit or size of the vehicles. They would pass several schools and small crossings/roundabouts that could cause incidents. - Two war memorials would have to be destroyed/disturbed. This is extremely rude and disrespectful to all of our war heroes and for those who bravely continue to serve. - Flooding, noise, wildlife disruption, contamination, devaluing of properties and potential development plans rehousing. - With the impending delivery of Crossrail, Wickford is a town of massive opportunities for commuters to live in a country style setting. I feel these plans could seriously impact</p> | <p>I feel that the only solution is for an alternative site to be used and the proposal rejected.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | people's decision to want to live here, but also equally as important the devaluing of current residents' properties is of serious concern. | |
| 1061933, 272 | No | My reasons for disagreeing with the proposal include: - Wickford residents have embraced change over the years, with the development of the Wick, Runwell etc. Roads have not generally not been updated to support, with the entrance and exit to Wickford, often being totally gridlocked on all routes. - It is Greenbelt land which is used regularly by local residents and with several new build estates going up recently in Wickford, there is a significant shortage of this. - I have serious concern around the access to the site (A129) as this road is already severally congested, particularly at peak times. It is also regularly used as an alternative route by many motorists when problems occur on surrounding roads (eg. A127, A130, A13). - Our local road infrastructure is not suitable to support the high level of heavy good traffic that would be visiting the site. There is evidence of local roads collapsing under current usage which continues to be a problem. | I feel that the only solution is for an alternative site to be used and the proposal rejected. |
| 1061919, 273 | No | because this site was not considered in the original consultation and local residents have not been formally notified. It is on green belt land very near to local housing and has two WW1 memorials on it. | I disagree with this site being used and want an alternative site to be used for the following reasons:- This greenbelt land that should not be used. There are public footpaths and bridle ways on the site where many people ride horses and walk their dogs To enjoy the peace and quiet Which would be totally spoiled by this. The bridle path has already been re-rerouted once when they built |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>the a130 so would be unfair to reroute once again There is a children's nursery in very close proximity to the proposed site which prides itself in having the children play outside for three hours a day, how can you put this so close to children? I live nearby and do not want the additional noise, or dust as I have an asthmatic son and am worried about air quality, and smells. I enjoy sitting out in the garden in the summer and do not want this ruined by noise smells and dust. this will devalue property in the surrounding area and no-one had the decency to inform local residents. the a129 is a very busy road already and the extra traffic with large vehicles that this site could bring will cause chaos on a small road that gets traffic jams on at busy times. The a129 has had serious accidents near the junction with the Chichester and i am worried the accident hotspot will be made worse. There are two WW1 memorials that should absolutely not be moved or degraded by having this proposed site anywhere near them, is nothing sacred anymore? There are brooks and a reservoir close by that could be contaminated. This has not been fully considered by anyone at all, as this is so late in the day to add this site that was not included in the original proposal. Please stop this now and do a full and proper consultation, asking local residents, doing proper site surveys etc.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1061931, 274 | No | <p>This area of Essex near Rayleigh, Wickford and Rawreth has, in recent years, been subjected to huge amounts of development. Thousands of houses have been built in the vicinity, and over 1200 more are due to be built in the next few months/years within a very few miles of Dollyman's. The A129 and surrounding roads are constantly under terrible strain already, even before this proposed new plan. The A129 in both directions into Wickford and Rayleigh at busy times is, almost every day, at a standstill or a crawl. Any problem on surrounding roads (A127) causes instant tailbacks. The road can take no more strain. This area is Green Belt and as such needs protecting, The Green Belt around this part of Essex is being encroached on from all directions. Local town councils all wish to preserve remaining areas. The impact on wildlife flora and fauna will be significant and damaging. It is impossible to prevent toxic chemicals released by waste of this type from leaching into surrounding land and waterways over many, many years. This can have terrible consequences on wildlife and also the many homes nearby. The landfill site at Pitsea, some miles away, produces an unavoidable stench which can be smelt from Rayleigh under certain wind and weather conditions. The smell from a site so much closer would be intolerable to many tens of thousands of households. Dollyman's Farm is between two large towns and putting a landfill site between them is irresponsible and unfair to all who live in them. Pollution in this area is currently a major problem already, and is under investigation. There are several schools in close proximity to the road and only a few fields away from the site. Monitoring stations in Rayleigh show it suffers from</p> | <p>This site should not be on Green Belt dividing two large towns at all. It should not be so close to large towns with pollution problems already.. It should be somewhere with purpose built road or rail access which will not adversely affect tens of thousands of families living nearby and using the already struggling road system. This part of Essex is being developed and concreted over at an alarming rate. And all remaining Green Belt and wildlife should be protected.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>very high levels of harmful airborne pollutants along the A129 through the town centre. Adding so many daily lorry journeys through our busy town roads will exacerbate this problem massively, not to mention these roads are not built to take large lorries which cannot negotiate the twists, turns and mini-roundabouts along the route. Observation on any day would show lorries too large for the road system bouncing up onto pedestrian pavements and crossing into other lanes at junctions, causing drivers to take evasive action. This area around Dollyman's Farm is one of the small number of areas which contain actively used bridlepaths and walkways. Many horses are stabled nearby and lorries of this size moving in and out so regularly, could cause accidents, putting riders and their mounts at risk. At present this is a safe, quiet route to ride on. We personally only found out about this proposed development through Facebook today. Surely a development of this magnitude, with the potential to damage local residents' health and the disastrous effects it will have upon local roads, should have been more publically and widely disclosed? We are strongly opposed to this plan, as are all we speak to.</p> | |
| 1061942, 276 | No | <p>This was not in the original plans. Shotgate residents have not openly been informed of this site.</p> | <p>The traffic along this road between Dollymans and Rayleigh is bad enough as it is. Seeing as this is a link road for Chelmsford, Rayleigh the A127 and A13, it's going to make the area a nightmare. The road on Hodgson Way is falling apart again, more than likely due to the heavy goods vehicles that use this road to access the industrial estate. Having this landfill site so close is</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>going to be a problem for several reasons. Health This cannot be good for residents' health Nursery There is a nursery nearby that uses outside space. How can this be healthy for the children Traffic The extra traffic will also affect health the fact this was done in such an underhand way, tells me there would be serious concerns walkers and horses This area is used by horse riders and many walkers. Greenbelt With all the properties going up in the area, we don't have many green belt areas left. Why take what little we do have?</p> |
| 1061939, 277 | No | <p>I disagree with this proposed modification as I have several strong concerns. Firstly regarding the environmental impact this would have. This includes air pollution, water pollution and the effect on wildlife. Also recent events have shown that with new waste management projects, in spite of much reassurance from the planners, builders and proposers of these facilities, that it is still very possible they have disastrous contamination to both people and the surrounding area, as has happened with the Tovi waste plant very recently with asbestos. Local people already have to put up with smell from the Basildon plant when the wind is blowing towards Wickford in spite of assurances this would not happen with the new plant. This would be made worse with yet another waste site. Another objection is regarding the already hugely busy A129 where lorries would have a huge impact on the local traffic causing misery to local residents trying to commute and those living along the route that these lorries</p> | <p>I believe this development should not go ahead at this location due to its proximity to existing residential areas already affected by traffic and environmental pollution (smells, dust and noise) which would only further increase. Furthermore would should be trying to keep our Greenbelt land, improving people's quality of life and promoting a healthy living lifestyle, not contaminating residential areas, close to schools and parks. I believe a new site should be found which is located away from residential locations and Greenbelt.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | would need to take, increasing road and noise pollution. | |
| 1061941, 278 | No | <p>I am opposed to this landfill site going ahead as i live backing on to this site and cannot agree with its location, my reasons are</p> <p>1)The roads are too busy now without the extra lorries carrying waste to the site, we have limited roads out of Wickford and these get heavily congested and this would just add to that congestion as well as further damage to roads not built for this sort of traffic, we already have problems with the Hodgson Way road leading to the industrial estate which is sinking due to heavy use of lorries to the estate, this would happen along the A129 too, and would cause more problem for Wickford road users.</p> <p>2). I worry about what sort of waste will be dumped there, who is going to be making sure hazardous waste isn't dumped there ? which could lead to pollution of our brooks and streams and wildlife and could potentially lead to hazardous fumes and dust being blown towards the housing developments of which i live, keep it away from local housing it is far too near in my opinion. .</p> <p>3) Many Wickford and shotgate residents walk along the paths and cycle along the route you are proposing not to mention the many riders i see along the way too. There are not many open areas like this in Wickford therefore I do not understand why Wickford seems to be losing all its greenbelt land for housing and now for landfill too, take it somewhere else.</p> | <p>a landfill site should in my opinion be in an area where there are better roads, no housing developments nearby away from streams and areas which could potentially become polluted with fumes, dust and chemical leaks.</p> |
| 1061946, 279 | No | <p>I feel that this particular development is too close to the residential area and also to the reservoir. The roads around</p> | <p>It needs to be built away from residential areas</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | Wickford are extremely busy and the extra trucks traveling on the A129 will make the situation even worse. In the past few years we have lost a lot of our green land due to Wickford being built up and the infrastructure such as roads cannot support it | |
| 1061950, 280 | No | Restriction of access to Bridal paths for both pedestrians and horses a much cherished local facility plus heavy vehicles and horses a problem mix Approaching the farms entrance from Carpenters Arms immediately under the bridge the slow moving vehicles pulling out from the farm are extremely likely to end in a collision a lot of near misses occur now when drivers get surprised turning the bend and a very visible slow down warning sign would be essential. Because of the very gridlocked history of the A129 especially during the commuter period particularly the early rush hour a time restraint to exclude this period would be .(between 0730 -0900 the road into Wickford is total jammed. The proposed total quantity of infill waste would be around 500,000 tons, equal to fourteen 20 ton lorries per day for 5 years. The local housing plan for Shotgate is for 400 new houses plus a large increase for the Rochford area will this should also be taken into account for the effect on the roads. The land at Dollymans Farm is all that remains of a very thin slither of green belt between Shotgate and westward creeping Rayleigh. I have concerns that there is a very real threat of leaching from the site into the North Benfleet/ Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook . This leaching could undo some of the recent improvement to the water quality in the River Crouch. In addition, | Restriction of access to Bridal paths for both pedestrians and horses a much cherished local facility plus heavy vehicles and horses a problem mix Approaching the farms entrance from Carpenters Arms immediately under the bridge the slow moving vehicles pulling out from the farm are extremely likely to end in a collision a lot of near misses occur now when drivers get surprised turning the bend and a very visible slow down warning sign would be essential. Because of the very gridlocked history of the A129 especially during the commuter period particularly the early rush hour a time restraint to exclude this period would be .(between 0730 -0900 the road into Wickford is total jammed. The proposed total quantity of infill waste would be around 500,000 tons, equal to fourteen 20 ton lorries per day for 5 years. The local housing plan for Shotgate is for 400 new houses plus a large increase for the Rochford area will this should also be taken into account for the effect on the roads. The land at Dollymans Farm is all that remains of a very thin slither of green belt between Shotgate and westward creeping Rayleigh. I have concerns that there is a very real threat of leaching from the site into the North Benfleet/ Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>unless the site is strictly controlled with what is dumped there, noxious material under the guise of building waste could find its way under the radar. There are also two very important War Memorials on the land, one of which will fall within the proposed site. The Memorials are dedicated to two Airmen and are of great historic and local interest and are both the subject of funding to restore them over the coming year.</p> | <p>from the site is direct into the brook . This leaching could undo some of the recent improvement to the water quality in the River Crouch. In addition, unless the site is strictly controlled with what is dumped there, noxious material under the guise of building waste could find its way under the radar. There are also two very important War Memorials on the land, one of which will fall within the proposed site. The Memorials are dedicated to two Airmen and are of great historic and local interest and are both the subject of funding to restore them over the coming year.</p> |
| 1061995, 281 | No | <p>I am writing to complain about the planned proposals for a Landfill Site at Dollymans Farm at Shotgate. It is Greenbelt land and should remain as such, together with all the increase in traffic and heavy lorries at all hours of the day and night, the crushing of concrete, the dust , noise etc. etc. is totally unacceptable. I object strongly and would like my complaints noted. We have horses and ride the bridle paths over there, people walk dogs, fishermen and other leisure pursuits, it would ruin the are completely. The roads in the area are totally gridlocked now so how they will cope with hundreds of heavy lorries I can only imagine what it will be like.</p> | |
| 1061952, 282 | No | <p>Not only is this one of the last bits of green belt land between Shotgate and Rayleigh, I live very close to Dollymans farm and</p> | <p>move the proposed to a place that isn't next to a forestry nursery or a residential area.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | do not want to have to smell the waste that will come from having a landfill site so close to my residential home. My sons' nursery is also located on Dollymans farm and it's a forestry nursery. The children spend lots of time outside, they take walks alongside the stream, look at the horses in the pastures and picnic and learn through play a lot outside. This would do nothing for the children's learning or health to have a landfill site situated right next to them. It would have a huge impact on their health. | |
| 1061947, 284 | No | Essex County Council's plans to turn part of Dollymans Farm into a landfill site for construction waste is dangerous for the environment, and will rob local people of the last piece of greenbelt land between Shotgate and Rayleigh. The plans say that an estimated 500,000 tonnes of waste will be put into the site, which will take approximately five years to fill. That averages at fourteen lorries carrying 20 tonnes of waste visiting the site every day for five years. They'd be using the A1245 and the A129, two roads which are already far too busy. Also, the water that currently goes down the old mineral pit will get into nearby streams, which eventually ends up in the River Crouch. This will become unsafe for the local population. Locals walk in this area and horse-riders also use the area on a daily basis, every bit of open land is being taken away and this is unacceptable. There is also a World War One memorial there at the moment which would have to be moved. This is totally unacceptable and is dishonouring those who fought for us and those who continue to fight for this country. I am a local resident and do not want this on my doorstep and object wholeheartedly | This landfill site should be placed elsewhere, away from residential areas and we should certainly not be having to move any war memorials. This is greenbelt land and should not be used for this purpose. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | to these plans. | |
| 1061945, 285 | No | <p>I object in the strongest terms to this proposed modification. The land at Dollyman's Farm is all that remains of a very narrow piece of green belt between Shotgate and Rayleigh. It offers several bridleways and footpaths that are used daily by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, joggers and horse riders. These are public rights of way, not for any individual landowner to deprive the community of. I, like many others, value this green belt land and ride my horse in the area and along the bridle ways. Contrary to the view of the landowner and Liz Lake Associates, we all enjoy the view and the land offers one of the very few local areas where we can access the countryside and ride safely. It defies belief to suggest that a landfill site would be more aesthetically pleasing!! The proposed use of the land would render the entire bridleway network unusable as using these bridle ways alongside the volume and type of traffic that the proposed development would attract would simply be too dangerous. The proposed "temporary" road dividing BW17 from BW55 would have to be crossed by horses and riders to make them usable, which is just not feasible when a conservative estimate suggests it will be used by fourteen 20 tonne lorries filled with waste each day. There are two livery yards in the local area that would be hugely negatively impacted by this proposal. Across the two, this modification would force up to 70 horses and riders off the bridleways and onto the surrounding roads. This would be dangerous for them and also for car drivers and other road users. The Liz Lake report itself highlights the complexity of the</p> | <p>The development of the Dollyman's site in this way is inappropriate and should be excluded from the Plan. Bridleways and public rights of way are supposed to be protected. Please do so.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>surrounding road network, including major interchanges that form "significant barriers" to pedestrian and cycle movements. Such barriers present themselves to horses and riders too. So it is accepted that there are no local alternatives to the public rights of way on the Dollyman's site. This, coupled with the fact that speeds on some of the surrounding roads are restricted only to the national speed limit, means that serious injuries to, or even deaths, of horses, riders and possibly also other road users are almost inevitable. The loss of the hacking scheme on Dollyman's Farm would almost certainly result in those who keep their horses in Rawreth moving elsewhere, where they can ride more safely. This would put a local family business out of business and its staff out of work. With it would go the only local Riding for the Disabled centre, depriving 38 disabled riders of the highlight of their week and much needed physical and emotional therapy. Not to mention the likely loss of the Forestry Pre-School, depriving many local children of their right to an early education place and more staff of their jobs. The county council not only has a duty to make provision for waste disposal; it also has a duty to ensure childcare sufficiency that the proposal is not conducive to. In addition, the land is currently home to a number of retired and injured horses who deserve to live out their days in peace and tranquillity as we all do. With limited alternative facilities for equine retirement and rehabilitation, some of these horses may sadly be destroyed if the site cannot be secured, as owners may have nowhere else suitable to keep them. The proposed development would require a new road and bring with it an estimated fourteen 20 tonne</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>lorries per day. The dirt, noise, disruption and pollution associated with this will ruin this peaceful area. The local road network, which is already gridlocked at peak times, simply cannot withstand any more traffic, particularly not of this nature, and I would respectfully suggest that the Planning Inspector pay a visit to the local area at peak time to see this for herself before making her decision. The landowner has apparently committed to returning the land to green belt however this seems at best unlikely and at worst futile. There is no guarantee that the site will be fully filled and restored within 5 years. Even if it is, by this time, the damage will have been done and these much loved and appreciated facilities and recreational assets will have been lost. The bridleways will have been destroyed, businesses and livelihoods will have been lost and horses will have moved out of the area, leaving no equines to enjoy this lovely land again. Likewise we cannot be confident that compliance with any conditions will be strictly controlled given the conspicuous absence of planning enforcement in the local area. This is not about what's best for Essex. It is motivated solely by money. The land owner has also indicated that they are not averse to importing waste in from London in the medium to longer term. Why should Essex's green belt land become a dumping ground for the capital?!</p> | |
| 1061949, 286 | Yes | <p>I am strongly opposed to the development of Greenbelt land on Dollymans Farm to an infill waste site. I have serious concerns regarding the loss of this Green Belt land and its impact on wildlife, the local waterways and the additional pollution</p> | <p>I believe that using our precious and extremely limited Green Belt land is not the way forward. Please consider looking for existing Brown Field sites away from</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>generated by the lorries bringing waste to the site. Roads in and out of Wickford are congested enough and, thanks to all the new houses being built/proposed this will only get worse! I understand there is also a local business, a nursery, who uses this land and promotes outside learning for the children. The loss of this Green Belt land may well affect their business as well and be a potential health risk to the children. Wickford already suffers with air pollution from the waste recycling plant, please don't add to this.</p> | <p>residential areas to use for proposals like this.</p> |
| 1061954, 287 | No | <p>Wickford doesn't need the facility. The road network cannot cope with the current traffic let alone an increase in what will occur if the proposed is given permission. The smell, the noise, the pollution a by-product of this suggestion. All of which are negative to the residents.</p> | <p>Don't proceed. It isn't needed.</p> |
| 1061955, 288 | No | <p>I disagree with this proposal due to there not being a lot of green belt left in the area and as a local I don't want the area ruined.</p> | <p>Find a more suitable site elsewhere.</p> |
| 1061956, 289 | No | <p>Green belt in the area around Wickford is being built on at an alarming rate, Wickford North for example. The authorities need to realise that areas given Green Belt status are given that for a reason and it should not be overruled just because it suits the council to do so. My scout group some years ago enquired about siting a container on our grounds for extra storage, but were told that it was not allowed as it was Green Belt land - now it suits the council (and the land owner wants to make a fortune out of it) it seems ok to change the rules. Also the roads in the surrounding</p> | <p>Delete the option completely!</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>area are falling apart and overcrowded already, adding extra HGV's will only make the situation worse. The consultation says it's to be used for "inert construction waste", this could include anything from a building site, and what safeguards will be in place to prevent unscrupulous operators disposing of Asbestos and other contaminants at the site.</p> | |
| 1061948, 290 | No | <p>I strongly do not agree with the M23 proposed modification due to; 1) Not being included within the original plans on waste inert materials. 2) Local residents within a one mile radius have not been informed correctly on this proposal. 3) Site access is off a national speed limit road Potential accident zone with HGVs pulling out. 4) H&S,E is coming down extremely hard on companies/ people who are creating/ disturbing dust particles, due to the proximity of the site this will effect an estimated 8,000 Wickford resident (1 mile radius) 5) Streets will be covered in daily dust making the local area a health hazard. 6) A nursery on the Dollymans site, this will be dangerous for children around heavy machinery entering/ leaving site. 7) as per comment 6, this will be more dangerous for the public picking their children up. 8) This proposal was brought around in a secretive, this seems an area of concern. 9) Local bridleways used by local youth groups for hiking events, hikers, dog walkers, Horses etc. 10) land planned to be used is Greenbelt, this should remain unchanged. 11) a local reservoir is next to the proposed site, this could potentially bring health hazards if contaminated. 12) Rare newts are known to be within the area, with local streams this will set-back the start date of as they will have to be moved. This will</p> | <p>I understand a new inert waste facility will need to be built, however I suggest this needs to be build further away from residents and off green belt. Dollymans Farm should be removed from the list, again. Unfortunately, I believe a decision has already been agreed and made, with all comments being disregarded, I hope you can provide me wrong.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>make this site unworthy. 13) A planned Wickford/ Shotgate expansion for housing will be within a stone's throw, this will drive house prices down and residents to move away. 14) HGVs could travel through Wickford at times schools are starting/ leaving, this is a serious call for concern. 15) The following type of pollution will drastically increase; water, air, soil, noise, light, emissions, dust, visual, contamination 16) Asbestos could be contained within the broken up materials, these particles are extremely dangerous. 17) Devaluation of entire local area 18) The proposer seems more interested in his own bank role. 19) 2nr war memorials will have to be destroyed/ moved This is very disrespectful and in bad taste. 20) Local infrastructure is already at breaking point. 21) This will have no benefit to the local community. 22) Was previously going to be turned into a steelworkers yard until deal fell through, owner seems to be desperate to get rid of the land by any means. 23) have any plans been made for the topsoil & sub-soil which will need to be removed/ moved? 24) this site is built on a flood risk area, due to the inert material this will make drainage difficult and could put the local area at risk. 25) Groundwater will be contaminated. 26) Date of consultation should have been rearranged (14th February is known people are spending time with others)</p> | |
| 1061958, 291 | No | I disagree with proposed land fill site at shotgate Wickford | I disagree due to pollution and as a young person growing up in shotgate Wickford think we should preserving our green belt areas and making our environment a cleaner and healthier place to live |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1061959, 292 | No | I disagree with the proposal. This will be using green belt land which needs to be preserved. It will have a detrimental effect on the local environment and the health of local residents causing excessive industrial traffic putting another strain on road infrastructure which is already at full capacity with a number of extra new houses being built. | This proposal needs to be opposed and not granted to proceed. |
| 1061932, 293 | No | As a resident of Shotgate I feel that we have had very little information regarding the proposed Landfill site, and I oppose for the following reasons:- - the land is greenbelt. - there are historical war memorials that will be ruined by the work - the A129 cannot cope with the increased traffic flow that will caused by the waste delivery vehicles, along with the plans to build 3500+ houses around the Rayleigh and Wickford. This road will become very hazardous. - the area is used for horse riders, walkers and even a nursery - who use the outside space as a forest school for the children. - the pollution of the water courses has not been taken into account. The smell (from the burning of the waste products) and noise pollution are all of a negative effect on people's health. | Listen to the residents and abandon the proposal. |
| 1061963, 294 | No | Leave greenbelt land alone the traffic in Wickford is bad enough already my partner works over at Dollymans and I have concerns for his health if this goes ahead | |
| 1061965, 295 | No | Please give a brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. I am strongly opposed to the development of Greenbelt land on Dollymans Farm to an infill | Losing green belt land in a town that is already suffocating with more and more pollution due to the massive amount of building developments and also the |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>waste site. I have serious concerns regarding the loss of this Green Belt land and its impact on wildlife, the local waterways and the additional pollution generated by the lorries bringing waste to the site. Roads in and out of Wickford are congested enough and, thanks to all the new houses being built/proposed this will only get worse! I understand there is also a local business, a nursery, who uses this land and promotes outside learning for the children. The loss of this Green Belt land may well affect their business as well and be a potential health risk to the children. Wickford already suffers with air pollution from the waste recycling plant, please don't add to this. If you disagree with this particular proposed modification, please give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised I believe that using our precious and extremely limited Green Belt land is not the way forward. Please consider looking for existing Brown Field sites away from residential areas to use for proposals like this. View consultation point Table 2 : Main Modifications Comment ID: 286 Response Date: 15/02/17 23:30</p> | <p>waste works at Nevendon is just not right. There are much more feasible options in the area that would affect green belt and would virtually go unnoticed by the public. Why not put it in the country somewhere, Wickford has become an easy target and it's not far.</p> |
| 1061969, 296 | No | I disagree with this modification due to the impact it could have on the local environment and area, I also agree completely with comments by the Shotgate parish council | |
| 1061970, 297 | No | It will cover the only greenbelt left between shotgate and Wickford. It will also effect the traffic even more. | |
| 1061971, 298 | No | I disagree with this as it could have an impact on the local area | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | and community | |
| 1061974, 299 | No | We Loose enough Green Belt Land already - The reason it is marked as Green Belt is to protect it! We do not need another area destroyed, especially as the underground water will eventually reach the Crouch river will cause even more devastation! | Leave Green Belt Land alone! |
| 1061983, 300 | No | I have been a Shotgate resident for many years and i feel there has been very little information given about these proposals. They seem to have come out of no-where and I heard via social media. I would object on the following grounds. This land is greenbelt There are two war memorials in the vicinity Increase in traffic, our roads are already congested, especially if there is a problem elsewhere in the area More refuse trucks in the area Possible pollution in the vicinity and to the River Crouch What type of waste will there be Proposal from Basildon Council for yet more house in the areas. Our doctors/schools etc. cannot support more housing | |
| 1061960, 303 | No | I ride my horse around the bridal paths at Dollymans Farm, this is the only safe area locally, away from traffic. Many horses are nervous around vehicles, the thought of 20 massive lorries coming towards horse and rider is extremely worrying and potentially fatal to horse and rider. This land is so vital to all those who use it for recreation whether it be walking or riding, we have nowhere else to go it is the only place I allow my children to ride in safety on their own. My youngest daughter has asthma, | Brown sites need to be considered. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | allowing her to ride in a 'clean' environment gives her so much joy, to take this away would be upsetting. We have so few 'green' areas left, we need to keep these fields for our wellbeing and for future generations to enjoy. | |
| 1061985, 304 | No | The proposed site is green belt land that needs to be protected not destroyed by a land fill site. The road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the added traffic in the area. This will also have an adverse effect on the local residents and businesses. | Move the proposed site to a different area that could cope better. |
| 1061985, 305 | No | The proposed site is green belt land that needs to be protected not destroyed by a land fill site. The road infrastructure would not be able to cope with the added traffic in the area. This will also have an adverse effect on the local residents and businesses. | Move the proposed site to a different area that could cope better. |
| 1061981, 306 | No | I do not agree with the use of Dollymans Farm for the following reasons... *further loss of greenbelt land - we have lost too much in this area already due to major road construction, building and unauthorised fly tipping *the increase volume of heavy traffic, and associated pollution, will badly affect local minor roads already congested at peak times and have an adverse impact on the lives and health of local residents *the increased risk of pollution [noise, dust, chemical, run-off into the local brook and nearby reservoir] *possible re-routing of the bridleway near the site will adversely affect walkers and riders in an area where open countryside has already been badly encroached upon and is at a premium *the adverse effect upon local wildlife from this intrusive change of use | Find a more isolated site where the impact would be less harmful |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1061452, 307 | No | <p>I would like to endorse the concerns raised by Rawreth Parish Council and the views held by Shotgate Parish Council with regard to plans being prepared by Essex County Council and Southend Council for waste disposal including land at Dollymans Farm. In particular I would like to mention that : The site was not originally included in the prepared plan because it lies within the Greenbelt. This area of Greenbelt land is used daily by walkers and horse riders and provides an area of attractive, open countryside where members of the public can walk and ride safely. Dollymans Farm offers several bridleways and footpaths running across the land. An access road will cause danger, noise and dust from heavy lorries and will add to an already congested route on the A129. There will be an adverse effect on the landscape. There is potential for leaching from the site. With close railway links at the southern boundary waste from further afield could be transported by the extension of a siding. Two war memorials are on the land which are subject to restoration funding in the coming year. With approved housing plans in the area more investigations need to be carried out to prevent further flooding to an already flood prone area. Please assure me that my concerns, and those of my family, will be taken into account on this important subject.</p> | |
| 1062013, Runwell Parish Council, 308 | No | <p>Runwell Parish Council strongly disagree with the change to introduce a new site at Dollymans Farm, Basildon which is situated close to the adjoining Parish of Shotgate, Wickford. We believe the filling of the site could cause flooding in the vicinity, there will be increased traffic volumes on the A129 and there is a</p> | <p>The introduction of the new site at this stage is unnecessary, the previous plan was satisfactory.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | danger of pollution from the leaching of toxic waste into the Chichester Brook nearby which is a tributary of the River Crouch. | |
| 1061993, 309 | No | This site was not considered in the original consultation and local residents have not been formally notified. It is on green belt land very near to local housing and has two WW1 memorials on it. | I disagree with this site being used and want an alternative site to be used for the following reasons:- This greenbelt land that should not be used. There are public footpaths and bridle ways on the site where many people ride horses and walk their dogs To enjoy the peace and quiet Which would be totally spoiled by this. The bridle path has already been re-rerouted once when they built the a130 so would be unfair to reroute once again There is a children's nursery in very close proximity to the proposed site which prides itself in having the children play outside for three hours a day, how can you put this so close to children? I live nearby and do not want the additional noise and am worried about air quality, and smells. I enjoy sitting out in the garden in the summer and do not want this ruined by noise smells and dust. This will devalue property in the surrounding area and no-one had the decency to inform local residents. The a129 is a very busy road already and the extra traffic with large vehicles that this site could bring will cause chaos on a small road that gets traffic jams on at busy times. The a129 has had serious accidents near the junction with the Chichester and i am worried the accident hotspot will be made worse. There are two WW1 memorials that should absolutely not be moved or degraded by having this proposed site anywhere near |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | them, is nothing sacred anymore? There are brooks and a reservoir close by that could be contaminated. This has not been fully considered by anyone at all, as this is so late in the day to add this site that was not included in the original proposal. Please stop this now and do a full and proper consultation, asking local residents, doing proper site surveys etc. |
| 1062007, 310 | No | The supporting road infrastructure can hardly cope with the traffic at present and what with the new 500 new builds given the go ahead on Rawreth lane/London Road in Rayleigh this issue will only get worse. What's the point of having protected green belt areas? | Put it somewhere else |
| 1061992, 311 | No | M23 - Dollymans Farm I strongly object. This proposed modification should be withdrawn for the following reasons: 1) Green Belt The site is important as part of the remaining protected sliver of land where the green belt is being eroded from both east and west. It has a significant local role for horse riders and as a green lung. As stated by Rawreth Parish Council: "Dollymans Farm offers several bridleways and footpaths running across the land and offers a very unique and much used facility for horse riders in the area. The circuit of bridleways includes a Pegasus crossing that is used to cross the A129, Bridleway 17 which runs past Dollymans farm, Bridleway 55 which runs from Doublegate Lane to Rawreth Barns and across the Rawreth Barn Bridge over the A130 back to the A129 and footpath 19. The use of the land for waste would curtail the use | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>of these bridleways as the proposed entry to the site from the A129 is very close to the Pegasus crossing and the access road runs parallel to Bridleway 17. Having an access road in such close proximity will cause danger, noise and dust from the heavy lorries, in addition Council are further concerned by the years of disruption this site will cause to residents along London Road."</p> <p>In my experience as district councillor for the past 33 years I have learned that waste sites such as this are a) difficult and time consuming for council officers to monitor and b) tend to remain in use for many years after the intended period. If this modification is accepted, the site may remain open for many years longer than the inspector envisages. 2) Air pollution and noise pollution. I am concerned about the impact on the nearest houses. As this is private land I am not at liberty to wander over the site myself. However I also understand that there are some undocumented uses there, included static caravans used as residences. Also there is a children's nursery (!) :</p> <p>http://www.thetreehouseclub.co.uk/ "Welcome to the multi award winning Treehouse Forestry Nursery and Out of School Club, the first full time forestry nursery in Essex and the greenest eco-friendly child care provision in Billericay. Being situated in the natural beauty of Norsey Woods in Billericay and Dollymans Farm in Wickford, we have over 165 acres of protected historic woodland for our children to explore and learn." 3) Flood risk and water pollution This is a contentious issue that the authorities have been slow to respond to. I am concerned about potential contamination of local water courses. Regarding flood risk, although there has been mention by other respondents that other</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>hollows could be used for floodwater shortage, it is premature to allocate this site for waste disposal until one of the potential other sites for water storage has been confirmed. 4) Traffic The proposal could cause additional traffic into the residential roads of Rayleigh which are already suffering from increased traffic. Lorries should be required to arrive from the west and leave the site heading west (this is the only way of exercising proper control). Finally, I concur with the comments of Rawreth Parish Council that not enough local knowledge has been passed on to the Inspector. The inspector should investigate further before coming to a conclusion.</p> | |
| 1062022, 312 | No | <p>I am responding to the news that Dollymans Farm is being considered for minerals waste. 1. Since we moved to Shotgate in 1971, practically all of the greenbelt has disappeared under housing. This is the last of the local area where you can walk in fields and not along a road. (Apart from the local park). 2. I am extremely concerned about the pollution this could cause. Either in the air or in the water running off into the local brook. As I'm sure you are aware pollution is causing many breathing problems for children and from what I have recently heard, when my nephew was taken to hospital with breathing difficulties two weeks ago, this is already on the increase. 3. The traffic already gets extremely busy through Shotgate, and has been known to come to a complete standstill if there has been an accident locally on the A127 or A130. This would be even worse if there were more lorries coming into the area. 4. I am also concerned</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | that landfill would affect the drainage in our area and cause flooding. In all I think it is the wrong place to choose for the waste site and hope that you will consider this move wisely. I am sure there are other places in Essex that are more suited to a mineral waste site, that will not affect so many people. | |
| 1062029, 313 | No | <p>I wish to register my concerns and objections re the above for the following general reasons: 1. Proposed location in the Green Belt 2. Two important war memorials situated within site 3. Increase in volume of traffic along A129 4. More refuse vehicles in local vicinity 5. Likelihood of pollution outside of site 6. Unknown types of waste to be deposited 7. Liquid seepage from site into local brook 8. A proposed plan by Basildon Borough Council for 400 new-built properties on land which is in close proximity to this proposed waste area site</p> <p>Specifics 1. Network Rail must be approached for comments to protect their land from leakage and debris from the proposed site i.e. high small-mesh chain-link fencing 2. Appendix 18 - Table xx Dollymans Farm You state all access should be via the A129. A. This should be amended to read : Access to site - via A1245 then A129 Access from site - via A129 then A1245 (appropriate signage to be in place) This suggested route will have an impact upon less residential properties than just A129 being shown, i.e. By Pass Junction at Wickford - Southend Road - Shotgate - London Road - Rawreth - Carpenter's Arms roundabout. B. The A129 route, details shown above, covers a section within Shotgate Parish called Southend Road between Baker's Farm Close and Hodgson Way roundabout. Joining this section of the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | A129 is a dog-leg shaped route, also called Southend Road (not A129) about 200 metres long, where residential properties , Post Office, shops, doctor's surgery and bus stops are. This has a 7.5 tonne weight restriction for general HGVs apart from those allowed under the relevant Act. Should a blockage occur of the section of the A129 between Baker's Farm Close and Hodgson Way roundabout, HGVs including vehicles bound for the proposed site would not be allowed the facility to travel through Shotgate Village because of the aforementioned 7.5 tonne weight restriction. | |
| 1061597, 314 | No | This would be the destruction of an area of green belt land and possible leaching into the river crouch. The increased levels of traffic would be unacceptable as well as the air pollution they would contribute to. | This facility should not be on green belt land or near residential properties. |
| 1061580, 315 | No | I would like to register my objections to this proposal. I moved to Shotgate 16 years ago from a London borough because of the appealing open space offered to me to bring my family up. As the years have gone on the green space is getting less due to the new builds appearing. Flooding has increased in the area and I fear that a land fill site would add to the potential of flooding. The road in and out of Wickford can't cope with the traffic as it is, especially if an incident has occurred on the A127 or A130, often leaving Wickford residence trapped in their own town as traffic becomes gridlocked. The increase of heavy industrial vehicles will add to this pressure not to mention the state of the road (Hodgson Way is already breaking up after a | This is green belt land and should remain so. People need to be able to enjoy what little space we have left. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>major re-surface several years ago. There are also two RAF war memorials within the fields and regularly have wreaths laid at them. It is important to continue the history of our town and pass it down to the younger generations. My daughter is involved in the Air Cadets and we are wondering if the relevant departments have been contacted about the war memorials. Recently a new forest school has opened and they advertise on their website as specialising in outdoor learning, and can often be seen out on walks and picnics enjoying the local wildlife and the field where horses are. I for one would not want a child to attend here if in close proximity of a waste plant... hardly a place to encourage the children to enjoy the fresh air and the environment. The pathways/bridal paths are used regularly by local residents to walk their dogs and horse riders exercising in a safe environment away from the roads. We should be encouraging the youth of today to be outside instead of being inside on electrical devices. If it's taken away what hope do they have. A waste plant would encourage vermin and seagulls to the area and my other concern would be the contamination that may seep into the ground and travel to local stream into the river Crouch causing pollution to the wildlife. I object to this proposal</p> | |
| 1062046, 317 | No | <p>I wish to oppose the proposed Dollymans Farm site for mineral waste on the following grounds: Significant risk from asbestos polluting the air Current road infrastructure is not suitable for the volume of traffic that would be experienced Leeching from the infill into nearby watercourses John Spence, Essex County Council Cabinet Member responsible for Planning, said: Should</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>it be approved, the Dollymans Farm site could be used to dispose of construction and demolition waste, such as bricks, concrete and rubble. As such, residents should not be concerned about potential air pollution or odour issues. By referring to the above statement by John Spence how would checks for asbestos be carried out & at what frequency, in the event of a related case of asbestosis in future years who would be liable for any compensation claims, the claim in the final statement hearing session of the 6th October 2016 states located a long distance from neighbouring properties with regard to that statement what is classed as a long distance and as dust and debris can be carried by the wind clearly has not be taken into account. As there will be no doubt an amount of debris in the air what precautions have been looked at or agreed regarding this debris being blown onto the nearby railway lines.</p> | |
| 1061734, 318 | No | <p>I have lived in Wickford for the last 24 years and in Shotgate for the last 12 years. Over the past 24 years, I have seen most of our green spaces in and around Wickford disappear for housing and the like. I have also seen the roads unable to cope, with the Southend road, the main thoroughfare of Wickford being at a standstill from 7.30 to 9.30 and likewise at rush hour the other end of the day. With Nevendon being impassable at all times during the day. The house I live in was built in a breeding ground for toads and I'm sad to say that although this house is about 30 years old, I still find toads on my driveway trying to find a mate. The green space you are proposing building this landfill site on, is one of the few green spaces that the toads,</p> | <p>There were a further 18 brown sites considered, choose one of those.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>hedgehogs, foxes, rabbits, badgers and the like are still able to call their own. This is before all the other reasons of the fact that a number of retired horses, live their lives over there, people walk their dogs over there, (including me) there is a war memorial that will have to be moved, which in itself is a travesty. Having visited the World War One memorials in Belgium and knowing how they continue to care for them, they would be absolutely horrified that we treat our own memorials in this way! There is also a children's nursery that is wonderful, as it teaches the children about the great outdoors, some of whom would not experience this in other ways. Then there's the noise, the dust, the smells, the leaching in to the streams, which if asbestos is included would poison the water. It is also part of the flood plain of Wickford, so it not only could devalue our houses, but potentially cause flooding near them too. We need to take a stand now and refuse this proposal, as if we start building on green spaces, we might as well say goodbye to other green spaces, what next? Memorial Park? Wick Country Park? How about Lake Meadows? This green space may not be as pretty as the others mentioned here, but building on it would be as massive impact for the local flora and fauna, an ecological disaster in the making.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1060492, 319 | No | <p>I wish to raise my concerns over the proposed waste disposal site at Dollymans Farm which is currently under consideration. On the original "Replacement Waste Local Plan" 18 sites were listed for consideration. Although the landowner had applied for Dollymans Farm to be included it was excluded on the grounds that the land is designated Greenbelt. That I believe should have been an end of the matter but the landowner lobbied the inspector and somehow managed to get Dollymans Farm added to the list! My first concern is access. This land is now being considered for use as a landfill site, 500,000 tons of building waste over a period of five years. This equates to forty lorry loads of rubble needing to gain access to the site via an already overstretched A129 every day. I foresee a situation where we could find many of these lorries passing through the residential areas of Wickford and Shotgate to reach the site. This would be totally unacceptable and therefore I would propose that, at the very least, for this plan to be passed an access road should be built from the A1245 precluding the use of the A129. My next concern is that the landowner on his application has also applied for the land to be used for the disposal of many other kinds of waste in the future. Passing the current proposal would open the floodgates to this future expansion as it suggests that after this initial five year period of landfill the landowner will simply have a ready-made platform to concrete over to form a hard stand for further "ventures". This opens up further environmental issues. There are a number of brooks running through the land which feed into the River Crouch. Should there be any kind of "seepage" from the site into the brooks the effect on the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>environment around these water courses would be catastrophic. Better to use this hollow to manage existing problems in the area with flooding and to create a lake for wildlife and future generations to enjoy. Lastly a personal concern, what affect is this site likely to have on the people of Shotgate? The noise, the dust, the smell. How will it affect the value of our properties?</p> | |
| 1061575, 321 | No | <p>I disagree with this proposal. I am currently studying childcare at college and have a very keen interest in the forest school that has opened. I believe that children should learn about their environment and flourish from being outside enjoying fresh air increasing their learning and encouraging positive behaviour. It helps promote a healthy lifestyle and studies show a reduction in child obesity. The children who attend this school are often seen out and about enjoying the horses kept in the nearby field. The increase in heavy lorries will add a health and safety danger to the children and their families who attend as they are encouraged to walk or cycle to the nursery instead of using the car. The bridal paths are often used by dog walkers and horse riders, who can exercise their horses in a safe environment away from road traffic. The roads in and out of Wickford are busy most of the time, adding more lorries will not help, particularly when diversions are in place if the neighbouring main roads have a problem. I am involved with the local Air Cadets and the squadron often remembers the fallen soldiers and lay wreaths at the two war memorials. It is important that the cadets know the history of the town and what happened. Have the relevant authorities been informed or were they just going to be</p> | <p>This is green belt land and needs to be saved, maybe encourage a nature reserve.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>removed??? As part of my placement work i assist a local childminder and we take the children for walks in the fields or as the children say " the country" to look for signs of nature. The children enjoy running in an open space and we know they are safe. We also attend the local park in Shotgate, this is only 2 fields away from the proposed land fill site. My concern is for the pollution to the ground and air and the increase of vermin. I disagree to this proposal on the grounds of health and safety to the residents and the pollution that it will cause.</p> | |
| 1061728, Shotgate Parish Council, 322 | No | <p>Following on from the Parish Council Meeting last night, please see the following objections to the proposed site at Dollymans Farm from Shotgate. The land at Dollymans Farm is all that remains of a very thin slither of green belt between Shotgate and westward creeping Rayleigh. The Parish Council believe the decision to ignore this fact may have been influenced by comments and reports commissioned by the landowner where it is stated that the fact that the land lies within the Greenbelt should not be a considered as relevant, the owner further states in the pre-submission consultation on the waste local plan (2016) that "the site is of poor quality, particularly in terms of visual amenity", in addition the LIVA conducted by Liz Lake Associates states, "The existing landscape amenity of the site has been assessed to offer a limited to negative contribution to the local landscape character of the District. This area of Greenbelt land is used daily by walkers and horse riders, it offers an area of attractive open countryside where members of the public can walk and ride in safety, something that is limited in an area that</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>offers little other access to green fields and bridleways. Dollymans Farm offers several bridleways and footpaths running across the land and offers a very unique and much used facility for horse riders in the area. The circuit of bridleways includes a Pegasus crossing that is used to cross the A129, Bridleway 17 which runs past Dollymans farm, Bridleway 55 which runs from Doublegate Lane to Rawreth Barns and across the Rawreth Barn Bridge over the A130 back to the A129 and footpath 19. The use of the land for waste would curtail the use of these bridleways as the proposed entry to the site from the A129 is very close to the Pegasus crossing and the access road runs parallel to Bridleway 17. Having an access road in such close proximity will cause danger, noise and dust from the heavy lorries, in addition Council are further concerned by the years of disruption this site will cause to residents along London Road." The landowner also states that "The allocation of Dollymans Farm would not compromise the objectives of the Greenbelt and in the medium to long term once restored would likely result in an improvement to the landscape character." This is highly disputed by the Council as this would indicate that the area would actually be improved by the proposed use, however the loss of the current land far outweighs any possible improvement to the landscape and this is supported by the fact that the total quantity of infill waste would be around 500,000 tons, equal to fourteen 20 ton lorries per day for 5 years. The Parish Council is further concerned by the years of disruption this site will cause to residents along London Road. The access to the site would be from the A129, with a road then running southwards through the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>farm to the site. The Council has very grave concerns that there is a very real threat of leaching from the site into the North Benfleet/ Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook. This leaching could undo some of the recent improvement to the water quality in the River Crouch. In addition unless the site is strictly controlled with what is dumped there much noxious material under the guise of building waste can find its way under the "radar". The "Site Layout Plan" indicates the areas of the site proposed for the respective uses, however, the landowners have also indicated that they are amenable to increasing the amount of inert landfill subject to Essex County Councils requirements and would also be willing to consider accommodating other waste streams to include non-inert and non-hazardous waste. In addition, while the proposed use of the site is for waste transfer and inert landfill, the landowners are willing to take a flexible approach to prospective uses and to discuss the possibility of locating alternative or additional waste facilities on the site including composting, recycling and energy from waste uses. The landowners and their agents, Strutt & Parker have stated they would be more than happy to enter into discussions with Essex County Council in this regard, and state "If an allocation for the site for a waste use is forthcoming, we intend to enter into detailed discussions with a number of interested operators in the area." This offers little support that the Greenbelt land would remain as such and that it would be restored to its former status. The site offers very close proximity to the Southend Victoria to Liverpool Street line, this lies on the southern boundary of the site and could also provide</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>the opportunity for a siding off of the railway line as part of a future waste development on the site, and allow for the importation of waste from London and further afield. There are also two very important War Memorials on the land, one of which will fall within the proposed site. The Memorials are dedicated to two Airmen and are of great historic and local interest and are both the subject of funding to restore them over the coming year. The Parish Council feels that not enough local knowledge has been gained by the inspector in considering this proposal and including the site within the plan. Both Rawreth and Shotgate are prone to flooding and with approved plans in both areas for new housing developments more investigations need to take place with regards to the impact this site could have with regards to flood risk. The void on this site could become a vital part of a flood prevention scheme to mitigate the pressures of the future developments to the East and the West, this could provide a haven for wildlife with creative planting, a scheme far more in keeping with the use of Greenbelt land.</p> | |
| 1062124, 338 | No | <p>I have the following objections to the potential use of Dollymans Farm for the purpose of waste disposal: 1. This was not part of the original waste disposal plan for Essex (apparently having been added at the behest of the landowner) and would be an unacceptable use of green belt land. 2. Part of the land is regularly used for leisure purposes such as horse riding, rambling and dog walking. 3. Construction waste could contain harmful substances such as asbestos which would obviously represent a health issue. 4. The potentially large numbers of</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>heavy vehicles would have a significant adverse effect on traffic flow and also the quality of surrounding roads which were not built with this type of usage in mind - Hodgson Way being an example of poor quality issues and requiring continuing repair.</p> <p>5,. The increased volume of heavy vehicle traffic would also significantly increase the level of noise and air pollution, particularly affecting those with health issues including COPD. 6.</p> <p>Approval of such a proposal could be seen to set a precedent for further unacceptable use of the land in the future. In view of the above, I strongly recommend rejection of the proposed use of Dollymans Farm for waste disposal or for other environmentally incompatible purposes.</p> | |
| 1062136, 341 | No | <p>I think that putting a landfill site at Dollymans Farm would have a dramatic impact on the environment and local areas, the bridleways would have to close due to safety factors, the noise from the lorries and machinery would be a disturbance to the local properties, the public footpaths would also be affected reducing the amount of places one can walk dogs etc. The A129 will not be able to take the extra traffic, the road is in a poor state of repair at the moment and only set to get worse, the lorries flow at the moment is considerably more than the road can take also there's no footpaths on the A129. I was under the impression that the area is GREENBELT and with the spread of Rayleigh and Wickford the little Village of Shotgate will disappear and village life would end.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1062154, 344 | No | I would like to lodge my objections to the use of this land for waste disposal. The increase in traffic will be horrendous especially when the new houses are built. It may start off as construction waste but who's to say what else will end up there. Some construction waste contains asbestos, so therefore we have a potential health hazard as well. You only have to look at the state of the road in Hodgsons Way mostly caused by lorries To see what potential damage could be caused. Are we not to have any green belt land left in Wickford? Think of the future for the children In this area please. | |
| 1062155, 345 | No | I object to the use of Dollymans Farm for waste disposal, this waste could contain lots of health Risks i.e. Asbestos. We already have 400 hundred houses being built in this area causing more traffic, will we end up With another road like Hodgsons Way? It has been in a bad state of repair for so long because of The lorries. Please listen to the voice of the people in this area. | |
| 1062150, 346 | No | I have the following objections to the potential use of Dollymans Farm for the purpose of waste disposal: 1. This was not part of the original waste disposal plan for Essex (apparently having been added at the behest of the landowner) and would be an unacceptable use of green belt land. - I am a local resident in VERY close proximity and we were not told or consulted on this but found out via Facebook on 14/02/17 two days before this closes. I consider this a very underhand practise 2. Part of the land is regularly used for leisure purposes such as horse riding, | Use one of the other brown sites - NOT greenbelt. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>rambling and dog walking. - I have walked my dog along the footpaths/bridle ways on many occasions and the waste plant would absolutely spoil this. 3. Construction waste could contain harmful substances such as asbestos which would obviously represent a health issue. 4. The potentially large numbers of heavy vehicles would have a significant adverse effect on traffic flow and also the quality of surrounding roads which were not built with this type of usage in mind - Hodgson Way being an example of poor quality issues and requiring continuing repair. There is also an accident blackspot just down the road by the Chichester. The road is a very bendy a road not suitable for these types of vehicles. 5,. The increased volume of heavy vehicle traffic would also significantly increase the level of noise and air pollution, particularly affecting those with health issues including COPD. - My son has asthma and this cannot be good for the air quality. 6. Approval of such a proposal could be seen to set a precedent for further unacceptable use of the land in the future. 7. We already have a waste plant about 3 miles or so away on the A127 which is a new facility which is causing local residents to suffer from the smell and everyone is now complaining of nasty coughs related to this. It was found out a couple of weeks ago that asbestos had already been found dumped there which is totally outrageous as this was not part of the agreement of the facility. We are therefore wondering why we should have another facility so close to this one but specifically for industrial waste. We are obviously concerned that asbestos will be dumped there too. Why should we have</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | two so close? This should not happen. | |
| 1062161, 347 | No | <p>I have the following objections to the potential use of Dollymans Farm for the purpose of waste disposal: 1. This was not part of the original waste disposal plan for Essex (apparently having been added at the behest of the landowner) and would be an unacceptable use of green belt land. 2. Part of the land is regularly used for leisure purposes such as horse riding, rambling and dog walking. 3. Construction waste could contain harmful substances such as asbestos which would obviously represent a health hazard. 4. The potentially large numbers of heavy vehicles would have a significant adverse effect on traffic flow and also the quality of surrounding roads which were not built with this type of usage in mind - Hodgson Way being an example of poor quality issues and requiring continuing repair. 5,. The increased volume of heavy vehicle traffic would also significantly increase the level of noise and air pollution, particularly affecting those with health issues including COPD. 6. Approval of such a proposal could be seen to set a precedent for further unacceptable use of the land in the future. In view of the above, I strongly recommend rejection of the proposed use of Dollymans Farm for waste disposal or for any other environmentally incompatible purposes</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1062157, 348 | No | because this site was not considered in the original consultation and local residents have not been formally notified. It is on green belt land very near to local housing and has two WW1 memorials on it. | I disagree with this site being used and want an alternative site to be used for the following reasons:- This greenbelt land that should not be used. There are public footpaths and bridle ways on the site where many people ride horses and walk their dogs To enjoy the peace and quiet Which would be totally spoiled by this. The bridle path has already been re-rerouted once when they built the a130 so would be unfair to reroute once again There is a children's nursery in very close proximity to the proposed site which prides itself in having the children play outside for three hours a day, how can you put this so close to children? I live nearby and do not want the additional noise, or dust as I have an asthmatic son and am worried about air quality, and smells. I enjoy sitting out in the garden in the summer and do not want this ruined by noise smells and dust. this will devalue property in the surrounding area and no-one had the decency to inform local residents. the a129 is a very busy road already and the extra traffic with large vehicles that this site could bring will cause chaos on a small road that gets traffic jams on at busy times. The a129 has had serious accidents near the junction with the Chichester and i am worried the accident hotspot will be made worse. There are two WW1 memorials that should absolutely not be moved or degraded by having this proposed site anywhere near them, is nothing sacred anymore? There are brooks and a reservoir close by that could be contaminated. This has not been fully |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | considered by anyone at all, as this is so late in the day to add this site that was not included in the original proposal. Please stop this now and do a full and proper consultation, asking local residents, doing proper site surveys etc. |
| 1062172, 349 | No | With reference to the recent notification of modification of land at Dollymans farm I feel with not a trace of regret that for the first time I must put my objections to this in writing I feel I should point out that direct members of my family have lived at my address since its construction over 100yrs ago so I have been aware of the erosion of the green belt and subsequent peace and quiet of the region over the years. I feel that the few remaining areas of tranquillity are vital to the country as a whole, in times of the ever increasing tensions a place to escape is vital. Trusting that the views of the local inhabitants will be borne in mind. | |
| 1062193, 357 | No | I would like to state my opposition to the development of Greenbelt land on Dollymans Farm to an infill waste site. I have strong concerns regarding the environmental impact this would have on wildlife, the threat of pollution not only to local waterways but also from the army of lorries bringing waste to the site. The A129 is a busy road at the best of times and the junction for Dollymans Farm is not suitable for large numbers of turning lorries. Site is too close to housing. - it's on green belt, possible leeching of contamination into local brook system, increased volume of traffic in already stretched road system | Site needs to be removed from plan. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | A129/A1245, movement of two WW1 war memorials to airmen, | |
| 1062193, 359 | No | I would like to state my opposition to the development of Greenbelt land on Dollymans Farm to an infill waste site. I have strong concerns regarding the environmental impact this would have on wildlife, the threat of pollution not only to local waterways but also from the army of lorries bringing waste to the site. The A129 is a busy road at the best of times, these lorries will have a huge impact on local traffic and cause misery to local residents. The junction of A129 and Dollymans Farm is not suitable for large numbers of turning HGV's - it's on green belt, possible leeching of contamination into local brook system, increased volume of traffic in already stretched road system A129/A1245, movement of two WW1 war memorials to airmen, | Site needs to be removed from development plan |
| 1061988, 360 | No | I disagree with this proposal as the site is on green belt and should be moved to a brownfill site option. Building on greenbelt land should only be considered at a last result and not the first option to save costs. Traffic levels will also increase significantly on the A129, which will impact on this busy link road. | |
| 1062186, 362 | No | The area in and around Dollymans Farm is green belt land and all we have in the Shotgate area of an unspoilt, peaceful and green area filled with wildlife. The area is also used as a bridle path and by dog walkers. The proposed waste site would cause pollution and no doubt danger to these, not to mention to the nearby residents of Shotgate and Rawreth too. I for one live near this site and don't wish to breath in toxic fumes from a waste | Please use a site already used for waste purposes, and one that is not near a residential area. Keep Shotgate and Rawreth green! |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | ground, not to mention the added noise the site would generate. The roads in and out of the proposed site cannot cope with more traffic as these are already very busy in rush hour, and gridlocked when there are issues on the A130 and A127. For these reasons I wholly oppose to this proposed modification at Dollymans Farm. | |
| 1062203, 363 | Yes | I wish to register my strong objection to the proposed siting of a Waste site within the area of the GREENBELT close to local housing in Shotgate. The road servicing Shotgate from Rayleigh and the A127 is very narrow and at times is totally gridlocked from 9am and towards 4.30pm. How we can manage to have extra Lorries accessing a waste site from our road and cope with the weight of heavy industrial transport bringing building rubble to the proposed site will make it impossible to live a normal life. We already have large weight bearing transport accessing the Business Park and the road has suffered yet again with the surface breaking up. The type of rubble brought to the proposed site worries me, How will checks be made for asbestos and other hazardous materials? I would like written confirmation that adequate checks will be done and if this proves wrong or misleading I want to know who will be held responsible for any damage to our health, environment, and expense of clearing up. There is a chance that any water running off the site will contaminate the local brook and cause pollution of not only the brook but other waters and any land crops growing nearby. Some land in Shotgate is prone to flooding, with inadequate provision of proper drainage when the houses were built in the | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>1980s. The council are also proposing another 400 houses near the Waste site. We have inadequate services in this area with a shortage of doctors, schools, services to look after the elderly, How does the council propose to provide services for all the extra residents . Who wants to live next to a Waste site with the noise and possible contamination. Add the chance of flooding as well will make it a very undesirable place to live. At present there are bridlepaths available long this road, will they still be available with the facilities for all residents to walk long these pathways. I do not believe this is a well thought out proposal and neither do our Parish Council. I shall certainly raise the matter further with my MP as well as the local press.</p> | |
| 1062184, 364 | No | <p>I disagree with the proposal because, The road infrastructure in Wickford Shotgate is already suffering and is at gridlock at the moment without having more traffic coming in. Also pollution would be increased think of the surrounding schools in particular affecting the health to nearby children from beauchamps and hilltop schools. Housing in shotgate would be affected more than likely house prices would suffer because who wants to live next door to a rubbish dump!!!! The odour from a landfill site would also be a problem Especially in the summer Shotgate would be affected by a terrible smell. Chemical used at the site would affect the environment and people health.</p> | None I don't want it on my doorstep would you!!!! |
| 1062184, 365 | No | <p>I disagree with the proposal because, The road infrastructure in Wickford Shotgate is already suffering and is at gridlock at the moment without having more traffic coming in. Also pollution</p> | None I don't want it on my doorstep would you!!!! |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>would be increased think of the surrounding schools in particular affecting the health to nearby children from beauchamps and hilltop schools. Housing in shotgate would be affected more than likely house prices would suffer because who wants to live next door to a rubbish dump!!!! The odour from a landfill site would also be a problem Especially in the summer Shotgate would be affected by a terrible smell. Chemical used at the site would affect the environment and people health.</p> | |
| 1062180, 366 | No | <p>My first comment is that the residents of Shotgate and Wickford have not had sufficient notice of this proposal, and therefore lack the time it will take in order to get everybody's voices heard on the matter. Sadly, I believe this is a deliberate tactic which has been utilised by individuals and organisations in order to benefit financially from a decision which will impact hugely on the surrounding areas and residents' lives and their wellbeing. We live here; we deserve to have some say in the fate of our environment. Councillors - please listen to the views of the people who put you, and keep you, in your jobs. If it goes ahead, the proposed site will:- Devalue local property Danger of airborne chemicals, dust, and asbestos contamination Endanger local businesses who rely on having a quiet, safe and clean environment surrounding them, incl. Livery Yards, and the Treehouse Forestry Nursery School Cause noise and air pollution Increase traffic and place more strain on our already compromised infrastructure Run off and chemical pollution into the stream and River Crouch Network Displace two WW1 War Memorials Destroy Public Bridlepaths and Footpaths Increase</p> | The modification MUST NOT be approved. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Flood Risk of an already endangered area Risk of damage to the railway line which is adjacent to the proposed site Loss of greenbelt and habitat to wildlife As well as these implications, there can be no doubt that many more unforeseen issues WILL arise if a landfill site were to be approved at Dollymans Farm. In the end, local councils will lose out, when residents and businesses are eventually forced leave the area after their livelihoods are destroyed by the impact of the site. This will mean those who pay insurance and rates to their local councils, will no longer do so. Whilst waste management facilities are always going to be needed, I feel that the proposed site is TOTALLY unacceptable, inappropriate, and a completely flawed concept. It will result in financial gains for a few, and devastation impact on a huge scale, for local residents, wildlife, and our environment.</p> | |
| 1062208, 367 | Yes | <p>I am writing to object to the Dollyman's Farm mineral waste site. My objections to this are as follows. This waste site will increase the traffic on the A129 and in the surrounding areas which will cause great inconvenience for the local people. As well as this the land you plan to use is green belt land so no building should occur in this area. The waste created by the mineral waste site could also include dusts and other polluting materials that could increase the health risks for the local people and potentially cause diseases such as lung cancer. As a result of this the house prices in the surrounding area will decline. I hope that you take my opinion into consideration.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1062213, 368 | No | I am writing to object about the plans to use Dollymans Farm for waste disposal - I believe this is part of green belt land and as such should be protected especially with such little green space in the Wickford area. The surrounding area is regularly used for leisure purposes. It's potential environmental impact near a populated area of families has significant health implications. I also have concerns about the impact it will cause to traffic in the area. Wickford typically has a high volume of traffic the planned access to the site will cause significant volume to the A129 and surrounding areas. This increase of heavy lorries will also affect the roads which in turn will need repair. The increase in traffic will increase noise and air pollution upon us residents. This newly added proposal that was not part of the original waste disposal plans has significant impact upon local residents and their environment. I feel as a resident here it is an unacceptable plan. Please add my objection to the existing objections made by Rawreth and Shotgate Parish councils | |
| 1062221, 370 | No | I do not agree with this and do not wish for this to go ahead. Pollution to the environment and excess traffic in the area are my main concerns. | |
| 1062209, 371 | No | 1) Given the proposal was added last minute and few residents were informed this is not a very ethical behaviour. 2) The increased traffic on the A1245 and A129, which is busy enough as it is and adding heavy haul vehicles will slow traffic more and could increase the degradation of the road surface. 3)Greenbelt land that is used for dog walking and horse riding, with the WW1 | For Dollymans farm to not be considered and another brownfield to be considered. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | monument there it would also be very disrespectful. 4) Only a desk based Archaeological assessment has been proposed, a full onsite inspection should at least be put into place to find the full extent of preservation required | |
| 1062201, 372 | Yes | <p>I am writing to object about the plans to use Dollymans Farm for waste disposal it is my understanding that this is green belt land which is currently being used for leisure activities and provides us the residents with what is much needed green space. It's only a few years ago that the new A130 was built impacting adversely on all the local residents of shotgate resulting in an increase in noise and pollution and now developers intend to load more of this on us . I would be interested in what the current air quality readings are surrounding this area and what the impact of an increase in vehicle emissions will make . I believe that this will have an real negative environmental impact on all us local residents. like many others I am also very concerned about the impact that this will have road congestion on the A129.Currently the roundabout at the carpenters arms is a nightmare at peak commuting times and this will no doubt add significantly to the congestion Not to mention the increase in noise and air pollution upon local residents. Finally it seems that this newly added proposal was not part of the original waste disposal plans and seems to be introduced at the last minute either deliberately or not and I don't believe that the timescales have given the local community enough time to either assess the impact that this may course or</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | even discuss the matter in depth before this application. | |
| 1062201, 373 | No | <p>I am writing to object about the plans to use Dollymans Farm for waste disposal it is my understanding that this is green belt land which is currently being used for leisure activities and provides us the residents with what is much needed green space. It's only a few years ago that the new A130 was built impacting adversely on all the local residents of shotgate resulting in an increase in noise and pollution and now developers intend to load more of this on us . I would be interested in what the current air quality readings are surrounding this area and what the impact of an increase in vehicle emissions will make . I believe that this will have an real negative environmental impact on all us local residents. like many others I am also very concerned about the impact that this will have road congestion on the A129.Currently the roundabout at the carpenters arms is a nightmare at peak commuting times and this will no doubt add significantly to the congestion Not to mention the increase in noise and air pollution upon local residents. Finally it seems that this newly added proposal was not part of the original waste disposal plans and seems to be introduced at the last minute either deliberately or not and I don't believe that the timescales have given the local community enough time to either assess the impact that this may course or even discuss the matter in depth before this application.</p> | Choose alternative low impact site with sufficient time for due local consultation |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 1062211, 374 | No | <p>I would like to strongly oppose to the proposed plans to remove what limited amount of Greenbelt land left in this area. This area is used daily by the local public for running, dog walking and horse riders for disabled children. There is also Treehouse Day Nursery who are nearby with Preschool age children. Should plans go ahead to build a site for construction waste, I am extremely concerned this may result in bad smells, dust (which would have a huge effect on asthma sufferers) and of course the attraction of vermin. The A129 is the main road I use to drive to work in Rayleigh and pass through here many times a day. This is an already busy road on the best days without rush hour, flooding from rain and no accidents from other roads. As soon as one of these occur, the A129 is immediately effected with painfully slow moving traffic. To add large heavy lorries to this would reduce the flow of traffic down even further.</p> | <p>As this is part of the Greenbelt land left in this area, please can this be protected for the local and future residents and children to continue to use. Please can this be removed from the list of areas to be considered.</p> |
| 1061877, 375 | No | <p>I strongly disagree with the proposals being considered for Dollymans Farm. The land is green belt and should be protected, there has already been too much development on green belt around Wickford. The area is used by walkers and horse riders and should be preserved for communal use. The A129 is totally unsuitable for a daily procession of large lorries containing the waste. The road is already under pressure due to continued development in Wickford and Rayleigh with no investment in the road network. Who would police the waste to ensure that it is totally safe? What about dust and air pollution? Would this lead to taking other types of waste? It is too close to housing in</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | Shotgate and the Wick estate. | |
| 1062225, 376 | No | <p>Restriction of access to Bridal paths for both pedestrians and horses a much cherished local facility plus heavy vehicles and horses a problem mix Approaching the farms entrance from Carpenters Arms immediately under the bridge the slow moving vehicles pulling out from the farm are extremely likely to end in a collision a lot of near misses occur now when drivers get surprised turning the bend and a very visible slow down warning sign would be essential. Because of the very gridlocked history of the A129 especially during the commuter period particularly the early rush hour a time restraint to exclude this period would be .(between 0730 -0900 the road into Wickford is total jammed. The proposed total quantity of infill waste would be around 500,000 tons, equal to fourteen 20 ton lorries per day for 5 years. The local housing plan for Shotgate is for 400 new houses plus a large increase for the Rochford area will this should also be taken into account for the effect on the roads. The land at Dollymans Farm is all that remains of a very thin slither of green belt between Shotgate and westward creeping Rayleigh. I have concerns that there is a very real threat of leaching from the site into the North Benfleet/ Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook . This leaching could undo some of the recent improvement to the water quality in the River Crouch. In addition, unless the site is strictly controlled with what is dumped there, noxious material under the guise of building waste could find its way under the radar. There are also two very important War</p> | Locate to an area away from housing and possible leaching into watercourse or river. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Memorials on the land, one of which will fall within the proposed site. The Memorials are dedicated to two Airmen and are of great historic and local interest and are both the subject of funding to restore them over the coming year. | |
| 1062261, 377 | No | I do not agree with this proposal. The site is on green belt and should be moved to a brownfill site option. Building on greenbelt land should only be considered at a last result and not the first option to save costs. Traffic levels will also increase significantly on the A129, which will impact on this busy link road and the town. | |
| 1062264, 378 | No | I do not agree with this proposal due to a significant increase in heavy traffic, the fact that the site is on green belt, waste could easily include asbestos, noise levels will increase and dust and other debris will impact on the local community . | |
| 1062108, 379 | No | 1. The impact on wildlife on this site. 2.The loss of another section of greenbelt. 3. The impact of more HGV on the roads in the area ,air pollution etc. 4 The effect on other business in area. 5. Loss of footpaths and bridleways to local residents and equestrian centres which use them. 6. Will the landowner be prepared to pay for the maintenance and repairs to the public roads if this site is allowed and will they be prepared to pay compensation for noise, environmental pollution, and the loss of trade to business that may be effected by this landfill site be granted. | The landfill should not allowed on greenbelt and should be allocated to more suitable brown field area with less impact on residents and wildlife. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1062268, 380 | No | I do not agree with this proposal. There will be more lorries, more noise and more mess over a significant period of time. There will be a detrimental impact on the local community. The site is green belt and we do not have much of it left in this area. | |
| 1062271, 381 | No | This is green belt and should remain as green belt. There are War Memorials on the site and should not be disrupted and is disrespectful to move them. It is far too close to residential properties, schools, preschools. The roads can't cope with the sheer volume of traffic for the Industrial Estate. as it is. Wickford does not need this extra volume of vehicles and it will cause leeching of chemicals into the rivers. Wildlife will suffer, there are riding areas for horses, people walk their dogs. We do not need this. | Look at another site that is not so close to residential areas. |
| 1062278, 382 | No | I have many concerns regarding the inclusion of land at Dollymans Farm in the plan for waste disposal up to 2032. The Inspectors comments leading to this modification of the plan to include Dollymans Farm site, assumes that the land would be restored to Green Belt after a very limited 5 year use but the precedent set by the current landfill site at Pitsea, which has overrun by several years, plus the landowners indication to Essex Council that they are amenable to increasing the amount of inert landfill subject to Essex County Councils requirements, and would also be willing to consider accommodating other waste streams to include non-inert and non-hazardous waste. In addition, while the proposed use of the site is for waste transfer and inert landfill, the landowners are willing to take a flexible | Ideally not proceed with allocation. |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>approach to prospective uses and to discuss the possibility of locating alternative or additional waste facilities on the site including composting and recycling facilities and supporting machinery. The landowners willingness to accommodate Essex County Council in expanding the use of the proposed site means it is likely this small remaining strip of greenbelt would be developed further, process more waste types and never be returned to its Greenbelt status. Once a Brown site would be open to a change of use. The total quantity of infill waste would be around 500,000 tons, equal to fourteen 20 ton lorries per day for 5 years. I am concerned therefore by the years of disruption this site will cause to the quality of life of local residents from air and noise pollution from the additional traffic and landfill works themselves throughout the day. This area of Greenbelt land is used daily by walkers and horse riders, it offers an area of attractive open countryside where members of the public can walk and ride in safety, something that is limited in an area that offers little other access to green fields and bridleways. The circuit of bridleways includes a Pegasus crossing that is used to cross the A129, close to the proposed access for waste lorries. I believe the safe and pleasurable use of Bridleway 17, Bridleway 55 and footpath 19 would all be adversely affected and in one case rerouted with the level of dust, noise and unnatural odours being severely impactful. There are also two very important War Memorials on the land which do not appear to have been considered, one of which within the proposed site boundary itself.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1062275, 383 | No | <p>I wish to express my concerns and objections to the proposed landfill at Dollymans farm. 1. The increase of HGV traffic to the area. 2.The impact this will have on wildlife at this particular site. For example many birds use this area for nesting i.e. Buzzards, Kestrels, (Hedge Sparrows, which have been on decline due to loss of habitat being destroyed).Egrets, Owls, Gold Finches and many more species of birds, mammals, and insects-all of which will lose habitat. 3 This site is a Greenbelt area which is gradually being reduced over time. A large number of residents use this area and bridle paths for many leisure activities i.e. dog walking, horse riding etc. 4. A new Forest Nursery has recently opened near to the proposed site the ethos of this Nursery is outdoor education and experiences for children - babies to school age. They also run after school Forest School clubs.....how Will this continue if a landfill site is place so close to these facilities 5. There are also two WW1 war memorials on this site - we should be honouring these men and considering the moving or removal of these memorials! 6. The entrance to Dollymans Farm also has a bridle way running right alongside the road.....20tonne vehicles filled with inert waste and horses and riders do not mix - this is a serious accident waiting to happen. 7. The land proposed leeching into the local brook system which in turn feeds the River Crouch which is a tidal system any harmful material leeching into these watercourse will cause wide spread damage.</p> | Remove Dollymans Farm from this plan and find a non-GREENBELT site to use |
| 1062281, 385 | No | I object to this because: It is the last bit of green belt left between Shotgate and Rayleigh I regularly walk my dog here I do not | Dolmans farm to be removed from the list of sites |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | agree with the war memorials being disturbed Pollution of the brooks and rivers here There is enough traffic already on this stretch of road and I feel this would add even more to an already congested road | |
| 1062707, 391 | No | I wish to object to the planned use of Dollymans Farm to be used as a waste disposal site on the following grounds: It will erode what little green belt is left in the area even further. It will increase the volume of traffic on the A129 to unacceptable levels Loss of bridleways and footpaths as these would be unusable with access given to refuse trucks The possibility of leaching into the Rawreth Brook system as natural drainage is directly into the Brook Both Rawreth and Shotgate are prone to flooding and the risk would be increased with the onset of Brexit, prime farm land where wheat and barley were previously grown will be needed to augment imports historic war memorials are in the area there are very few areas left available to wildlife due to erosion of greenbelt designated land. | |
| 1062720, 393 | No | We live on London Road Rawreth and its just come to our notice that there is a proposed waste site to be developed on Dollymans Farm. We cannot object strongly enough about this, we already have lorries from the Hogesons Way industrial estate hurtling past our front. We don't need any more especially waste trucks as they leave most of their load flying out on the road. I walk my dogs round the bridal way and I've wondered what landowners have been doing with a lot of earth moving, its clear not they are making an access road which seems to me that they | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>are confident of getting planning permission. I dread to think what's going to happen to the First World War memorials that are there it would be sacrilege for them to be damaged or even worse moved. This development must not happen.</p> | |
| 1062731, 394 | No | <p>I strongly object to the planning application and comment on the plan as follows: Greenbelt This land is designated greenbelt and the mere fact that the owner makes comment now (money available?) this it is poor quality should be of no relevance to that fact. Should the designation be changes or ignored it may suggest to many that the financial gain to a few is being put at the disadvantage to the many of the general public and bring the whole process of consultation into disrepute. The greenbelt land left between Shotgate and the ever encroaching Rayleigh is now at its shortest and a considerable amount of this owners land adjacent is already planned to have hundreds more houses on it. The countryside as a whole is being phased out to be replaced by concrete or construction serving concrete. Land for wildlife, local amenities in bridleways, footpaths etc. are being lost in general and the loss of such land in this application will indeed effect the aforementioned. Pollution The road where lorries are proposed to deliver/return from the site is already congested at many times of the day. It is very often gridlocked with traffic at a standstill due to constantly being dug up by one or more utility company as well as numerous ongoing repairs throughout the entire route. Flooding by Shotgate Bridge often closes the road completely and all of these occurrences lead to traffic standstill and polluting fumes being discharged. This main</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>road alone serves many schools and Healthcare homes housing the elderly and vulnerable. In fact, one primary school and a few care homes are actually on the main road itself while other are just alongside. Pollution from the already too many vehicles will be added to by the way of heavy vehicles. This route is massively populated at school times and is walked by shoppers and school children of all ages who will succumb to the pollution from even more traffic. They will also be in danger of accidents due to the increase of not only just regular vehicular traffic but heavy lorries and the odds of an incident must logically increase. Any dust, burning off of waste as laid out in the uses application will only further pollute the air for all those living in the vicinity and let us not forget the houses not yet built have attained planning permission. We already live near to another waste plant in Nevendon and the two combined will no doubt have serious implications on people health, both young and old. This is against government policy on its own merit. Damage to road surface These road are under constant repair already and it is not rocket science to understand that the increase of such vehicles will do further damage and contribute highly to the gridlocking, pollution and repair cost to the highway authority. Planning permission Looking at the planned uses applied for, it does not stop at what has been locally advised to the press as filling in a hole with builders' rubble. The owner applies for other uses such as transfer station, burning of waste and a vehicle scrapyard. By granting him permission for this landfill use, it will also lead him to attain permission for other extreme and damaging uses as set out. The landfill application merely masks</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>such use! Flooding The mere use of any more builds on greenbelt affects flooding, be it in the nearby house, to the land, planned housing and the general area due to overload on the drains. The water which will be polluted will then run into the drainage and even via the watercourse into our rivers. No meagre amount of diverting a watercourse (just to tick a box) will take away an overall effect. Decision I believe this application was originally discounted but because the owner made direct approach to a government inspector and was able to convince him/her it should be included, we find ourselves having to enter into this debacle. I would surely hope that it is comes to a decision, it must be made by another completely different inspector as to the one agreeing the inclusion. If this is not so, then the public may well think this matter is outside of what the government demands of such matters i.e. completely transparent.</p> | |
| 1062738, 395 | No | <p>I am writing to voice my concerns and to ask why the people of Shotgate were not informed earlier about the proposed mineral and waste facility at Dollymans Farm. Apparently, this proposal was discussed in September and October 2016. It was a public hearing but nobody in Shotgate was privy to this meeting as no notices or press releases were issued at this time. The first notice we had was a parish council's flyer about responding to a deadline for reactions to this plan. These had to be received by Essex County Council on 16 February 2017. The flyer did not arrive at our homes until 7 Feb 2017. The next parish council meeting was not until 14 February 2017, giving us two days to</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>find out about said proposal and send in our reactions. Some people do not have internet facilities and have no means to access any information the only answers we have are the limited details passed on by our parish councillors. On 14 February we were told that an inspector has been asked to make changes to the original plans considering 18 sites in Essex (we knew nothing of these plans). No information was given about the other 17 sites are they still being considered or is the timely representation by Dollymans Landowner the front runner. The landowner is not doing this for nothing, he is doing it for profit. He has no concerns about the view of the people of Shotgate and Rawreth. It is also perfectly obvious that the very quiet low key and quite frankly underhand way this proposal has been handled that the views of the local people are of little importance. I have many objections to the site at Dollymans farm being used: The A129 route is where 7 schools are situated the safety of the children will be compromised if there was any more increases in traffic. It is a residential road and is not built wide of strong enough to take the estimated 14 20ton lorries per day plus the buses, dust carts lorries that don't use the road provided at Hodgson way or the industrial site, cars and other traffic heading for the A130 as well as yes our vehicles. The congestion in this area is at a high already more would hamper the passage of emergency vehicles putting the health and safety of the local people at risk The greenbelt. The land at Dollymans farm is all the is left of a very small slice of green belt between Shotgate and Rayleigh. It does not matter if as the landowner considers it is of poor quality. It is what we have, it may not be the Lake</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>District but we love it. It is a limited area of open countryside and the bridleway and footpath are used daily by walkers and riders in safety. The proposed plant would limit endanger and spoil the area with noise and dust. There is of course the risk of polluted from noxious material. Hold would this be monitored would all complete loads be tipped out and scrutinised what types of loads if they are from building site would they be sorted we will need to be told exactly what materials will be divided here. This area is subject to flooding more development would increase this risk it would also increase the risk of leaching any noxious substances into the Rawreth brook and hence into the river crouch. There is a plan to build 400 new properties near this site. Who would want to live opposite a dump with a continual train of noisy dirty 20 ton refuse lorries not a great selling point and what about the existing properties they would be devalued who would want to buy a house in congested noisy dirty roads near a mineral waste dump. Will we be compensated for the fall in the value of our property. It would be interesting to know what the other 17 sites feel about this.</p> | |
| 1062742, 396 | No | <p>Why should we the residents of Shotgate have 20 ton lorries driving down narrow lanes the public take walks along the lanes this is greenbelt land and shul remain so. Also there are two very important war memorials on the land, two brave airmen whom fought for this green and pleasant land. We will have heavy lorries causing danger dust noise to our little village.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1062751, 401 | No | I object to the plan of using Dollymans Farm for waste. The roads A1245 A129 will not be able to take this additional loads. The land at present helps to stop flooding due to its position being low. We at present have to put up with noise and pollution to the air from the A1245, we have asked for additional fencing and noise barriers but Essex County Council cannot afford it. The problems on the fire and now asbestos tipping and noxious materials at Michelins farm A127/A1245 have been carried out and you have been unable to stop this. There is still thousands of tyres on this site, when will this land, which is green belt be put back to what it should be. That is why we are unable to trust what you propose. | |
| 1062762, 403 | No | I want to object to this site being used as a landfill it will affect protected wildlife in the area and will destroy a bridleway | |
| 1061598, 404 | No | I would like to object to the modification 23 related to the proposed landfill site at dolly man's farm. The moving of wars memorials and the future leaching of landfill waste into the water table and into the local streams and Brooks is unacceptable. | |
| 1062769, 406 | No | Having received a letter from Shotgate Parish council about the above proposal I feel duty bound to add my comments. It is clear that this is a plan that will directly affect the area and its residents as well as the natural habitat afforded by such green belt space. The potential for this site to be used for the purpose of waste disposal was decided unsuitable and excluded from the list of proposed sites due to its importance as greenbelt. The only | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>reason this appears to now be in question is purely down to the landowner who clearly does not have any consideration for the locality as far as residents and its natural local flora and fauna. I believe that the landowner's claims that such a development would not compromise the objectives of the greenbelt demonstrates complete ignorance and is actually a contradiction of the terms of greenbelt. Local walkers and horse riders as well wildlife and nearby residents, not to mention road users of the A129 and surrounding road networks would suffer as a consequence of this: Increased traffic, large lorries turning in and out of the access road from A129 causing noise, increased pollution and added hazards to road users. Also destruction of ever decreasing green space. Any site used for waste disposal is at increased risk of causing environmental contamination and its close proximity to waterways is a worry. The control of such waste, particularly building waste which takes many forms, I would imagine is extremely difficult to police and there are no guarantees that unscrupulous dumping of toxic substances will not occur.</p> | |
| 1062770, 407 | No | I hereby offer my objection to your proposed waste disposal site. Reference M23 | |
| 1062773, 408 | No | also opposes this land fill site Ref M23 | |
| 1062781, 409 | No | Read this article, regarding proposed landfill site at Dollymans Farm. Should be ashamed of trying to do a back door implementation, without proper public consultation. What | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | happened to fairness and respect for all. | |
| 1062780, 410 | No | I am concerned about the flooding in Shotgate my house was flooded in 2014. Also 14 twenty-ton lorries per day for 5 years. | |
| 1062782, 412 | No | I object to this proposal. | |
| 1062783, 413 | No | I would like to lodge my opposition to the plans for a landfill site at Dollymans Farm in Shotgate, Wickford. I believe a site would have negative impacts on the local environment caused by increased traffic and a high risk of contamination from the site into the local water table and surrounding areas. | |
| 1062786, 414 | No | I would like to oppose the development of a landfill site at Dollymans Farm in Wickford. What with 500+ houses being built just off the A129 which will be on the other side of the Carpenters Arms. How is Rayleigh and Wickford going to cope with the extra traffic caused from the houses let alone big lorries coming and going on our small roads. I live just down the road from this site and some days it can take me 40 mins to travel from the Carpenters arms down to my house, a 1 mile journey. Besides, who is likely to buy new houses when they know a landfill site will be just across the road. This is a silly area for this site and you will just ruin all the surrounding towns. | |
| 1061582, 416 | No | I write to object to the entire proposals in the above matter as I believe the impact factors will create a tidal wave of heavy traffic in this area and surrounding areas I am concerned that the waste transfer station will have a disastrous effect on local arable land | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | through leakage through sub soil levels the most concerning is our infrastructure overall will in my opinion fail further and all private residential properties will in my opinion be significantly devalued. The access and proposed routes for this major project will create serious congestion far greater than we are experiencing now including pollution in the atmosphere that will affect all our lives our health and wellbeing. | |
| 1062790, 417 | No | 1. It is on green belt land, in an area which is already being taken from us for housing. 2. The added traffic would result in even more traffic on very congested roads. 3. This seems to have been pushed through without any consultation. | |
| 1062791, 418 | No | I have just read a rather concerning notice about the M23 proposal for Dollymans Farm. I would like to state my objection to this proposal. This would be terrible for the local environment and local wildlife as well as adding a greater burden on the local roads. | |
| 1062794, 419 | No | I would like to take this opportunity to express my concerns regarding the proposed use of Dollymans farm as a waste disposal site. It is a poor use of Green belt land which in my opinion has been deliberately kept in poor condition since its reinstatement. Both Shotgate and Rawreth are rural villages which over the past twenty plus years have already been stretched with housing and industrial dwellings, a vast amount located on Philpot land already. We do not need or relish the extra volume of Transport and undoubtedly litter in the area. The | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | waste will also wash into the local water system entering the River Crouch polluting an already overworked tidal river causing harm to it wildlife and animals that graze the banks. The areas do already suffer from flooding at times and with the loss of even more natural land drainage this is also a concern of mine. Please do not allow this proposal to be accepted as the environmental effect would be catastrophic for the area something the land owners obviously care little about. | |
| 1062795, 420 | No | I have lived at this address for 25 years and I wish to strongly object to the plans to modify Dollymans Farm for the use as a landfill site. I feel that the way in this process has been kept under the radar, so to speak, absolutely stinks (Excuse the pun!) Myself and most of my neighbours had no idea about these plans until it was brought to our attention by one of them and we were only informed today, Wednesday 15th February 2017, which was too late to attend the meeting, which it appears was very cleverly arranged for it to be on evening of Tuesday 14th February, obviously coinciding with Valentine's Day, when most couples would be otherwise engaged in celebrating the occasion. Please could you inform me of any further developments regarding this proposal and any future meetings I can attend to voice my objections. | |
| 1062804, 422 | No | I am a resident of Shotgate and I am strongly opposed to the plans to create a waste landfill site at Dollymans farm. There are already a lot of heavy lorry movements in the area (which have also seriously damaged the roads) in what is now primarily a | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | residential area. There are also two valuable first world war memorials on the site. Bearing in mind that this is mainly a residential area with a high number of young families in the area (which will grow considerably with the new housing developments) and the fact that recent studies have shown how dangerous diesel fumes are, I think increasing lorry movements in the area would be extremely irresponsible. | |
| 1062806, 424 | No | I would like to formally lodge my objection to the plans for the above development of the Landfill site at Dollymans' Farm. As a resident who lives close by and one of many people that would be directly affected by the increased traffic, desecration to green belt land, pollution threatening not only wildlife but also waterways and the general environment. I would also like to mention that there are two war memorials on site which I strongly believe should not be touched, moved or tampered with in any way, shape or form in respect of the fallen. How these proposals ever got as far as this is totally incomprehensible. | |
| 1062807, 425 | No | This is my view to the development of Greenbelt land on Dollymans Farm to an infill waste site. I have great worries regarding the environmental impact this would have on wildlife, the threat to pollution to our waterways also from the large number of lorries bringing waste to the site which would also have huge impact on our local roads, cause more traffic problems and be a complete misery to local residents. | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1062810, 426 | No | <p>I am writing to register my objection to the suggestion of waste disposal or processing at Dollyman's Farm. My reasons are-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is GREEN BELT land and should remain in this category. 2. Dollyman's Farm is not in the original waste disposal plan for Essex. (It is thought this site has been added following a request by the landowner). 3. This area is enjoyed for numerous leisure pursuits as there is little land available for Wickford residents to enjoy. At present this green belt area is used by numerous people for fishing, horse-riding (using bridle path), dog walking, hiking and birdwatching. 4. Concerns over suggested landfill and how this may adversely impact on the green environment upsetting the natural equilibrium and habitat. Dependant on what is thought suitable as landfill material there is potential for unpleasant substances to be included in hard core such as asbestos/oil or toxins. These toxins could leach through the soil into the water table and local stream, or become airborne particulate matter. Should this occur the legacy would remain for hundreds of years and be a considerable problem for others to inherit. 5. The surrounding roads would be used by a considerable number of noisy heavy diesel vehicles creating increased wear and tear. (Hodgson's Way, the entrance/exit to the industrial area, bears testimony to heavy industrial use and is in a dangerous state of disrepair and subsidence). Another side effect could be traffic build up plus increased diesel emission). This activity would cause a detrimental effect on local residents' health, particularly those with breathing conditions, such as Asthma and COPD. 6. It was thought that British Rail may have been approached to create a spur line to act as a waste transfer | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>station. 7. Although the initial suggestion states the mineral waste site could be used for 5 years it appears from the information available this period could become a much longer and potentially be 'open ended' becoming a larger multi-functional waste processing site. Should this occur this could set a precedent for others to follow. This will have an enormous detrimental effect on the health and wellbeing of Wickford and in particular Shotgate residents. This idea of creating a waste disposal/processing area is abhorrent and caused considerable upset and distress to local residents. I cannot envisage any benefit of this proposal to Wickford residents and may have an adverse effect on future house valuation. I strongly recommend the proposal is rejected for Dollyman's Farm to be used for waste disposal/processing.</p> | |
| 1062812, 427 | No | <p>I strongly oppose the proposed modification relating to Dollymans Farm. Pollution from trade waste seeping into the water concourse. The roads surrounding Dollymans Farm are already in a bad state of repair which heavy refuse vehicles would greatly add too. Also these roads are already congested which would be further added to by this modification. It would also produce air and environmental pollution and I would also be extremely concerned if asbestos waste was to be disposed of on or buried in the earth of Dollymans Farm. I feel that the use of this Farm for commercial refuse is too close to residential areas and would also result in house prices in the surrounding area plummeting. I also feel that the proposal for this 'change of use' has been kept under wraps and 'need to know basis'. I feel that</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | we the residents, have only been notified at the 'eleventh hour' and a meeting held on the 14th of February so that little opposition could be registered. I would also like to make the point that I am surprised that something so significant as using Dollymans Farm as a Commercial and Landfill Site has not been made more public. | |
| 1062815, 428 | No | Please add my details to objection list relating to your proposed plans. | |
| 1062820, 430 | No | I have viewed the consultation document regarding some of the proposed changes of use. I have significant concerns regarding safety, health, the environment and noise pollution. I live very close to the boundary of the proposed increased use of this land and my property faces on to the trees on the edge of Dollymans farm in Boreham Close. In terms of health. I suffer with Asthma and both my sons suffer with dust allergies. This proposed increase for the next five years. - I understand that the agreement on the quantity of infill waste could amount to fourteen twenty ton lorries per day. The amount of dust/ detritus could significantly impact on my families' health & wellbeing . My neighbours' 7 month old baby has a life limiting lung disease - cystic fibrosis and this could exacerbate his poor health and long term prognosis. In terms of safety - there was a serious accident just last night at the entrance to Dollymans farm. Today there is large pieces of vehicle on the verge at the entrance. The road is a very busy one at peak times and lorries often pull out in to oncoming traffic as they clearly get frustrated at having to wait | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>for space to get in and out safely. This is clearly going to get much worse with the increased level of traffic and I'm not sure that there are any significant changes that can be made to make this safe for local motorists. To me it appears it will only be a matter of time before lives are lost. I would like some assurance of what measures you think could be put in place to reduce risks to other motorists. My sons and I all work a variety of shift patterns and at times will sleep in the daytime. With the increased noise pollution this could change our whole lifestyle. We chose to live here when we moved to Essex 13 years ago because it was quiet and overlooked green belt land which we assumed meant it wouldn't be built on. I had reservations about the local industrial estate but having spoken to people locally was reassured that in the position we were moving to it was relatively quiet and uninterrupted by noise. This is not entirely true as there is noise from the industrial estate but it is not a Significant problem at present to my sons who sleep at the front of the property. If this planned development goes ahead we will be sandwiched between industrial developments. In reality who would choose to live in this sort of a position so closely on both sides to industrial waste. There have been numerous issues with land locally on the junction of the A127/A1245 and my fear is this could replicate some of those public health issues and risk but at even closer proximity. Personally I would also be very concerned by potential reduction in my property value and will certainly not make this an attractive place to live anymore. I urge you to reconsider changing the current use and not allowing the waste</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | disposal development to go ahead | |
| 1061944, 431 | No | <p>I am writing to formally lodge my objection to the proposals to have a waste site at Dollyman's farm. I live within 500m of the farm and am very concerned about the amount of traffic and fumes that my daughters will be contending with when walking to school every day. It is already an area prone to traffic build up, so having lots more lorries coming down this way will increase both traffic and pollution. Furthermore we as a family are involved with the River Crouch Conservation Trust. We work to keep the River Crouch clean to help the local wildlife flourish. There are many brooks in the Dollymans farm area, and there is a general concern that pollutants will seep into the River as a result of this development. My final key concern is the war memorials. What an absolute disgrace to even think about impacting on these when these people lost their lives in a war which saved Britain from Nazi Germany. This just shows a lack of respect for the victims and their families. I am absolutely against this development and look forward to hearing your response.</p> | |
| 1063115, Hullbridge Parish Council, 432 | No | <p>Hullbridge Parish Council wish to object to the proposal for an inert landfill site at Dollymans Farm for the following reasons: Poor infrastructure Residents Quality of Life jeopardised due to the poor air quality that will be generated by odours from the site. Environmental impact Contravenes EU Law of such a site being so near to residential areas.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1062831, 433 | No | <p>I have been made aware of the potential use of Dollymans Farm for the disposal of waste and have the following objections: The proposed site is in the Green Belt classification and used for recreation purposes by walkers and horse riders. Traffic congestion in this area is currently a problem and additional waste disposal traffic will only make the situation worse. Repeated serious problems with the road in Hodgson Way indicate the likely issues of roads in this area. Concerns with pollution from the vehicles used may present health issues. The area has in recent years had a waste disposal incinerator imposed on it with associated concerns about emissions etc. How can it be justified to have another facility in the area ? There will be concerns with the type of waste being deposited and monitoring of environmental effects. In view of these concerns I recommend rejection of the proposed use of Dollymans Farm for any waste disposal.</p> | |
| 1062883, 435 | No | <p>With reference to the above proposal, I, like many of my friends & neighbours, strongly object to the council giving permission of approval on the grounds of health & safety, environmental, green belt infringement, and the councils short-sightedness in the future development of Shotgate, Wickford. The road structure in and around Shotgate area are not suitable for additional & heavy traffic because many vehicles get lost through poor road signs and end up around the Avenues of Shotgate similar to what the industrial vehicles are still doing today, after 20 years. To my knowledge the council as not carried out any major road works to the area except resurfacing & emergency repairs & with a</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>proposal of anther 400 new houses within the area, meaning another 800 + vehicles. Your approval of this site would create more pollution and the area will become contaminated, driving residents away from the area. If Essex Council is committed to supply a waste disposal site, I believe they should seriously look for an alternate site before they make a gross mistake.</p> | |
| 1062892, 437 | No | <p>I am writing to voice my considerable concerns regarding the prospect of a waste disposal facility at Dollymans farm. This land is green belt land, which should immediately negate any proposals for development. There are very few wild open spaces in Wickford for people to enjoy and this attractive open area is enjoyed by walkers, horse riders and nature lovers alike; I believe there are also public footpaths and bridleways which would be affected by the change of use. Although the proposal states that this is a 5 year plan, I am sure that this figure is impossible to project and can only be estimated, which may lead to an extension of the time used to fill the site. I am also dismayed to hear that the landowner has applied for further use of the land for waste disposal following completion of the initial landfill. As a town Wickford already has issues regarding traffic and is frequently gridlocked. The pollution and inconvenience caused by current traffic is worrying; let alone adding an additional 20 large lorries a day for 5 years. Our homes are in danger of becoming devalued, by these issues I am very concerned about the impact (and danger to people) of this additional traffic upon the A129, a road used by many young families and people walking to and from local schools. I am</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>aware that there is a supposed weight restriction for this road; however it is no secret that this is largely ignored. Finally I ask you to consider the fact that there are War memorials on this site for two airmen who lost their lives. The inscription on one of these reads "This spot is sacred to the memory of Capt. Henry Clifford Stroud, RFC and RE. Killed in action at midnight 7th March 1918". I find nothing sacred in the plan to dump waste in an area that should be treated with respect and dignity. Perhaps a more appropriate use of the site is to develop it as a proper country park.</p> | |
| 1062896, 440 | No | <p>Please register my objection to Modification 23 regarding the Dollymans farm. Not only has this not been made very clear or public knowledge, but it will have a severe impact on the natural landscape, quality of the air and water in the surrounding areas and will destroy what little green space is left.</p> | |
| 1062909, 441 | No | <p>I strongly object to the proposed landfill site ,Ref M23, which is being considered on Dollymans Farm. My objections are: The land to be used is green belt and in an area already to be developed for housing, resulting in further air quality problems on already extremely heavily congested roads. The additional traffic of large trucks on overcrowded roads pumping out dangerous diesel fumes, dumping rotting waste near residential area can only lead to more health issues for the local inhabitants. The erosion of Green Belt land without infrastructure improvement in the Wickford, Shotgate, Rayleigh area can only be detrimental to residents now and future Generations This decision appears to</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | have been pushed through without views and consultation with the people it will effect being heard and considered. | |
| 1062121, 442 | No | I wish to object to the RWLP relating to Dollymans Farm Wickford on the grounds that;- 1. It encroaches on precious green belt land. 2. It will create an ongoing traffic problem with heavy lorries using a single carriageway road daily for a period of 5 years - this will eventually be exacerbated by the repairs required to this road as a result of the continued usage by these heavily laden vehicles. 3. The local area will be contaminated by dust coming off the site particularly when unloading is taking place - almost inevitably some of this dust will contain asbestos | |
| 1062915, 444 | No | I am writing to urge you to reject the use of Dollyman's Farm, Wickford, as a dumping site for waste material. Here are my reasons: Firstly, there is a real risk of leaching from this site into the North Benfleet/Rawreth Brook system as the natural drainage from the site is direct into the brook. The leaching will pollute the river Crouch with very damaging consequences to the water life ecosystem. Secondly, unless the site is strictly controlled, there is the very real danger that poisonous material will be dumped there under the guise of building waste. The damage that will do to the health of local people and the surrounding environment could be immeasurable. Please reject Dollyman's Farm as a suitable site for dumping waste material. | |
| 1062913, Anglian | Yes | In regards to the new allocation, Dollymans Farm site, there are | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Water, 447 | | no Anglian Water assets located on the proposed site. | |
| 1062917, 448 | No | <p>Although I don't currently live in Wickford, I am an interested party as I am currently selling my property and will shortly be moving to Shotgate, Wickford. I am writing to register my objection to the suggestion of waste disposal or processing at Dollyman's Farm. My reasons are-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is GREEN BELT land and should remain in this category. 2. Dollyman's Farm is not in the original waste disposal plan for Essex. (It is thought this site has been added following a request by the landowner). 3. This area is enjoyed for numerous leisure pursuits as there is little land available for Wickford residents to enjoy. At present this green belt area is used by numerous people for fishing, horse-riding (using bridle path), dog walking, hiking and birdwatching. 4. Concerns over suggested landfill and how this may adversely impact on the green environment upsetting the natural equilibrium and habitat. Dependant on what is thought suitable as landfill material there is potential for unpleasant substances to be included in hard core such as asbestos/oil or toxins. These toxins could leach through the soil into the water table and local stream, or become airborne particulate matter. Should this occur the legacy would remain for hundreds of years and be a considerable problem for others to inherit. 5. The surrounding roads would be used by a considerable number of noisy heavy diesel vehicles creating increased wear and tear. (Hodgson's Way, the entrance/exit to the industrial area, bears testimony to heavy industrial use and is in a dangerous state of disrepair and subsidence). Another side effect could be traffic build up plus | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>increased diesel emission). This activity would cause a detrimental effect on local residents' health, particularly those with breathing conditions, such as Asthma and COPD. 6. It was thought that British Rail may have been approached to create a spur line to act as a waste transfer station. 7. Although the initial suggestion states the mineral waste site could be used for 5 years it appears from the information available this period could become a much longer and potentially be 'open ended' becoming a larger multi-functional waste processing site. Should this occur this could set a precedent for others to follow. This will have an enormous detrimental effect on the health and wellbeing of Wickford and in particular Shotgate residents. This idea of creating a waste disposal/processing area is abhorrent and caused considerable upset and distress to local residents. I cannot envisage any benefit of this proposal to Wickford residents and may have an adverse effect on future house valuation. I strongly recommend the proposal is rejected for Dollyman's Farm to be used for waste disposal/processing.</p> | |
| 1062921, 449 | No | <p>As a horse owner and rider our off road riding is very limited and this proposed modification would take this area away from us and the lorries bring in the materials could be very dangerous and frightening to the horses therefore increasing our risk of accidents</p> | |
| 1062935, 452 | No | <p>This area should not be exposed to yet more environmental disruption. We have a large industrial works and water treatment plant already the added HGV vehicles would congest the already</p> | <p>Remove the Dollymans Farm modification from the proposal.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | heavily used roads with the added dangers these types of vehicles pose. | |
| 1062942, 456 | No | I think there is already enough environmental disruption in this local area. We already have the water treatment works and industrial buildings which in turn generate an already intolerable number of HGVs using the local road infrastructure. | Remove Dollymans Farm from the Plan |
| 1062298, 460 | No | The proposed Dollymans Farm site is within a designated Green Belt Area. It should continue to be protected as such. There would appear to be a risk of leaching into the sensitive North Benfleet & Rawreth Brook Systems. No clear plan on management of local run-off water, which regularly pools in the proposed area. This potentially exacerbates the leaching problem above. Displacement of two War Memorials | Removal of site M23 Dollymans Farm from the list of proposed sites. I would prefer that the Authority had a greater focus on recycling waste with a concerted effort to move away from landfill solutions. |
| 1062951, 463 | No | I am opposed to the M23 landfill site proposal in Wickford. I am a resident of 36 years and have a young family. | |
| 1062010, 464 | No | Your web site for objecting is not user friendly hence my email. I wish to object to the proposed waste facility at Dollymans Farm for the following reasons: 1. There is not enough infrastructure in place in Wickford to support any further development whether that development be residential or commercial. Vehicles accessing this site will large and frequent. Our roads are not suitable. 2. Contamination issues due to waste seeping into local rivers. 3. WW1 memorial is on this site. 4. Wildlife and recreation ground will be lost. 5. This site is green belt! Protect it! | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1063282, 465 | No | I wish to oppose to the above being a landfill site. We in Wickford are fed with the over building of new properties in the area, we are over populated in the area causing traffic issues constantly coupled with the pollution and a blot on the landscape. | |
| 1063346, 471 | No | With regard to the above, I am writing to register my objection to the proposal within the Replacement Waste Local Plan to use Dollymans Farm as a waste disposal site. The land proposed is green belt. In addition, the roundabout by The Carpenters Arms pub, at the junction of the A129 and A1245, is dangerously busy, particularly at peak times, and additional slow-moving waste lorry movements going to and from the site would cause further congestion and risk of accidents. Lorries coming and going in the opposite direction towards and through Wickford via the A129/Southend Rd, would also be traversing a thoroughfare that is at times undulating, twisting and again, very busy at peak times. It is a residential road serving Mayflower school, so heavy lorry movements on it would be both dangerous and ruin the amenity of people's homes along the Southend Road. Although I live just across the Borough boundary, the proposed waste site would have a direct impact on my locale and the routes that I and my family use almost every day. | |
| 1063383, 483 | No | I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans Farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this green belt land and walk my dog and ride my | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>horse in the area and along the bridleways. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride safely. The development requires a new road and all the dirt, noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area will entirely ruin it. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up area so please protect this area.</p> | |
| 1063385, 486 | No | <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans Farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this green belt land and walk my dog and ride my horse in the area and along the bridleways. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride safely. The development requires a new road and all the dirt, noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area will entirely ruin it. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up area so please protect this area.</p> | |
| 1063388, 487 | No | <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans Farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this green belt land and walk my dog and ride my horse in the area and along the bridleways. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride safely. The development requires a new road and all the dirt, noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area will entirely ruin it. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up are so please protect this area.</p> | |
| 1063392, 489 | No | <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans Farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this green belt land and walk my dog and ride my horse in the area and along the bridleways. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride safely. The development requires a new road and all the dirt, noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area will entirely ruin it. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up are so please protect this area.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1063397, 490 | No | <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans Farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this green belt land and walk my dog and ride my horse in the area and along the bridleways. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride safely. The development requires a new road and all the dirt, noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area will entirely ruin it. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up area so please protect this area.</p> | |
| 1063407, 491 | No | <p>Green belt land that should be left as it is as too much of it in this area has already been given up. I'm concerned that this may pose a health risk to that of the local environment and its occupants. Pollution in all its forms is unsafe, particularly when it happens to be next to a children's nursery. The roads and infrastructures are not in place to be able to support this proposal.</p> | |
| 1063413, 492 | No | <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans Farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this green belt land and walk my dog and ride my</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>horse in the area and along the bridleways. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride safely. The development requires a new road and all the dirt, noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area will entirely ruin it. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up area so please protect this area.</p> | |
| 1063417, 493 | No | <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans Farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this green belt land and walk my dog and ride my horse in the area and along the bridleways. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride safely. The development requires a new road and all the dirt, noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area will entirely ruin it. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up area so please protect this area.</p> | |
| 1063451, 495 | No | <p>I wish to lodge my objection to the above modification to include Dollymans Farm as a possible site for a waste dump. I object to the use of this Green Belt land for this purpose and believe the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | development of the site in this way is inappropriate. I like many others value this green belt land and walk my dog and ride my horse in the area and along the bridleways. I enjoy the green view and it is one of the few places in the local area where I can access the countryside and walk and ride safely. The development requires a new road and all the dirt, noise and disruption that this would bring to this relatively peaceful area will entirely ruin it. Once the land is allocated for waste I do not believe it will be restored to its current green use. We have little enough access to the countryside in this built up are so please protect this area. | |
| 1063482, 496 | No | Opposed to this plan | |
| 1063440, Natural England, 499 | No- subject to amendments | <p>We understand that this site was not allocated at the pre-Submission phase. This allocation should be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment in order to demonstrate that it would not have an adverse effect on European sites. We note that the future restoration provides the opportunity for significant biodiversity enhancement and habitat creation, and would advise that this should follow the opportunities presented in our evidence description of the Northern Thames Basin National Character Area.</p> <p><u>UPDATED RESPONSE: March 2017</u></p> <p>We note in the Habitats Regulations Assessment Addendum for Dollymans Farm L(i)16 (v1.3 dated, 10th March 2017) the assessment has screened out likely significant effect. The</p> | <p>We make two recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. that the HRA Addendum be amended to include screening against FLL (our advice being that this can be screened out); 2. that any project-level HRA consider FLL within the assessment and demonstrate no adverse effects on the integrity of any international site. Evidence will change over time regarding the preferences of species such as the Dark-bellied Brent Geese, so appropriate foraging distances should be reviewed as part of any HRA. <p>On the basis that your council is able to follow the two recommendations above, then Natural England is</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Council, as competent authority must make the decision whether a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a European site, or will adversely affect the integrity of a European site. The screening assessment in Table 8 concludes no likely significant effect on basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the inert landfill screening distance parameters for European sites; and • ground and surface water protection measures. <p>Neither Table 8 nor paragraph 4.2 consider ‘functionally-linked land’ (FLL). FLL describes areas of land or sea occurring outside of a designated site which nonetheless are considered to be critical to or necessary for the ecological or behavioural functioning in a relevant season of a qualifying feature for which that site has been designated.</p> <p>Crouch and Roach Estuaries SPA and Ramsar is of importance for wintering waterbirds, especially Dark-bellied Brent Goose <i>Branta bernicla bernicla</i>. Dollymans Farm is situated about 2.6km from the Crouch and Roach Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site and the Essex Estuaries Special Area of Conservation. We consider that such a distance is beyond the currently understood foraging preferences for Dark-bellied Brent Geese and therefore it would not appear that Dollymans Farm would be suitable functionally-linked land at such a distance. We have not assessed the current habitat regarding suitability as FLL.</p> | <p>satisfied with the current assessment of Dollyman’s Farm and its conclusions. For avoidance of doubt we support the continued reference to Northern Thames Basin National Character Area.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | |
| 1064025, 507 | No | Please note that I feel that your plans for a land fill site at Dollymans Farm is inappropriate and wish to register mine and my wife's objection. | |
| 1064243, Historic England, 530 | No | We welcome efforts to protect archaeological deposits where this site is to be excavated. To ensure that these deposits are not unnecessarily disturbed, we request the following amendment. Areas of archaeological deposits in situ will require excavation and recording if working is likely to cause detrimental disturbance in the north western part of the site. | |
| 1064297, 536 | No | I live very close to the site, I am very concerned on increased traffic and the effect it will have on the land ,flooding, smell, wild life and the possible decrease in the price of our houses as one of the reasons to move here was the green belt location. | |
| 1064318, 538 | No | I would like to object to the above. If this goes ahead it will cause water pollution, increased traffic and pollution, likelihood of increased accidents, removal of war memorial (heritage site) foul smells from decomposing waste, and the build-up of methane cases amongst other things. | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M23? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1064376, 541 | No | <p>We would like to state our strong opposition to the proposal for a landfill site off Greenbelt land on Dollyman's Farm. We believe this is not a suitable site for landfill due to strong concerns for the environmental impact this would have on the local area: This is a heritage site, an important war memorial stands on the land and another close by, these must be protected. The threat of pollution to local waterways where rainwater and flood water can pick up contaminants from the waste as it flows across the surface of the landfill and pollute the water courses when it drains from the site causing leachate. We understand the government have undertaken extensive surveys on current landfill sites and over half experienced leachate with no action taken to control this. Landfill sites often generate objectionable smells due to the decomposition of waste and there will be terrible problems of noise, dust, vibration, traffic congestion from the many lorries taking waste to the site which will increase in the likelihood of accidents in the area. Landfill sites can cause serious pollution of rivers, streams and ground waters. Landfill sites generate gas, especially methane, as waste decomposes. Methane is an important greenhouse gas contributing to climate change. We must reduce the amount of greenhouse gases that are emitted into the atmosphere. Methane is also a dangerous explosive gas. Furthermore this proposal will drastically affect local business such as the day care nursery proposed nearby.</p> | |

Modification M24 – Table 21 Development in Waste Consultation Areas

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M24? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 137 | Yes | Support this change as it will reduce the unnecessary administrative burden for Local Planning Authorities to consult the Waste Planning Authorities on the change of use, if there is not likely to be an impact on waste management facilities. | |

Modification M25 – Table 21 Development in Waste Consultation Areas

No Comments Received

Modification M26 – Oakwood and Crusader Business Park

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M26? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1063382, Tendring District Council, 482 | Yes | Main modification 26 recommends the removal of Oakwood and Crusader Business Park as the site is no longer being considered as an Area of Search. This modification would address the Council's first objection previously raised. TDC therefore withdraw this ground for objection. | Given the above proposed modifications, TDC consider the Replacement Waste Local Plan Schedule of Modifications to be sound. TDC also recommends continued involvement of its members, land owners and town councils in the waste local plan process to ensure its deliverability. |

Minor Modifications

Modification M27 – Paragraph 4.11

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M27? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| 910743, Cumbria County Council, 38 | No | Firstly, I think it would be clearer if the terms nuclear waste and non-nuclear waste were amended to read "nuclear industry waste and non-nuclear industry waste. Secondly, nuclear (industry) wastes are actually from a broader range of sources than just the nuclear power industry for example, they are also from products that contain radioactive substances (smoke detectors, pace-makers, some ceramics, etc.) or from mineral extraction/processing (NORM) and non-nuclear (industry) wastes also include research establishments. I'm not sure where defence-related radioactive wastes lie, probably nuclear industry. However, if your text is meant to refer only to those radioactive wastes that arise or are managed in Essex, then you could simply add In Essex at the beginning of the sentence Nuclear wastes are from!!.. | |
| 1062191, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Magnox Limited, 351 | Yes | The NDA and Magnox Limited would like to confirm their support for the following modifications, which are consistent with the representations made by GVA (on behalf of the NDA and Magnox Limited) to the consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft of the RWLP: Main Modification 10 the modification to Policy 7. Minor Modification 27 the modification to paragraph 4.11. Minor Modification 35 the modification to paragraph 6.6. Minor modification 40 the modification to paragraph 8.32. While the NDA and Magnox welcome the abovementioned modifications to the RWLP, they maintain their view that further minor modifications are still required for the Plan to be considered sound. | |

Modification M28 – Paragraph 4.12

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M28? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1062913, Anglian Water, 445 | Yes | Anglian Water are in support of MIN 28. | |

Modification M29 – Paragraph 4.16

No Comments Received

Modification M30 – Paragraph 4.24

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M30? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1062191, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Magnox Limited, 354 | No | With respect to Minor Modification 30, it is noted that the WPA has proposed an amendment to the opening sentence of paragraph 4.24 and this is consistent with the wording proposed by the NDA and Magnox Limited. It is further noted that the RWLP makes reference to the national process to identify a site for a GDF facility in Chapter 8. However, this process is an important part of the context to national nuclear waste management and, as such, also needs to be referenced in the introductory text in Chapter 4 for the purposed of consistency and clarity. Thus, the NDA and Magnox Limited maintain their view that paragraph 4.24 should also refer to the national process to identify a site for a GDF and confirm that any proposed GDF facility would be approved as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under the Planning Act 2008. It is noted that paragraph 4.24 also states that: "Locational criteria policies provide the means by which future nuclear and non-nuclear waste proposals will be assessed should the market identify a need for further facilities in the Plan area." It is | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M30? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>assumed that, in terms of nuclear radioactive waste, the primary relevant locational criteria policy is Policy 7, at least for Bradwell sites own radioactive waste. It is considered that paragraph 4.24 should cross-reference the relevant locational criteria policies for consistency and clarity, as well as ease of understanding. Furthermore, it is considered that a new sentence should also be added following paragraph 4.24 to clarify the role of NDA Strategy in the waste planning arena. The NDA and Magnox request that the following wording is added: "The national strategy for the management of radioactive waste is prepared and issued by the NDA. The Energy Act 2004 requires that the NDA Strategy is reviewed and republished at least every five years. UK Government and the Scottish Ministers approved the current Strategy, "NDA Strategy III" in March 2016 and it came into effect in April 2016. The Local Plan seeks to be consistent with prevailing NDA Strategy and recognises its status as a national policy in the arena of radioactive waste management."</p> | |

Modification M31 - Paragraph 4.25

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M31? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 143 | Yes | The Council supports this modification as a factual update. | |

Modification M32 – Paragraph 4.26

No Comments Received

Modification M33 – Paragraph 5.2

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M33? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 1053830, 16 | No | <p>The change in wording puts the emphasis on commercial viability over practical self-sufficiency. For instance the wording of this paragraph would allow the import of 595,000 tonnes of commercial waste to the Rivenhall incinerator from outside the administrative area, which would make the Rivenhall facility commercially viable, but would not make the county self-sufficient with the handling of its own waste. With no clear definite in of what is considered a small amount of waste of what volumes or ratios we are willing to accept in comparison to what we generate ourselves. This wording lends itself to the administrative area becoming a net importer of waste from outside the administrative area and therefore a dumping ground for the rest of the nation or even further afield and little to encourage self-sufficiency.</p> | <p>The Plan is based on the principle of net self-sufficiency, where practicable. This means having sufficient waste transfer, recycling, recovery, and disposal capacity within the Plan area to manage the amount of waste generated, with only limited cross border movements with other authorities. Such an approach recognises that waste travels across administrative boundaries, particularly when the source of the waste is located close to an administrative border with the distance travelled being, at least in part, related to the volume of waste required to make a facility economically viable set against the amount of waste expected to arise in a given area. The smaller the quantity of a waste type generated, the less practical it is to be net self-sufficient due to economies of scale making small, purely local facilities unviable. Particularly specialist types of waste travel beyond one or more administrative boundaries. Emphasis, should however be on self-sufficiency and all facilities should be designed and administered to serve the administrative area first and foremost, with the avoidance of the administrative area becoming a net importer of waste due to the tender process, which could mean the administrative area has to export its own waste while other administrative areas win tenders to export their waste to Essex.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M33? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 985256, , 301 | No | <p>The modification sacrifices the principle of net self-sufficiency to make 'a facility economically viable' through 'economies of scale'. The modification is made for the benefit of the Rivenhall facility, a facility that is not built, not licensed, already benefitting from subsidy in the form of a Contract for Difference and enjoying a monopoly under the terms of the plan. The 'economies of scale' at Rivenhall will mean an increase in the importation of waste from outside the plan area, an increase in the number of journeys and the distances travelled by lorries transporting waste, resulting in an increase in pollution, an increase in congestion and a further disincentive to recycle and reduce waste. The modification justifies and makes way for a course of action that undermines the 'circular economy', is out of line with the 'waste hierarchy', renders the 'proximity principle' meaningless and makes a mockery of the concept of 'sustainable development'. In short the modification makes it possible for the reality delivered by the Plan to be completely at odds with the Vision it sets out, rendering the plan not deliverable, not justified, not effective and not consistent with national policy.</p> | <p>The modification should be removed and the final sentence modified to reinforce the principle of self-sufficiency by making clear that all facilities should serve the plan area first and foremost.</p> |

Modification M34 – Paragraph 6.6

No Comments Received

Modification M35 – Paragraph 7.1

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M35? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1057927, Hayleys Padfield Ltd, 65 | No | <p>In our view the amended statement “Although it is recognised that capacity gaps remain in all the waste streams other than for biological treatment, it is considered that all suitable sites submitted to the Waste Planning Authorities have been allocated” is incorrect. The inspector recommended a number of modifications which were deemed necessary to make the plan sound/legally compliant and appropriate for adoption. One such recommendation was that discounting a site purely on the grounds that it is situated in the Green Belt renders the plan unsound. The inspectors recommendations in relation to Dollymans Farm and its subsequent allocation in our view, is a clear steer that other sites discounted purely because of their location in the Green Belt should also be reconsidered. As set out within paragraph 6 of the NPPW, local authorities should work collaboratively with local planning authorities and first look for suitable sites and areas outside the Green Belt for waste management facilities that, if located in the Green Belt, would be inappropriate development. There is now an identified need for 7.05mt of inert waste capacity over the plan period and Essex County Council has not identified enough sites for inert waste disposal to meet the calculated demand over the plan period, with an increased shortfall of 4.47mt. Therefore in accordance with paragraph 6 of the NPPW and paragraph 83 of the NPPF, sites within the Green Belt should be considered to meet the shortfall in need. The methodology of Site Assessment and Selection Report states that Stage 2 introduces a sequential approach whereby sites that are in the green belt or score red for traffic and transportation are held back (unless there</p> | <p>In order to ensure that paragraph 7.1 is correct and the Plan is sound/legally compliant, Green Belt sites need to be reassessed for allocation.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M35? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>are exceptional circumstances). Rather than being excluded completely such as at Stage 1, sites in the green belt or that do not comply with transport policy would only be considered for allocation if, after the rest of the assessment had been carried out through Stage 3, insufficient sites that passed Stage 2 were suitable for meeting the capacity gap associated with a particular waste stream.. Despite this statement which is in line with the NPPF and NPPW guidance set out above, the increase in shortfall and the inspectors observations, Essex County Council continues to take a blanket approach to rejecting all landfill/inert waste disposal sites within the Green Belt, regardless of other sustainability factors, with only Dollymans Farm being allocated in response to concerns raised by the inspector in relation to that specific site. Furthermore the blanket approach has resulted in a lack of waste facilities and in particular inert waste recycling facilities in the south of the County. As a result the plan is not in accordance with the three dimensions of sustainable development, namely economic, social and environmental. In particular it will result in long journeys within and out of the County to dispose of waste. Especially given that it is the southern part of the county which is the most populated. As a result there is a strong and over reliance on inert waste sites in the North of Essex and a long distance in sustainability terms from Harlow, which does not accord with the Spatial Strategy. The Spatial Strategy specifically sets out that new waste developments should principally be directed to key urban centres including Harlow. An example of a site which should be allocated to ensure that the statement is correct and the Plan sound/legally compliant is Hastingwood, Harlow (W19). This 1.35 hectare Green Belt site was submitted by the landowner for consideration for either inert or non-inert</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M35? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>waste recycling. The extent of the site proposed resulted from discussions with Essex County Council and is currently made up of 0.96 hectares of previously developed land and 0.39 hectares of agricultural land. At the time of submission the majority of the site had been used for many years for the storing, sorting and recycling of aggregates, albeit without the benefit of planning permission. Since that time the landowner has successfully acquired a Certificate of Lawful Use for the site to be used for the storage, screening and distribution of recycled of road plantings (and use of associated plant and equipment) (LPA Ref: ESS/39/EPF). The majority of the site can therefore now be described as previously developed land which in our view is now a material consideration in favour of its allocation. The site was discounted on the grounds that it was situated in the Green Belt. However, it scored very well in the sustainability appraisal with benefits of allocating the site including its location is a very sustainable location in close proximity to Harlow which is an area of the County that does not have any inert waste disposal facilities; t location next to Junction 7 of the M11, a major transport corridor; the significant distance of the site from residential properties; and the low quality nature of the Green belt land particularly given that over 2/3 of it is previously developed land.</p> | |
| 1062191, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Magnox Limited, 352 | Yes | <p>The NDA and Magnox Limited would like to confirm their support for the following modifications, which are consistent with the representations made by GVA (on behalf of the NDA and Magnox Limited) to the consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft of the RWLP: Main Modification 10 the modification to Policy 7. Minor Modification 27 the modification to paragraph 4.11. Minor Modification 35 the modification to paragraph 6.6. Minor modification 40 the modification to paragraph 8.32. While the NDA and</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M35? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | Magnox welcome the abovementioned modifications to the RWLP, they maintain their view that further minor modifications are still required for the Plan to be considered sound. | |

Modification M36 – Paragraph 7.2

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M36? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| 985065, 42 | No | This retains the previously used vague description. The plan should be amended to describe this material correctly as srf/rdf. | |
| 1059617, 55 | No | I object to 7.2 as it still refers to "other waste management" at strategic sites (i.e. Rivenhall) This is very vague. | This should be amended to correctly describe this material as SRF/RDF |
| 1060507, Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee, 84 | No | This retains the previously used vague description. The plan should be amended to describe this material correctly as srf/rdf. | |
| 477311, 93 | No | This retains the previously used vague description. The plan should be amended to describe this material correctly as srf/rdf. | |
| 1061659, 180 | No | What exactly does this mean - it's a vague description. The plan should be amended to describe this material correctly as srf/rdf. | |
| 1061682, 197 | No | This retains the same previously used and vague description. The plan should be changed to correctly describe the material/waste as SRF/RDF. | |
| 1059617, 227 | No | Para 7.2 still refers to other waste management at strategic sites (i.e. Rivenhall Airfield). This retains a very vague description and should be amended to describe the material correctly as SRF/RDF. | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M36? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| 988283, Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council, 234 | No | This retains the previously used vague description. The plan should be amended to describe this material correctly as SRF/RDF. | |
| 1062089, Coggeshall Parish Council, 326 | No | This retains the previously used vague description; -The plan should be amended to describe this material correctly as srf/rdf. | |
| 743809, 457 | No | For some reason, this still retains the previously used vague description. Clarification needed i.e. the plan should be amended to describe this material correctly as srf/rdf. | |
| 1063344, 472 | No | This retains the previously used vague description. The plan should be amended to describe this material correctly as srf/rdf. | |
| 618724, 511 | No | This retains the previously used vague description. The plan should be amended to describe this material correctly as srf/rdf. | |
| 911132, Cressing Parish Council, 521 | No | Other waste management is a vague description. The plan should be amended to describe this material correctly as SRF/RDF. | |

Modification M37 – Paragraph 8.7

No Comments Received

Modification M38 – Paragraph 8.15

No Comments Received

Modification M39 – Paragraph 8.23 and 8.26

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M39? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| 1062191, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Magnox Limited, 356 | No | <p>With respect to Minor Modification 39, it is noted that the proposed amendments to paragraphs 8.23 and 8.26 are consistent with the wording proposed by the NDA and Magnox Limited. However, it is considered that paragraph 8.23 should be amended to make reference to the latest versions of the national strategies (which governs the management of radioactive waste) in order to reflect the current national planning policy position. As highlighted in the NDA and Magnox Limited's previous representations, the relevant strategy is the UK Strategy for the Management of Solid Low Level Waste from the Nuclear Industry , which was published in February 2016, as well as Nuclear Decommissioning Authority Strategy Effective from April 2016 ("NDA Strategy III") , which was published in March 2016 (effective from April 2016). This paragraph should also recognise that the national strategies referred to are under continual review. As a process, decommissioning may include the development of new buildings and other required facilities and potentially the in-situ management of waste (both radioactive and non-radioactive), and the NDA and Magnox would like to ensure that the Waste Local Plan recognises and supports the works that may be required in connection with the decommissioning and remediation process. In terms of waste management, the NDA and Magnox would like to draw the Councils attention to the emerging policy 1 and regulatory guidance concerning site remediation and site end state (condition after final site clearance). The Environmental Regulators draft guidance 2 will require Magnox (and other Nuclear Site Licence holders) to review the site-wide waste management approach to identify and deliver an optimised site end state. This includes</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M39? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>consideration of site end states which may involve options for the in-situ disposal of existing sub-surface structures and the on-site disposal of any associated above ground portion, together with the approach to managing land contamination. End state options which may include in-situ disposal, together with any associated on-site disposal of the above portion, are being considered at Bradwell as one of the first NDA-owned sites to enter Care & Maintenance Phase under an accelerated decommissioning programme. This waste management approach would be in line with the national strategy for managing radioactive waste and thus be in accordance with clause (a) of RWLP Policy 7. For consistency and clarity, the NDA and Magnox suggest that paragraph 8.23 is reworded in order to take the above considerations into account. It is suggested that paragraph 8.23 be reworded as follows: "The Bradwell-on-Sea site is one of the first UK nuclear Magnox reactor sites to be decommissioned. Within the period covered by this policy document, the site will enter into a period of quiescence, termed care and maintenance. Prior to this, ILW will be packaged and placed within the dedicated on-site storage facility. The packaged ILW will remain in the store until a national Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) is available. This process is in accordance with DECCs UKs waste management strategy for LLW & ILW (dated 2010) national strategy for the management of radioactive waste (the current strategy was published in 2016 and is subject to regular review). . Following the period of care and maintenance, the site will be decommissioned and remediation activities undertaken (which may include in-situ disposal) which when completed will allow the site to reach end state. "</p> | |

Modification M40 – Paragraph 8.32

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M40? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| 1062191, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Magnox Limited, 353 | Yes | The NDA and Magnox Limited would like to confirm their support for the following modifications, which are consistent with the representations made by GVA (on behalf of the NDA and Magnox Limited) to the consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft of the RWLP: Main Modification 10 the modification to Policy 7. Minor Modification 27 the modification to paragraph 4.11. Minor Modification 35 the modification to paragraph 6.6. Minor modification 40 the modification to paragraph 8.32. While the NDA and Magnox welcome the abovementioned modifications to the RWLP, they maintain their view that further minor modifications are still required for the Plan to be considered sound. | |

Modification M41 – Paragraph 9.21

No Comments Received

Modification M42 – Paragraph 9.23

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M42? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|---|---|
| 1062089, Coggeshall Parish Council, 328 | No | Material changes are defined in this section and as such the redesign of the IWMF represents a material change and needs to be considered as such and not minor changes | |

Modification M43 – Paragraph 9.44

No Comments Received

Modification M44 – Table 6 Monitoring Framework

No Comments Received

Modification M45 – Basildon Waste Recycling Centre

No Comments Received

Modification M46 - Rivenhall

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1053830, 2 | No | Site has been refused Environmental Licence by the Environmental Agency, therefore should be excluded from the document. | Table 16 Rivenhall should be excluded from the document. |
| 1053830, 12 | No | ECC have removed geographical restrictions in import of waste to the site. Therefore this site may potentially not process any waste from Essex as this will be dependent on legal fair tender, by which non-county providers may outbid Essex providers for waste management. | Table 16 Rivenhall and any mention of Rivenhall site should be removed from the Waste Plan. |
| 985065, 43 | No | This is not clear! The term 'other waste' is totally vague - it should be made clear that this material is the 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF - because you know that this is the output from the operational Basildon plant - that would have to be brought in by lorry to the proposed (but not built) Rivenhall site. Is this legally compliant? Essex County Council is proposing that an unbuilt (and not yet fully approved) private site at Rivenhall, take output from the Basildon plant. This output is known to be (TPA) SRF/RDF which Essex County Council legally owns, as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore, ECC appears to be disregarding the planning process that the Rivenhall site is engaged in, and jumping ahead to name the Rivenhall site as the one that will receive Basildon's output. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an OPEN PROCUREMENT PROCESS. ECC has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRG/RED from Basildon ahead of that procurement process, knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | the stated time horizon. However, even that assumption should now be questioned, given that the Environment Agency has refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site (in December 2019) because of their failure to demonstrate Best Available Technology (BAT). ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that HAS NOT BEEN BUILT, IS STILL GOING THROUGH PLANNING, AND HAS NO LICENCE for a potential contract to take waste material that it owns. | |
| 1059617, 57 | No | I oppose this modification as it doesn't clearly identify the non-hazardous residual waste as SRF/RDF the known specific output from the Basildon pant. It is also questionable if it is legally complaint for ECC to allocate waste they own to a specific plant without procurement and when allocating this to a non-built or facility which has questionable planning permission and no environmental permit. | Clearly state the 200,000 tpa SRF/RDF and do the correct process of allocating material and to plants which can actually function which is built, has permits and permissions to actually function. |
| 1060507, Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee, 85 | No | THE PLAN SHOULD CLARIFY THAT THIS MATERIAL IS 200,00 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF. THIS IS KNOWN TO BE OUTPUT FROM THE OPERATION BASILDON SITE WHICH WILL BE SENT VIA ROAD TO THE PROPOSED SITE AT RIVENHALL. IT IS NOT OBVIOUS THAT THIS MODIFICATION IS LEGAL. ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSES TO ASSIGN THE PROPOSED, PRIVATE, RIVENHALL SITE TO TAKE OUTPUT FROM THE PLANT IN BASILDON. THIS OUTPUT IS KNOWN TO BE SRF/RDF AND OWNED BY ECC AS SET OUT IN THE OPERATIONAL CONTRACT FOR THE BASILDON PLANT. ECC IS THEREFORE CONFUSING PLANNING AND PROCUREMENT BY ALLOCATING MATERIAL IT LEGALLY OWNS TO A SPECIFIC SITE. ECC IS AWARE THAT THE APPLICANT FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE, GENT FAIRHEAD, HAS UNAMBIGUOUSLY STATED IN PLANNING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO ECC THAT RIVENHALL IS THE SITE TO WHICH THE BASILDON SPECIFIC OUTPUT CAN BE SENT. NO SINGLE ALLOCATION SHOULD BE MADE FOR THIS SPECIFIC MATERIAL. THE PLAN SHOULD BE AMENDED TO REFLECT THIS. BY LAW THIS WASTE MATERIAL SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO AN OPEN PROCUREMENT PROCESS. ECC HAS SAID THAT ITS FINAL | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>PROCUREMENT PROCESS FOR SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON HAS BEEN DELAYED FOR A FEW YEARS TO ALLOW FURTHER SITES TO BECOME AVAILABLE. HOWEVER, IT HAS NONETHELESS ALLOCATED RIVENHALL TO TAKE THE SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON IN ADVANCE OF THAT PROCUREMENT PROCESS IN THE KNOWLEDGE THAT ONLY RIVENHALL COULD BE USED IN THE STATED TIME SCALE IN THE AREA COVERED BY THIS PLAN. THIS ASSUMPTION SHOULD NOW BE QUESTIONED GIVEN THAT THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE IN DECEMBER 2016 DUE TO THE FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE BAT. ECC IS THEREFORE ATTEMPTING TO ALLOCATE AN UNBUILT PLANT WHICH IS STILL GOING THROUGH THE PLANNING PROCESS TO TAKE OUTPUT FROM THE BASILDON PLANT. IN ADDITION ECC HAS NO LICENCE FOR A POTENTIAL CONTRACT TO TAKE WASTE MATERIAL IT OWNS. ECC STATES THAT RIVENHALL SHOULD BE ALLOCATED FOR RESIDUAL NON-HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT. MAP 5 DOES NOT ALLOCATE THE RIVEN HALL SITE FOR THIS USE.</p> | |
| 477311, 94 | No | <p>IT DOES NOT PROVIDE CLARITY. THE PLAN SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THIS MATERIAL (ORIGINALLY CALLED OTHER WASTE) IS 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF BECAUSE THE ALLOCATION IS A SPECIFICALLY KNOWN OUTPUT FROM THE OPERATIONAL BASILDON PLANT TO BE TRUCKED TO THE PROPOSED (BUT NOT BUILT) RIVENHALL SITE. IT IS NOT CLEAR THAT THIS IS LEGALLY COMPLIANT. ECC IS PROPOSING TO ALLOCATE THE PROPOSED (BUT NOT BUILT) PRIVATE SITE AT RIVENHALL TO TAKE THE KNOWN SRF/RDF OUTPUT FROM THE BASILDON PLANT. THIS OUTPUT IS LEGALLY OWNED BY ECC AS STATED IN THE OPERATIONAL CONTRACT FOR THE BASILDON PLANT. THEREFORE ECC APPEARS TO BE CONFUSING PLANNING AND PROCUREMENT BY ALLOCATING MATERIAL IT LEGALLY OWNS TO A SPECIFIC SITE. ECC IS AWARE THAT GENT FAIRHEAD, THE APPLICANT FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE HAS SPECIFICALLY STATED</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>IN PLANNING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO ECC THAT RIVENHALL IS THE SITE TO WHICH THE BASILDON SPECIFIC OUTPUT CAN BE SENT. THE PLAN SHOULD BE AMENDED TO ENSURE THAT THERE IS NO SINGLE ALLOCATION MADE FOR THIS SPECIFIC MATERIAL OWNED BY ECC. IT IS WASTEMATERIAL THAT SHOULD BY LAW BE SUBJECT TO AN OPEN PROCUREMENT PROCESS. ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL HAS STATED THAT IT DELAYED ITS FINAL PROCUREMENT PROCESS FOR SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON FOR A FEW YEARS TO ALLOW FURTHER SITES TO COME ON-STREAM BUT HAS NEVERTHELESS ALLOCATED RIVENHALL TO TAKE THE SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON AHEAD OF THAT PROCUREMENT PROCESS KNOWING THAT ONLY RIVENHALL IN THE PLAN AREA COULD BE USED IN THE STATED TIME HORIZON. HOWEVER EVEN THAT ASSUMPTION SHOULD NOW BE QUESTIONED GIVEN THAT THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE IN DECEMBER 2016 BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE BAT (Best Available Technology). ECC IS THEREFORE ATTEMPTING TO ALLOCATE A PLANT THAT HAS NOT BEEN BUILT (AND IS STILL GOING THROUGH PLANNING) AND HAS NO LICENCE, FOR A POTENTIAL CONTRACT TO TAKE WASTE MATERIAL IT OWNS. IN ADDITION, MAP 5 FAILS TO ALLOCATE RIVENHALL FOR RESIDUAL NON-HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT (PREVIOUSLY "OTHER WASTE") AS ECC STATES IT WISHES TO DO.</p> | |
| 1061659, 181 | No | <p>IT DOES NOT CLEAR DETAIL THE PLAN SHOULD MAKE IT PLAIN AND CLEAR THAT THIS MATERIAL IS 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF BECAUSE THE ALLOCATION IS SPECIFICALLY KNOWN OUTPUT FROM THE OPERATIONAL BASILDON PLANT TO BE TRUCKED TO THE PROPOSED (BUT NOT BUILT) RIVENHALL SITE. IT IS QUESTIONABLE WHETHER THIS IS LEGALLY COMPLIANT. ECC IS PROPOSING TO ALLOCATE THE PROPOSED (BUT NOT BUILT) PRIVATE SITE AT RIVENHALL TO TAKE OUTPUT FROM THE BASILDON PLANT. THIS OUTPUT IS KNOWN TO BE</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>SRF/RDF WHICH ECC LEGALLY OWNS AS STATED IN THE OPERATIONAL CONTRACT FOR THE BASILDON PLANT. THEREFORE ECC APPEARS TO BE CONFUSING PLANNING AND PROCUREMENT BY ALLOCATING MATERIAL IT LEGALLY OWNS TO A SPECIFIC SITE. ECC IS AWARE THAT GENT FAIRHEAD, THE APPLICANT FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE HAS SPECIFICALLY STATED IN PLANNING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO ECC THAT RIVENHALL IS THE SITE TO WHICH THE BASILDON SPECIFIC OUTPUT CAN BE SENT. THE PLAN SHOULD BE AMENDED TO ENSURE THAT THERE IS NO SINGLE ALLOCATION MADE FOR THIS SPECIFIC MATERIAL. IT IS WASTE MATERIAL THAT SHOULD BY LAW BE SUBJECT TO AN OPEN PROCUREMENT PROCESS. ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL HAS STATED THAT IT DELAYED ITS FINAL PROCUREMENT PROCESS FOR SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON FOR A FEW YEARS TO ALLOW FURTHER SITES TO COME ON-STREAM BUT HAS NEVERTHELESS ALLOCATED RIVENHALL TO TAKE THE SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON AHEAD OF THAT PROCUREMENT PROCESS KNOWING THAT ONLY RIVENHALL IN THE PLAN AREA COULD BE USED IN THE STATED TIME HORIZON. HOWEVER EVEN THAT ASSUMPTION SHOULD NOW BE QUESTIONED GIVEN THAT THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE IN DECEMBER 2016 BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE BAT. ECC IS THEREFORE ATTEMPTING TO ALLOCATE A PLANT THAT HAS NOT BEEN BUILT (AND IS STILL GOING THROUGH PLANNING) AND HAS NO LICENCE FOR A POTENTIAL CONTRACT TO TAKE WASTE MATERIAL IT OWNS. IN ADDITION, MAP 5 FAILS TO ALLOCATE RIVENHALL FOR RESIDUAL NON-HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT AS ECC STATES IT WISHES TO DO.</p> | |
| 1061682, 198 | No | <p>This does not clearly define what exactly " other waste" actually is. It should be made clear that the 200,000 tonnes of waste per year will be SRF/RDF as this has been allocated from the Basildon plant to be driven down to the Rivenhall site. This site has and may not still be built</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>and is adds additional pollution. It is still unclear if this is even legally allowed. Essex County Council are proposing to allocate the Rivenhall site which as stated above has not even been built or received a permit, to take the SRF/RDF waste from Basildon which coincidentally is owned by ECC as was stated in the operational contract for the plant. It would therefore appears that ECC are allocating their own waste to a specific site. ECC are also aware that the applicant for the site at Rivenhall, Gent Fairhead has stated in their planning documentation that the site at Rivenhall will take the output from the Basildon site. This is not only confusing the planning and procurement by doing this, it is also a conflict of interests I feel. This should therefore be amended so that the waste material should go through an open procurement process and not all be pushed towards an already environmentally unsound plant. Just to boost their figures. ECC had delayed the procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon to allow further sites to come forward, yet have still allocated Rivenhall to take all the waste knowing that this site would be the only one able to take the waste in the time frame. In view of the recent environmental agency permit refusal and the sites failure to demonstrate BAT, their assumption should be questioned as the plant has not been built and has not licence in which to enable a contract between the companies to take the waste.</p> | |
| 988283, Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council, 235 | No | <p>It does not provide clarity. The plan should make it clear that this material (originally called other waste) is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) SRF/RDF because the allocation is a specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant to be trucked to the proposed (but not built) Rivenhall site. It is unclear whether this is legally compliant. ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take the known SRF/RDF output from the Basildon plant. This output is legally owned by ECC as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant, therefore ECC appears to be confusing planning and procurement by allocating material it legally owns to a specific site. ECC is aware that Gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site, has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>can be sent. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material owned by ECC. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex County Council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream, but has nevertheless has allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. That assumption should now be questioned given that the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate bat (best available technology). ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence, for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management (previously "other waste") as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|---|---|
| 1062089, Coggeshall Parish Council, 327 | No | <p>This modification does not provide the intended clarity. We believe the plan should make it clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) srf/rdf because the allocation is specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant to be trucked to the proposed (but not built) Rivenhall site. One of the key aspects of the review is to ensure legal compliance and we do not believe that is legally compliant. It appears that ECC is proposing to allocate the proposed (but not built) private site at Rivenhall to take output from the Basildon plant. this output is known to be srf/rdf which ECC legally owns as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. ECC appears to be allocating material it legally owns to a specific private facility without any adherence to their procurement processes and procedures or those associated with the provision of government contracts. This could, clearly, be interpreted as meaning that agreement has been reached between ECC and Gent Fairhead without either the proper planning or procurement procedures being followed. This would be ultra vires the Councils powers and shows a level of pre-determination. ECC is aware that Gent Fairhead, the applicant for the Rivenhall site, has specifically stated in their planning documents submitted to ECC that Rivenhall is the site to which the Basildon specific output can be sent. We believe the plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. Essex County Council has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for srf/rdf from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-stream but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the srf/rdf from Basildon ahead of that procurement process in the knowledge that only Rivenhall in the plan area and could be used in the stated time horizon. In addition, the inclusion of Rivenhall should now be questioned given that the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016. The refusal was because of the applicants failure to utilise the Best Available Technology (BAT), air quality emissions with predicted emissions more than twice the legal limits and the stack height that is too low for a plant of this size (changes will contravene the</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Secretary of State planning conditions 2010). Consequently, we believe that ECC is clearly attempting to allocate waste material it owns (SRF Form Basildon) to a plant that has not been built, has no operating licence, will require significant redesign, gas dispersion remodelling, an environmental impact assessment and must go through the planning process again before it is even possible to consider processing waste and this does not appear sensible, never mind legal. Consequently, we require an explanation as to why ECC is allocating a plant (Rivenhall) that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence for a potential contract to take waste material it (ECC) owns? In addition, the applicants own response to the EA (Fitchner Report in response to second schedule 5 questions from the EA section 2) clearly stated that if the EA permit was refused the plant would not go ahead and given the above allocating waste to the plant is at best irresponsible. Furthermore, and importantly the plan does not consider any alternatives should the Rivenhall plant may not survive the next round of planning or the next EA permit application and as such the plan must be revisited in light of the accreditation problems the Rivenhall plant faces. We also believe that, MAP 5 is incorrect inasmuch as it fails to allocate Rivenhall for "residual non-hazardous waste management" as ECC states it wishes to do.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 743809, 458 | No | <p>THIS DOES NOT PROVIDE CLARITY. THE PLAN SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THIS MATERIAL IS 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF BECAUSE THE ALLOCATION IS THE SPECIFICALLY KNOWN OUTPUT FROM THE OPERATIONAL BASILDON PLANT - TO BE TRUCKED TO THE PROPOSED (BUT NOT YET BUILT) RIVENHALL SITE. IT IS NOT CLEAR WHETHER THIS IS LEGALLY COMPLIANT. ECC WANTS TO ALLOCATE THE PROPOSED (BUT NOT BUILT) PRIVATE SITE AT RIVENHALL TO TAKE OUTPUT FROM THE ECCBASILDON PLANT. THIS OUTPUT IS KNOWN TO BE SRF/RDF WHICH ECC LEGALLY OWNS (AS STATED IN THE OPERATIONAL CONTRACT FOR THE BASILDON PLANT). THEREFORE ECC APPEARS TO BE CONFUSING PLANNING AND PROCUREMENT BY ALLOCATING MATERIAL IT LEGALLY OWNS TO A SPECIFIC PRIVATELY OWNEDSITE. ECC IS AWARE THAT GENT FAIRHEAD, (APPLICANT FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE) HAS SPECIFICALLY STATED IN ITS PLANNING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO ECC THAT RIVENHALL IS THE SITE TO WHICH THE BASILDON SPECIFIC OUTPUT CAN BE SENT. AMEND THE PLAN : ENSURE THAT THERE IS NO SINGLE ALLOCATION MADE FOR THIS SPECIFIC MATERIAL. SUCH MATERIAL SHOULD BY LAW BE SUBJECT TO AN OPEN PROCUREMENT PROCESS BY ECC . ECC HAS STATED THAT IT DELAYED ITS FINAL PROCUREMENT PROCESS FOR SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON FOR A FEW YEARS TO ALLOW FURTHER SITES TO COME ON-STREAM BUT ECC HAS NEVERTHELESS ALLOCATED RIVENHALL TO TAKE THE SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON AHEAD OF THAT PROCUREMENT PROCESS KNOWING THAT ONLY RIVENHALL IN THE PLAN AREA COULD BE USED IN THE STATED TIME HORIZON. EVEN THAT ASSUMPTION SHOULD NOW BE QUESTIONED PLEASE. NOTE 1: THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE (DECEMBER 2016) BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE BAT. NOTE 2: AS THE SITE DOES NOT HAVE FULL PLANNING CONSENTS NOR A LICENCE TO OPERATE AND THOUGH NOT TO BE DIRECTLY</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>CONSIDERED HERE, I WOULD CALL THE INSPECTORS ATTENTION TO THE PLANNED SHORT STACK. YET WOULD NOT CURRENT TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE HAVE DICTATED LONG AGO THAT A MUCH HIGHER STACK WOULD BE NECESSARY FOR SUCH AN UNDERTAKING ? THIS IS ALSO FURTHER COMPOUNDED BY THE WATER PROCESSING CYCLE SITUATION. ON THE PART OF ECC, IT WOULD APPEAR THAT IT IS THEREFORE ATTEMPTING TO ALLOCATE A PRIVATE PLANT (AT RIVENHALL) THAT HAS NOT YET BEEN BUILT (AND IS STILL GOING THROUGH PLANNING). IMPORTANTLY, ECCHAS NO LICENCE FOR A POTENTIAL CONTRACT TO TAKE WASTE MATERIAL IT OWNS. MAP 5 FAILS TO ALLOCATE RIVENHALL FOR "RESIDUAL NON-HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT" AS ECC STATES IT WISHES TO DO.</p> | |
| 1063344, 473 | No | <p>THIS DOES NOT SEEM TO BE LEGALLY COMPLIANT AS ECC IS PLANNING TO ALLOCATE MATERIAL FROM THE BASILDON PLANT, WHICH IT OWNS TO THE PROPOSED RIVENHALL FACILITY WHEREAS THE ALLOCATION OF MATERIAL OWNED BY ECC SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO AN OPEN PROCUREMENT PROCESS. THE PLAN SHOULD BE AMENDED TO ENSURE THERE IS NO SINGLE ALLOCATION, FOR THIS SPECIFIC MATERIAL. ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL STATED THAT IT POSTPONED ITS FINAL PROCUREMENT PROCESS FOR SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON FOR A SEVERAL YEARS SO THAT FURTHER SITES COULD COME INTO OPERATION YET HAS ALLOCATED RIVENHALL TO TAKE THE SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON AHEAD OF THAT PROCUREMENT PROCESS IN THE KNOWLEDGE THAT RIVENHALL WOULD BE THE ONLY SITE IN THE PLAN AREA AVAILABLE IN THE STATED TIME HORIZON. EVEN THAT ASSUMPTION SHOULD BE QUESTIONED SINCE THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE IN DECEMBER 2016 DUE TO THE FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE BAT. ECC IS THUS TRYING TO ALLOCATE A PLANT THAT HAS NOT BEEN BUILT (AND IS STILL GOING THROUGH PLANNING) AND HAS NO LICENCE FOR A</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | POTENTIAL CONTRACT TO TAKE WASTE MATERIAL IT OWNS. IN ADDITION, MAP 5 FAILS TO ALLOCATE RIVENHALL FOR RESIDUAL NON-HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT AS ECC STATES IT WISHES TO DO. | |
| 618724, 512 | No | THIS DOES NOT PROVIDE CLARITY. THE PLAN SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THIS MATERIAL IS 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF. THE WASTE IS SPECIFICALLY A KNOWN OUTPUT FROM THE OPERATIONAL BASILDON PLANT ALLOCATED TO THE PROPOSED (BUT NOT BUILT) RIVENHALL SITE. THE PROPOSED TEXT IS AN IMPROVEMENT ON THE VAGUE OTHER WASTE PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED BUT STILL DOES NOT PROPERLY DEFINE THE MATERIAL. IT IS NOT CLEAR THAT THIS IS LEGALLY COMPLIANT. ECC IS PROPOSING TO ALLOCATE THE PROPOSED (BUT NOT BUILT) PRIVATE SITE AT RIVENHALL TO TAKE THE SRF/RDF OUTPUT FROM THE BASILDON PLANT. THIS OUTPUT IS WASTE MATERIAL WHICH ECC LEGALLY OWNS - AS STATED IN THE OPERATIONAL CONTRACT FOR THE BASILDON PLANT. THEREFORE ECC APPEARS TO BE CONFUSING PLANNING AND PROCUREMENT BY ALLOCATING MATERIAL IT LEGALLY OWNS TO A SPECIFIC PRIVATE SITE. ECC IS ALSO AWARE THAT GENT FAIRHEAD, THE APPLICANT FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE HAS SPECIFICALLY STATED IN PLANNING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO ECC THAT RIVENHALL IS THE SITE TO WHICH THE BASILDON SPECIFIC OUTPUT CAN BE SENT. THE PLAN SHOULD BE AMENDED TO ENSURE THAT THERE IS NO SINGLE ALLOCATION MADE FOR THIS SPECIFIC MATERIAL. IT IS WASTE MATERIAL THAT SHOULD BY LAW BE SUBJECT TO AN OPEN PROCUREMENT PROCESS. ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL HAS STATED THAT IT DELAYED ITS FINAL PROCUREMENT PROCESS FOR SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON FOR A FEW YEARS TO ALLOW FURTHER SITES TO COME ON-STREAM BUT HAS NEVERTHELESS ALLOCATED RIVENHALL TO TAKE THE SRF/RDF FROM BASILDON AHEAD OF THAT PROCUREMENT PROCESS | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>KNOWING THAT ONLY RIVENHALL IN THE PLAN AREA COULD BE USED IN THE STATED TIME HORIZON. HOWEVER EVEN THAT ASSUMPTION COULD NOW BE QUESTIONED GIVEN THAT THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REFUSED THE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR THE RIVENHALL SITE IN DECEMBER 2016 BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE TO DEMONSTRATE BAT. ECC IS THEREFORE ATTEMPTING TO ALLOCATE ITS OWN WASTE TO A PLANT THAT HAS NOT BEEN BUILT (AND IS STILL GOING THROUGH PLANNING) AND HAS NO LICENCE, AND HAS DELAYED ITS PROCUREMENT TENDER PROCESS IN ORDER IN PART IN THE HOPE THAT RIVENHALL WILL BE BUILT. HOW IS THAT LEGALLY COMPLIANT ? IN ADDITION, MAP 5 FAILS TO ALLOCATE RIVENHALL FOR RESIDUAL NON-HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT AS ECC STATES IT WISHES TO DO.</p> | |
| 911132, Cressing Parish Council, 522 | No | <p>This does not provide clarity. The plan should be clear that this material is 200,000 tonnes per annum (TPA) SRF/RDF because the allocation is a specifically known output from the operational Basildon plant to be trucked to the proposed Rivenhall site. It is not clear that this is legally compliant. It is proposed to allocate the proposed private site at Rivenhall to take the known SRF/RDF output from the Basildon plant. This output is legally owned by ECC as stated in the operational contract for the Basildon plant. Therefore planning and procurement appears to be confused by allocating material ECC legally owns to a specific site. The applicant for the Rivenhall site has specifically stated in planning documents submitted to ECC that the Basildon output can be sent to the Rivenhall site. The plan should be amended to ensure that there is no single allocation made for this specific material owned by ECC. It is waste material that should by law be subject to an open procurement process. ECC has stated that it delayed its final procurement process for SRF/RDF from Basildon for a few years to allow further sites to come on-board but has nevertheless allocated Rivenhall to take the SRF/RDF from Basildon ahead of that procurement process knowing that only Rivenhall in the plan area could be used in the stated time horizon. However that assumption should</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M46? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | now be questioned given that the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 because of the failure to demonstrate BAT (best available technology). ECC is therefore attempting to allocate a plant that has not been built (and is still going through planning) and has no licence, for a potential contract to take waste material it owns. In addition, map 5 fails to allocate Rivenhall for residual non-hazardous waste management (previously "other waste") as ECC states it wishes to do. | |

Modification M47 – Little Bullocks and Crumps Farm, Great and Little Canfield and Newport Quarry

No Comments Received

Modification M48 – Festival Business Park, Basildon

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M47? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 934262, C A Telecom, 23 | Unrelated | We can confirm that COLT Utility Services are within one of the areas of your enquiry, Festival Business Park, Basildon. All other locations are not affected. See attachment - 'Map of Colt Utility Service area of Festival Business Park in Basildon' | |
| 735401, Basildon Borough Council, 144 | Yes | The Council supports this modification as a factual update. | |

Modification M49 – Land off Axial Way, Myland, Colchester

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M49? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| 990583, The Churchmanor Estates Co Plc, 19 | No | This has consequential effects on the designation of Areas of Search as defined on the relevant maps. We therefore object to the relevant modifications 49 and 50. | At Appendix 21 the land that has been removed (currently allocated for employment development) should be reinstated i.e. that between the community stadium and the land retained in the Area of Search |

Modification M50 – Tollgate, Stanway, Colchester

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M50? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|--|
| 990583, The Churchmanor Estates Co Plc, 20 | No | This has consequential effects on the designation of Areas of Search as defined on the relevant maps. We therefore object to the relevant modifications 49 and 50. | At Appendix 22 (land at Tollgate) the area immediately to the north of the Wyvern farm residential development (currently allocated for employment development) should also be retained. |

Modification M51 – Langston Road/Oakwood Hill, Loughton, Epping Forest

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M51? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 922196, 25 | No | I have received advice from EFDC's Assistant Director of Environment following a conversation he had with the Head of ECC Commission for Waste that I should continue to make my comments through the consultation process and therefore my comments and objections relate to a previously proposed Waste site W19 at Hastingwood M11 J7 Epping Forest District and a site mentioned in Appendix 23 - Langston Road/Oakwood Hill, Loughton Epping Forest District. Appendix 23 - Langston Road, Loughton, Epping Forest District - I object to this site being | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M51? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | included in the waste plan. I understand that the boundary in Langston Road has now been altered. It would be more helpful to confirm that EFDC's site has been withdrawn by ECC from the potential list of waste sites. Planning consent has been granted for EFDC to develop a Retail Park in Langston Road. The construction of these retail units is underway and the necessary associated roadworks have been commenced in consultation with ECC. | |
| 1058318, Loughton Town Council, 32 | Unrelated | However, we draw Essex County Councils attention to an amendment required to the plan in Appendix 23 on page 85. This should be re-labelled to correct the reference to Langston Road and Oakwood Hill and not Langston Road and Oakland. | |
| 1058324, Transport for London, 36 | Unrelated | Thank you for consulting Transport for London (TfL) on the modifications to the replacement Essex Waste Local Plan following the recent Examination in Public. TfL notes the minor factual modification reflecting recent planning permissions at the Langston Road/Oakwood Hill area of search which is adjacent to London Undergrounds Central Line tracks and Debden station. I can confirm that TfL has no comment to make on the proposed modifications | |

Modification M52 – Glossary ‘Residual Waste’

No Comments Received

Modification M53 – Glossary ‘Water Bodies’

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification M53? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1063440, Natural England, 498 | Yes | We support the clarification proposed. | |

Unrelated Representations

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| 1053529, Essex Chambers of Commerce, 5 | Unrelated | Thank you for details of the above consultation. Having read through the consultation documents we have no comments to make on the proposed amendments. | |
| 1056431, Highways England, 6 | Unrelated | Thank you for your consultation. We are content that the proposals will not have a severe impact upon the Strategic Road Network. | |
| 609943, KTI Energy Limited, 14 | Unrelated | Government Policy In the preparation of its Replacement Waste Local Plan, Essex County Council is obliged to comply with s.2.5.26 and s.2.5.27 of National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) 2011, s.97 of National Planning Policy Framework 2012, and s.1 and s.4 of National Planning Policy for Waste 2014. In each case, Government policy expects Essex County Council to identify opportunity for Combined Heat & Power with particular emphasis upon promoting sustainable development amongst communities. That should tell the County Council that emphasis should be placed upon maximising mitigation of climate change by the installation of extensive district heating networks which deliver low carbon heat to new and | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>existing properties. S1 2010 No 695 The Replacement Waste Local Plan is authorised to promote all those waste disposal projects which are authorised by Environment Agency under Chapter 5, viz. landfill, incineration and processing. There is no evidence that Essex County Council is authorised to promote power projects fired by virgin/waste biomass fuel which are authorised by Environment Agency under Chapter 1 of that document as private utilities. Furthermore, Essex County Council believes itself qualified to dismiss the proposed licensed renewable CHP scheme serving Dunton Garden Village by its wrongful belief that it is an incinerator on Green Belt land hence justifying issue of "Red" against the traffic signal assessment it uses for new waste disposal facilities. Dunton Garden Village The Minister on 2 January 2017, when awarding the Brentwood side of Dunton Garden Village its enhanced status, removed that land from the Green Belt. KTI Energy Limited responded by inviting Basildon Borough Council to modify its Local Plan to do the same with its half of the Village. The outcome is the attached letter and site plans which will enable both local authorities to achieve their climate change obligations. The CHP plant itself has been re-located on the Brentwood side of land in the ownership of Barrie Stone to be out of Green Belt. The alignment of 7.5km long district heating main from Friern Manor Farm to Gardiners Lane South is described elsewhere for Basildon Borough Council to plan and enter into its Local Plan. The Schedule of Modifications confirms Essex County Council is evaluating an eastern CHP project. However, it is unlikely to achieve the 60,000kWth to 75,000kWth heat target set for the western scheme. Request of Essex County Council The formal request made of Essex County Council is that it cooperates with East London Waste Authority, Basildon Borough Council and Brentwood Borough Council in the provision of virgin/waste biomass fuel according to schedule:- a) Essex County</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Council to produce 200,000 t/a fuel to specification from MSW for delivery to the CHP plant on Friern Manor Farm; b) East London Waste Authority to produce 200,000 t/a fuel to specification from MSW for delivery to the CHP plant on Friern Manor Farm; c) 2nd tier waste contractors operating in London/Essex to produce 200,000 t/a fuel to specification from C&I/C&D waste for delivery to the CHP plant on Friern Manor Farm.</p> <p>This request is legitimately founded upon policy expressed by both Essex County Council and East London Waste Authority several years ago that the production of virgin/waste biomass fuel from household and non-household waste is to be deployed for Chapter 1 power/CHP generation process and not Chapter 5 incineration process. The Rivenhall incinerator hence is not an approved outlet for fuel produced by the Burnt Mills processing plant. See attachment - KTI Energy; correspondence with Basildon Council.</p> | |
| 1057637, Peterborough City Council, 21 | Unrelated | I have read through the proposed modifications to the Replacement Waste Local Plan and do not have any comments to make. Please however keep me informed of future consultations. | |
| 922196, , 24 | Unrelated | I have received advice from EFDC's Assistant Director of Environment following a conversation he had with the Head of ECC Commission for Waste that I should continue to make my comments through the consultation process and therefore my comments and objections relate to a previously proposed Waste site W19 at Hastingwood M11 J7 Epping Forest District and a site mentioned in Appendix 23 - Langston Road/Oakwood Hill, Loughton Epping Forest District. W19 M11 J7 Epping Forest District - This is a totally inappropriate site as it is in the Green Belt. it makes an important contribution in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. There are 5 houses including a Grade 2 listed building in close proximity to the proposed site. In addition there is St Clare's Hospice nearby. These would have to endure even greater noise, dust | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>and dirt and it would be detrimental to their amenity. In addition Listed Building Latton Priory (Augustian) is also in the vicinity. Adjacent to the proposed site is a McDonald's restaurant and also a cafe/restaurant at the adjacent Garden Centre. Food outlets such as these would be affected by the dirt and dust and food preparation could be compromised. The amenity of customers and users of both these sites would be affected. Ingress and Egress with the intensification of HGV's serving the site would increase congestion on an already over capacity junction. The slow moving lorries would contribute to further backing up and queuing at junction7. This junction is constantly jammed at present due to the volume of traffic, particularly at peak times. Any problems/accidents on M25 brings even greater traffic along this route and even greater gridlock being created, which is affecting the towns of Epping and Harlow. In addition, there are the problems it causes to the village of Hastingwood eg Volume of Rat runners and huge HGV's using a rural country road, where they are over the centre line of the road. There would also be a further deterioration in the air quality surrounding Junction 7. Highway Officers have stated that even with introduction of J7A, Junction 7 would continue to be over capacity as there is likely to be significant growth around Harlow.</p> | |
| 1058318, Loughton Town Council, 33 | Unrelated | On behalf of Loughton Town Council, I write to advise that members have considered the consultation documents but did not wish to comment on the proposed modifications. | |
| 910365, Brentwood Borough Council, 37 | Unrelated | Thank you for consulting Brentwood Borough Council on the Essex and Southend-on-Sea Replacement Waste Local Plan Schedule of Modifications. I can confirm that at the Planning and Licensing Committee on the 24 January 2017 members resolved to approve a response of 'no comment' to the consultation. | |
| 922471, | Unrelated | At the Planning and Highways Committee held on 26 January | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|---|---|
| Galleywood Parish Council, 108 | | 2017 it was agreed to submit a comment of No Comment on the Joint Replacement Waste Local Plan. | |
| 1060937, Colchester Cycling Campaign, 114 | No | Please ignore the "no" above. CCC has only just heard of this consultation. We would like to make a late appeal for inclusion of the following: :: The imposition of standards that align with the current policy of Transport for London and associated local government organisations in the London area to cover control and supervision of ECC and contractors' vehicles. These standards should ensure that all vehicles meet the current and ongoing safety standards for lorries in respect of visibility of and protection for cyclists and pedestrians, especially in urban situations. The imposition of standards that align with the current policy of Transport for London and associated local government organisations in the London area to cover control and supervision of ECC and contractors' vehicles. These standards should ensure that all vehicles meet the current and forthcoming emissions standards for lorries and other vehicles. Installation of real-time air quality monitors in areas where there are maximum lorry movements (i.e. within the yard and any nearby homes, retail). | |
| 1061567, Maldon District Council, 150 | Unrelated | Thank you for giving Maldon District Council the opportunity to consider and respond to the consultation on the Essex County Council Replacement Waste Local Plan Schedule of Modifications. We note the modifications made to the Waste Plan but do not wish to make any representations at this stage. The Council reserves the right to make representations to any further modifications made to the plan. | |
| 1062089, Coggeshall Parish Council, 333 | Unrelated | We believe the plan does nothing other than regurgitate the existing approach to waste, when a paradigm shift is needed. We wish to express our disappointment that the plan does not reflect ECC own published waste plan and their intent to be 50-60% recycled relying on a Burn and Bury solution with a total lack of forward thinking to addressing waste with no | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | consideration being given to innovative schemes such as those repurposing plastics for construction bricks for example. | |
| 741248, Ongar Town Council, 337 | Unrelated | At the Councils Planning, Environment and Public Relations committee held on the 9th February 2017, councillors confirmed that they had no comments to make on the proposed modifications of the Plan. | |
| 1062191, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Magnox Limited, 355 | Unrelated | Paragraph 5.3 It is noted that the WPA has proposed no modification to paragraph 5.3. The NDA and Magnox Limited reiterate their previous comment that the following text should be added to paragraph 5.3 to acknowledge and clarify the statutory position with regard to the proximity principle and the management of radioactive waste (and to align with the principles of the NPPW): "Proposals for the management of radioactive waste emanating from beyond the Plan area should meet a need that is not provided for in the area of origin. They should also comply with national strategies for waste management and for radioactive waste management specifically, in the latter case including those produced by the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority." Waste planning authorities (WPAs) are required to have regard to Article 16 of EU Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC, which requires Member States to take account of the principles of self-sufficiency and proximity. Whilst Directive 2008/98/EC specifically excludes radioactive waste from its scope in Article 2, from a radioactive waste management perspective, disposals of waste are subject to the requirement of Best Available Techniques (BAT) for which the proximity principle is a factor the EA would expect to be considered. National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) (October 2014) describes the Governments ambition to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management. Key principles in the NPPW include the consideration of need for additional waste management capacity of more than local significance, collaborative working between waste planning | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | authorities, and account for waste management arising in more than one waste planning authority area where only a limited number of facilities would be required or existing facilities are under-utilised. | |
| 1062191, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Magnox Limited, 358 | Unrelated | Appendix A It is noted that the WPA has proposed no modification to Appendix A of the Pre-Submission Draft version of the RWLP. Appendix A details the policy context to the Plan. Reference to up-to-date policy within this Appendix is critical as it underpins the references to national strategy, policy and guidance that are contained throughout the RWLP. The current absence of the NDA Strategy from the list of "National Policy and Strategy" needs to be addressed and the relationship of the strategy to the RWLP, given the presence of nuclear radioactive waste streams in Essex and the neighbouring WPAs of Suffolk and Kent, needs to be acknowledged. As such, the NDA and Magnox Limited reiterate their previous comment that Appendix A should include reference to the following: UK Strategy for the Management of Solid Low Level Waste from the Nuclear Industry (February 2016) Nuclear Decommissioning Authority Strategy Effective from April 2016 ("NDA Strategy III") National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) | |
| 1062191, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and Magnox Limited, 361 | Unrelated | This representation has been made by GVA on behalf of the NDA and Magnox Limited in response to the current consultation on the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Replacement Waste Local Plan, Schedule of Modifications. In summary, while the NDA and Magnox Limited welcome amendments to the RWLP to ensure consistency with their representations to the consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft version of the RWLP, they maintain their view that further minor modifications (as detailed within this letter) are still required for the Plan to be considered sound. | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 923423, Fairfield Partnership, 488 | Unrelated | <p>I write on behalf of our client Fairfield (Elsenham) Ltd (part of and hereafter referred to as The Fairfield Partnership (TFP)) in response to the above consultation. TFP controls land to the north east of Elsenham in Uttlesford District and is promoting long-term, strategic development in this location. TFP has played an active role in Replacement Waste Local Plan and has made written representations at the Issues and Options stage, Revised Preferred Approach stage and Pre-Submission stage with reference to allocation Site W8, Elsenham TFP has no comment to make on the proposed modifications as published. However, in reviewing background information related to the examination it is noted that the hearing agenda for Day 2 included a supplementary question: Q54: what does the dismissal of the recent appeal (2213025) indicate as regards the possibility of housing in the vicinity during the plan period? TFP is concerned that the Inspector did not seek its views on this point: 1. The Parish Council who were present at the Examination were active participants in opposing the appeal proposals. 2. TFP were the appellant. As a participant in the Replacement Waste Local Plan process, and in the interests of balance TFPs views should have been sought on this matter. In view of the above concerns, TFP would welcome your confirmation whether the Inspector has attached weight to any views expressed on Q54 in arriving at the proposed modifications to the Waste Local Plan, and in considering the soundness of allocation Site W8, Elsenham. I would also welcome sight of any notes that may exist of the discussions of Q54 at the Examination.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1064021, Manchester Airport Group, 505 | Unrelated | <p>London Stansted Airport is an officially safeguarded aerodrome and under ODPM Circular 1/2003 (Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosive Storage areas: The Town and Country Planning Direction 2002), there is an obligation on local planning authorities to consult safeguarded airports on planning applications for developments which have the potential to impact the safe operation of aircraft or which may prejudice the Airports future development. The safeguarding map, which is issued to local planning authorities by the Civil Aviation Authority, shows the extent of the safeguarded area and sets out the requirements for statutory consultation with the Airport. The safeguarded area for Stansted Airport covers part of Essex County and it is therefore important that aviation operations are protected. Further to our previous response to the Essex County Council and Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Joint Replacement Waste Local Plan consultation, we wish to re-emphasise that of the proposed Strategic Site Allocations, there are a number of sites located close enough to the Airport to require further assessment, these are: Elsenham, Uttlesford (Reg 18 ref: W8); Crumps Farm, Gt and Lt Canfield, Uttlesford (Reg 18 ref: W32); Little Bullocks Farm, Great and Little Canfield, Uttlesford (Reg 18 ref: L(n)7R); Little Bullocks Farm, Great and Little Canfield, Uttlesford (Reg 18 ref: L(n)8R). The above allocations, and other waste development applications that may come forward within the airports safeguarding area, will require assessment from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective on a site-by-site basis. In line with ODPM Circular 1/2003 (Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosive Storage areas: The Town and Country Planning Direction 2002), the aerodrome safeguarding authority must be consulted on applications that are within 13km of the aerodrome that have the potential to attract birds. For example, significant areas of landscaping, water bodies, nature reserves, waste facilities, sewage works and mineral</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | extraction or quarrying. In addition, certain open-air waste centres have the potential to increase the level of bird activity in the vicinity of the airport. Consequently such proposals require a detailed assessment and potential controls and mitigation measures to ensure the risk of bird strike is not increased. These can be considered as proposals are brought forward at the application stage. | |
| 908779, Chelmsford City Council, 545 | Unrelated | Thank you for consulting Chelmsford City Council on the above consultation. Please be advised that we have no comments to make on the proposed modifications. This response has been agreed by Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Chelmsford City Councils Development Policy Committee and the Director of Sustainable Communities. | |
| 1064805, Environment Agency, 556 | Unrelated | Thank you for consulting us on the modifications to the plan. Our apologies for the late response, however, we write to confirm we have no objections to any of the modifications proposed. | |
| 983846, Network Rail, 557 | Unrelated | As the proposal at this stage is an outlined document, we have no comments at this stage, however it would be prudent to keep us informed of any site specific proposals that are within 250 meters of the railway as this will give us an opportunity to review and assess the risk to our infrastructure and we will respond accordingly. | |
| 1064832, Medway Council, 558 | Unrelated | Having assessed the modifications, we have no further comment to make regarding the plan; however we would like to continue to be informed of further progress towards its adoption. | |

MC2 – Site Assessment and Methodology Report Addendum

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|---|---|
| M17 – Morses Lane, Brightlingsea | | | |
| 1057254 (15) | No | <p>Thank you for the opportunity to both view and comment on http://www.essex.gov.uk/Environment%20Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Documents/MC2_%20SiteAssMethod_ReportAddendum%20_January2017FINAL.pdf</p> <p>In Site Selection Criteria 3D , - Proximity to Sensitive Receptors, your very thorough appraisal highlights and flags up that</p> <p>in this category 3 RED Judgements are shown. Highlighting the impact that this development would have on nearby homes, school etc. Surely on these judgements alone, notwithstanding the other amber3 judgements, this development cannot be allowed to proceed as this site is quite unsuitable.</p> <p>Furthermore Brightlingsea has only one road in and out and an increase in traffic would be detrimental to the highway and the additional pollution we would all have to suffer.</p> <p>As I have pointed out previously why not use the Martin's Farm site which would have few of the potential problems that you have identified with Morses Lane site.</p> | |
| 984933, 126 | No | <p>This comment relates to Main Modification 17 regarding site W31 Morse's Lane, Brightlingsea. I submit that the Modification, while welcome, fails to address the two major points of my comment on the Pre-Submission Draft, reference 351. Specifically:- (1) Map 3 of the Draft RWLP, which purports to show all existing and under-construction facilities in Essex, is deficient by the exclusion of the Oliver's Wharf waste-</p> | <p>(a) The Examiner should require Essex CC to provide a complete version of Map 3. This should be examined to determine if new data indicates revision of the Site Allocations. (b) The Judgements Guidance of code Red for criteria in 3D (Proximity to Sensitive Receptors) does not actually give any guidance as to what it indicates. I submit that it should indicate further study is</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>handling facility at Brightlingsea Harbour. I note that the Morse's Lane Applicant, Eastern Waste Disposal (EWD), has submitted a new Proforma wherein section 3D acknowledges that "The site is within 1km of Brightlingsea, which is within 1km of an existing waste management facility. Therefore, there is a potential for cumulative effects." Consequently, the criterion 3D judgements have changed to code Red, acknowledging that Brightlingsea residents will be exposed geographically to a double jeopardy from Oliver's Wharf and Morse's Lane. I welcome this recognition, but seek further clarification (see changes, below). I note also that Oliver's Wharf has a wider permission ("Unspecified Transfer") than Morse's Lane. As a consequence, it is now being used by EWD for hazardous waste material handling (WEEE, large domestic appliances). I note also that another preferred applicant, JJ Prior (JJP), submitting for site L15 Fingringhoe Quarry as an inert landfill site, has selected Oliver's Wharf as an export waste transfer point (for shipments to Ballast Quay). The above facts are material to the Site Selection process, as they are contributory to the "cumulative effects" of the two sites. (2) I expressed the opinion that the Critical Path as regards road traffic was the "Last Mile and a Half" between Site W31 Morse's Lane and Brightlingsea Harbour. This comment was dismissed by the examiner because "It has not been suggested by the site promoter that transport of waste will be from wharf facilities in Brightlingsea". Yet, the Applicant's Proforma has been scored three code Greens for Traffic & Transport because it has "Appropriate connection to a wharf". Brightlingsea port was deemed unsuitable for expansion in the 2007 Tendring District Local Plan, due to constraints of the adjacent road network. This policy was endorsed by the Department of the Environment. Despite this, traffic has increased relentlessly since the re-opening of Oliver's Wharf in 2015. It is essential that EWD submit a credible plan for their usage of this critical path. It is already a</p> | <p>required. The examiner should seek clarification of this point, then incorporate the appropriate indication into the Proforma for Morse's Lane. (c) The allocation of code Green for criteria in 2B (Traffic & Transport) at Morse's Lane should be changed to Amber 3, indicating that a major issue (traffic path to harbour) requires further study. (d) The examiner should inform JJP that I have commented on their prospective use of Oliver's Wharf in connection with their application for Site L15 Fingringhoe Quarry.</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>major user of the wharf for export of its separation products (firewood, metal) from Morse's Lane. Also, EWD feed substantial van and LGV traffic directly to the harbour estate, where their WEEE recycling operation is based. It is perfectly sensible to infer that the wharf and harbour estate play a major part in EWD's operational plans for expansion at Morse's Lane. As I noted in section (1) above, JJP have elected to use Oliver's Wharf for exports to Fingringhoe. Also, there is now a substantial flow of imported aggregates, primarily for Silverton (a materials retailer). These two flows will exacerbate demand on Brightlingsea's limited traffic capacity, and they should consider in conjunction with EWD's traffic demand. As regards physical aspects of this critical path, it is notable that inward harbour traffic takes a signed divergence from the B1029 at the end of Church Road. The route is then Spring Chase/Lower Park Road/Colne Road/Waterside onto Copperas Road (the "Dock Road") at the harbour estate. Colne Road is a particular bottleneck, being single-lane with passing points, and Waterside is single lane, both constraints being due to street parking. New Street, the final stretch of the B1029 within Brightlingsea settlement, is presently being improved, and will likely be subjected to overflow traffic. Further capacity can only be achieved by routing inward traffic over the B1029 and return traffic over the existing harbour route. Both routes are in densely-populated and densely-used areas, and I am concerned for the amenity of residents and (particularly) users of Brightlingsea Infants and Junior Schools. In conclusion: For the above reasons I submit that Main Modification 17 has not been positively prepared. Thus the examination of the Application for expansion of Site W31 Morse's Lane does not meet the requirement for soundness.</p> | |
| 1061227, 125 | No | <p>The site is in the town and not 1km from the settlement. The dwellings in Samsons road are not new construction at least 50yrs old. The site is surrounded on 3 sides by houses, a school and a supermarket. The highway as highways would</p> | <p>As it is impossible to contain dust in the lorries or on site , for the health of the town free from dust and noise this operation should not be approved in this location. My suggestion is to install it away from built up areas ,</p> |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>know if they had done a survey is not wide enough for max width lorries most of the way to Frating. Representing Breathe Easy support groups for the British lung foundation we are currently campaigning for clean air in urban areas nationally in line with governments high priority in this area It is of great concern that an increase in diesel particulates and dust will not only have a detrimental effect on people with a lung condition but overall. As you are well aware Inert waste may be biologically stable but is still harmful when ingested. For your information the discharge from ex plant have already entered the supermarket Aircon vents on occasions ,the odours making it a very unpleasant environment</p> | <p>schools etc. and built it either next to the Viola transfer tip on the A120 or to the closed amenity site at Martins Farm</p> |
| 1061547, 146 | Yes | <p>I agree with the revision of Appendix 15 Table 14 to upgrade Morses Lane Assessment Sources - 3D from Amber 3 to Red and 3K from Green to Amber 2.</p> | |
| 981289, 202 | No | <p>I have looked at the proposed modifications to the Joint Replacement Waste Local Plan, site selection criteria 3D and note that 3 RED and also AMBER 3 judgements are shown with regard to proximity to sensitive receptors in the Morses Lane site. This highlights the harmful impact that this development will have on the surrounding environment. As a result I feel that this site is quite unsuitable for the proposed development and should not be allowed to proceed. I was also very disappointed to see that traffic access to the site had been given a green judgement. How can this be considered acceptable when the increase in lorry traffic to the site will be by way of a small local road with residential buildings, a secondary school and a supermarket in close proximity? The increase in traffic pollution will be detrimental to the health and safety of local residents. An alternative site should be found which allows traffic access by main roads only and is not within a residential area. I hope you take these points into consideration when making a final decision on the proposed development.</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1062280, NEEB, 384 | No | <p>I write on behalf of NEEB Holdings Ltd in connection with the current focused consultation being held in respect of the above. We wish to make the following comments in respect of the document. We maintain our objection to the inclusion of site W31 of the proposed Replacement Waste Local Plan. We have identified omissions and inaccuracies in the site assessment for W31 which are set out under the heading MC2: Site Assessment and Selection/Methodology Report addendum below. We respectfully request that the site be reassessed in light of these points. We believe that the site is unsuitable and should not be allocated for waste development. Notwithstanding the foregoing we note the Inspectors findings in relation to the draft plan and, should the plan progress without the omission of site W31 once our comments have been addressed, we respectfully request that the changes detailed below are made prior to it progressing.</p> <p>MC2: Site Assessment and Selection/Methodology Report addendum Page 4 W31 - Morses Lane, Brightlingsea, Tendring (Main 17) Table introduced as follows Significant issues from the site assessment for Morses Lane include:</p> <p>RESPONSE: the table provides an estimated capacity of 75,000tpa information in the public domain suggests that this capacity will not be fulfilled despite the plan identifying significant need for facilities of the type proposed this suggests that the Plan is partially undeliverable</p> <p>DETAIL: representations made by the promoter dated February 2016 state: ECC wants to make available 75,000 tonnes of extra inert processing capacity at Morses Lane. EWD proposes that this capacity in reality is split between Brightlingsea and Ardleigh, purely to limit lorry movements. This indicates that the site would actually deliver only half of the capacity it is proposed to be allocated for. The allocations</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>ability to meet the needs identified in the plan has not therefore been demonstrated and it is respectfully suggested that the site should not be allocated on the basis that it compromises the delivery of the plan</p> <p>Page 42 Stage 3 Site Selection Criteria Stage 3D Proximity to Sensitive Receptors</p> <p>RESPONSE: the site receives are judgement in respect of all types of waste management facilities in relation to this criterion - the purpose of the scoring system is presumably to assess the suitability of the various sites being considered the Red judgement must therefore indicate that the site is unsuitable and should not be progressed</p> <p>DETAIL: The Councils response to the Inspectors Main Matters and Issues states that: It is noted in the representations that there is no mention of the school under Criterion 3D Proximity to Sensitive Receptors and therefore there is the potential that the school may not have been included in the assessment. However, even if the school Essex and Southend-on-Sea Replacement Waste Local Plan- Examination Response to Inspectors Main Matters and Issues was to be factored in to the assessment, due to the score being calculated using address points, this would not change the score from Amber 3 to Red. This implies that a change in the score from Amber 3 to Red would be significant. The fact that the site does in fact score Red and not Amber 3 is significant and highlights site W31s inherent unsuitability for accommodating a waste transfer station and waste processing There are a number of existing and approved sensitive receptors within 250 metres of the site in relation to waste transfer stations Planning for Waste Management Facilities: A Research Study provides: Sites closer than 250 m from residential, commercial, or recreational areas should be</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>avoided. Transfer routes away from residential areas are also preferable. Taking into account the sites Red judgement and the guidance provided by Planning for Waste Management Facilities it is contended that the site is not suitable for waste management development and therefore that it should be removed from the draft Plan</p> <p>Page 52 Stage 3 Site Selection Criteria Stage 3L Proximity to Key Centres of Growth</p> <p>RESPONSE: the assessment approach adopted for this criterion is flawed</p> <p>DETAIL: The Council argues in its response to the Inspectors Main Matters and Issues states that: Within the Site Assessment and Methodology Report (SD-16), the performance of sites in relation to the proximity principle was assessed under Criterion 3L- Proximity to Key Growth Centres. This is calculated as the shortest distance (measured as the crow flies) between the site boundary and the boundary of each growth centre. Morses Lane (W31) scored green in respect of Criterion 3L; the site is calculated as being 8km away from the nearest centre of growth; Colchester. If distances had been calculated to the urban growth centre or by highway travel distances, this would change the score from Green to Amber 1. However as all sites have been calculated in the same manner, this would not change the overall outcome of the site assessment process. This is not correct. The fact that the same approach has been taken to assessing all sites does not make the assessment sound. Driving distances between key centres and proposed sites in comparison to as the crow flies distances will vary significantly. Driving distances will be significantly more than The as the crow flies distances in some cases, whereas in others the two may be similar. As the crow files distances are therefore not an</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>appropriate proxy for proximity of sites to key centres. It is respectfully requested that all sites be reassessed against this criteria using driving distances rather than as the crow flies distances</p> <p>Councils response to the Inspectors Main Matters and Issues Page 1 6.1 Is the allocation deliverable having regard to highway and traffic considerations, including the safety of uses of the nearby school?</p> <p>RESPONSE: the Councils response document states: The site is located within an existing industrial estate, with waste related activities already occurring on the site. this is inaccurate and misleading and it is requested that it be corrected</p> <p>DETAIL: The site is not within and existing industrial estate and does not have waste related activities occurring on it While the site is allocated as and Allocated Employment Site and a Principal Business and Industrial Area it should be noted that the site is vacant / managed grassland and is undeveloped Requested changes</p> <p>MC2: Site Assessment and Selection/Methodology Report addendum Page 38 Stage 3 Site Selection Criteria Stage 3A planning background</p> <p>RESPONSE: the justification text provided in respect of all three types of possible facility is factually incorrect it is requested that this be corrected</p> <p>DETAIL: reference is made to previous permissions being granted for a waste transfer station and for an increase in tonnage restrictions for the same facility (ESSO/04/05/TEN &</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>ESS/04/11/TEN). Both these permissions relate to the site next door to site W31 and not site W31 itself. Site W31 does not have, nor has previously had any planning permissions for waste related development. It is requested that the justification text be amended to make it clear that site W31 does not have any existing or historic waste planning permissions.</p> <p>Page 42 Stage 3 Site Selection Criteria Stage 3D Proximity to Sensitive Receptors</p> <p>RESPONSE: the justification text provided in respect of all three types of possible facility does not make reference to 4 recently approved dwellings it is requested that the text be amended to address this</p> <p>DETAIL: Planning permission 16/00057/FUL was granted in January 2016 for development of 4 no. bungalows with associated garages at land to the north of Samsons Road (opposite numbers 47 to 55) The site is less than 100 metres from site W31 Construction of the development is due to commence and be completed in 2017</p> | |
| 1062818, 429 | No | <p>Although modifications to W31 are currently in progress I feel that certain inaccuracies have been portrayed in the site selection criteria and I would like clarification as to why this site is being allowed to proceed. In the Stage 3 summary 3C, 3H, 3I, 3J and 3K have all amber judgements. 3D - proximity to sensitive receptors open air/enclosed and enclosed thermal has three red judgements. However, 2B has been allocated green - why? Has the Highways Authority conducted an up to date professional traffic survey to ascertain the present and potential increase in HGVs using the B1029 with its hazardous bends and two small local residential roads (Sampson and Bateman) to reach the site. The B1029 is used for ferrying children to and from various local villages/areas to the secondary school, local business traffic, Moverons Farm HGV</p> | |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | quarry traffic, housing development traffic, half hourly bus service plus general local traffic. Your complete disregard of the safety and environmental comments against the plan suggest the whole scheme stems from a desk/office based decision. A facility of this nature should be located on a main A road with better access for the volume of traffic that will be using it. One where there is no immediate housing, schools, etc. If this scheme goes ahead, regardless of the impact on the town, particularly those facilities and homes in close proximity to the site, how will the processed material leave the site? Will it be by lorry back through the same route or is there a possibility of the wharf being used? The increased use of the wharf would be totally unacceptable as the road leading to it is unfit for increased heavy traffic. In view of the above I feel that the above scheme should not go ahead. I look forward to your responses/comments to my above queries. | |
| M21 – Sunnymead, Elmstead and Heath Farms | | | |
| 496468, David L Walker Limited, 9 | Yes | Tarmac support the main modification 21 with the inclusion of C&D recycling within the plant site area for site L (i) 5, subject to a few comments on the issues and opportunities which are detailed on the form attached. No further comments are presented in respect of the remainder of the main consultation document. Please find attached completed response form covering the comments on Appendix 17 above, covering details for site L(i)5 (table 19). We note the new assessment profile in document MC2 for site W36 (as a replacement for site W13) Tarmac agree with the majority of the assessments apart from question 3D of site W36, where we do not believe that 66 sensitive receptors are within a 250m radius of the site. The plan extract attached only shows a handful of properties to the east of the proposed allocation within a 250m radius. As such the site should be scored Amber 1. | |
| M23 – Dollymans Farm | | | |
| 1061767, 246 | No | There are errors in the paperwork which call into question the | Postpone Dollymans farm inclusion until a full review has |

| Person ID, Organisation, Comment ID | Do you agree with proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>validity of the whole report. www.essex.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/Planning/Minerals-Waste-Planning-Team/Planning-Policy/Documents/MC2_SiteAssMethod_ReportAddendum_January2017FINAL.pdf:</p> <p>Stage 3, section K states: Open Air - Judgement: Green Justification: Directly adjacent to PRow. but the Judgements Guidance states: Green : Sites not containing PRow or within 100m of formal open spaces, such as outdoor sports facilities, parks and gardens, children's equipped play space and school grounds and playing fields. Amber 2 : Sites directly adjacent to PRow and/or formal open spaces, such as outdoor sports facilities, parks and gardens, children's equipped play space and school grounds and playing fields. That changes the summary page to a median of Amber 2 from Amber 1.5, surely enough criteria to put a stop to the process? Allowing benefit of doubt that this is a genuine error it should at the very least cause the whole report to be reviewed and a further public consultation to be launched once it has been deemed accurate. Furthermore, the government inspector should be pressed to reveal why they pushed to overrule a local planning issue at such an early stage when the capacity issue is far enough away to allow for further exploration of alternative sites. And lastly any report commissioned by the land owner or their agent should be given very little weighting as there can be no guarantee the report is not biased.</p> | <p>been completed to confirm accurate and transparent reporting. Commission an independent review of the site prior to any further action.</p> |

MC3 – Sustainability Appraisal Addendum

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|--|---|
| M1 – ‘Waste Challenge at a Glance’ | | | |
| 985065 (46), | No | <p>Accompanying SA/SEA Environmental Report – this document makes assessments on whether the proposed Modifications have significant (as opposed to minor) sustainability impacts</p> <p>Appendix 1 The Waste Challenge at a Glance</p> <p>4.21 Non Hazardous Waste</p> <p>The Vision & Strategic Objectives of this Plan therefore recognises the need to continue to make provision for imports from London, albeit at a reducing rate. After 2026, imports of non-hazardous waste to landfill should only be of non-recyclable and non-biodegradable wastes, while some provision may also be made for the management of residues suitable for energy recovery at consented plant.</p> <p>THIS IS NOT A MINOR CHANGE. AS THINGS STAND THIS CLAUSE DIRECTS RESIDUAL WASTE FROM LONDON POST 2026 TO RIVENHALL, IT BEING THE ONLY RELEVANT CONSENTED (BUT NOT BUILT) PLANT IN THE PLAN AREA. IT IS NOT CLEAR HOW SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, INCLUDING MINIMISING HAULAGE DISTANCES, PROTECTING AIR QUALITY AND ACHIEVING CO2 EMISSIONS REDUCTION WOULD BE COMPATIBLE WITH HGV HAULAGE FROM LONDON TO RIVENHALL.</p> <p>At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could</p> | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plan's Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term.</p> <p>As things stand, the allocation of srf/rdf from basildon is specifically to rivenhall. It is not clear how this allocation meets sustainability objectives including minimising haulage distances, protecting air quality and achieving co2 emissions reduction given that it is approx. 40 miles from the basildon plant to the rivenhall plant along the approved route via the a120. The only means of transporting wastes to and from the rivenhall plant would be by road.</p> <p>Ecc should demonstrate why these changes, specific to haulage distances, are minor in stating that "there will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification."</p> | |
| 1059617 (48) | No | <p>The Vision & Strategic Objectives of this Plan therefore recognises the need to continue to make provision for imports from London, albeit at a reducing rate. After 2026, imports of non-hazardous waste to landfill should only be of non-recyclable and non-biodegradable wastes, while some provision may also be made for the management of residues suitable for energy recovery at consented plant.</p> <p><i>This clause directs residual waste from London post 2016 to Rivenhall as it is the only relevant consented (not built) plant within the area. The HGV haulage from London to Rivenhall would not meet sustainability objectives minimising haulage distances, protecting air quality and certainly would not reduce CO2 emissions. This is not a minor change.</i></p> | <p>ECC need to demonstrate why these changes, specifically to haulage distances are minor and justify why they feel there are 'no significant sustainability effects or changes to the SA as a result of this modification'. Have the increase in haulage fit within the previously approved limits of the planning permissions?</p> |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plan's Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term.</p> <p>Currently the allocation of SRF/RDF from Basildon is specific to Rivenhall. How does this allocation meet sustainability objectives, same comments as above.</p> | |
| 983638 (69) | No | <p>This introduces the post 2026 importation of residues from London to be incinerated in the Plan area for 'energy recovery at consented plant'.</p> <p>Rivenhall is currently the only consented plant in the plan area able to take imported London waste for incineration. There is no clear justification for this. ECC stated that 'there will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification'. I do not consider this to be only a 'minor' change when considering sustainability objectives such as; minimising haulage distances, protecting air quality and complying with CO2 emission reduction rates. Bringing waste all the way from London to Rivenhall does not comply with these objectives. It is also 40 miles from the Basildon plant to the proposed Rivenhall site, and the waste can only be transported by road, (using the A120, which is at full capacity and in urgent need of an upgrade).</p> | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Paragraph 4.21 also states:</p> <p>At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility.</p> <p>In this amendment, the original wording stating that 'a competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area' has been deleted, replacing it with 'the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term'. This new sentence is specifically referring to Rivenhall only, and, as stated previously, the inclusion of this site is legally questionable, as it involves sending ECC owned waste to a not yet built private site, which currently has no environmental agency permit to proceed.</p> <p>In conclusion, the modifications relating to waste being transferred from Basildon to the proposed Rivenhall site is not legally compliant, as ECC cannot make objective decisions on this, due to having a specific interest in recommending the Rivenhall site to take ECC owned waste. In addition, this site may not even be built, due to the Environment Agency's refusal to grant a permit. ECC should have identified other potential sites for the waste that they have earmarked for Rivenhall, in order to be able to make this proposal legally compliant. The objective of the Waste Plan is to make the best choices for waste in the area, giving due regard to a variety of considerations.</p> | |
| 1060507 Coggeshall Neighbourhood Plan | No | The Vision & Strategic Objectives of this Plan therefore recognises the need to continue to make provision for imports from London, albeit at a reducing rate. After 2026, imports of non-hazardous waste to landfill should only be of non- | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| Committee (88), 477311, , 97 1061659, , 184 988283, 1061682, , 201, Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council, 238 1062089, Coggeshall Parish Council, 331 743809, , 468 1063344, , 476 618724, , 515 911132, Cressing Parish Council, 525 | | <p>recyclable and non-biodegradable wastes, while some provision may also be made for the management of residues suitable for energy recovery at consented plant. This is a major change not a minor one with huge impact on the local area. As things stand this clause directs residual waste from London post 2026 to Rivenhall, it being the only relevant consented (but not built) plant in the plan area. It is not clear how sustainability objectives, including minimising haulage distances, protecting air quality and achieving co2 emissions reduction would be compatible with HGV haulage from London to Rivenhall. At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000 t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term. As things stand, the allocation of SRF/RDF from Basildon is specifically to Rivenhall. It is not clear how this allocation meets sustainability objectives including minimising haulage distances, protecting air quality and achieving co2 emissions reduction given that it is approx. 40 miles from the Basildon plant to the Rivenhall plant along the approved route via the a120. The only means of transporting wastes to and from the Rivenhall plant would be by road. ECC should demonstrate why these changes, specific to haulage distances, are minor in stating that There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.</p> | |
| 1059617, , 230 | No | The Vision & Strategic Objectives of this Plan therefore recognises the need to continue to make provision for imports | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>from London, albeit at a reducing rate. After 2026, imports of non-hazardous waste to landfill should only be of non-recyclable and non-biodegradable wastes, while some provision may also be made for the management of residues suitable for energy recovery at consented plant. I object to this as it is not a minor change but a major one as it directs residual waste from London post 2026 to the proposed Rivenhall site, this doesn't meet sustainability objectives including minimising haulage distances, or protecting air quality. ECC must demonstrate why these changes are minor.</p> | |
| 746050, Rivenhall Parish Council, 481 | No | <p>Accompanying SA/SEA Environmental Report this document makes assessments on whether the proposed Modifications have significant (as opposed to minor) sustainability impacts. Appendix 1 The Waste Challenge at a Glance 4.21 Non Hazardous Waste The Vision & Strategic Objectives of this Plan therefore recognises the need to continue to make provision for imports from London, albeit at a reducing rate. After 2026, imports of non-hazardous waste to landfill should only be of non-recyclable and non-biodegradable wastes, while some provision may also be made for the management of residues suitable for energy recovery at consented plant. And At present, the Waste Disposal Authority is considering long term management options for the stabilised residual waste output of the Tovi Eco Park Facility. In 2016, the annual 200,000t output from this facility was exported from the Plan area. (Deleted - A competitive tender process will identify the long-term management solution for this waste, which could include continued exportation from the Plan area). In line with the Plans Strategy for the Plan area to become net self-sufficient with regard to its waste management needs where practicable, the Plan includes a site allocation which has capacity to potentially manage this residual waste in the Plan area in the longer term. The Parish Council would submit these are not minor changes. As things stand this directs residual waste from Basildon, and from</p> | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | London post 2026, to Rivenhall as an allocation. Given the distances involved (Basildon to Rivenhall is about 40 miles), and the availability of sites that are closer, it is not clear how sustainability objectives, including minimising road haulage distances, protecting air quality and achieving CO2 emissions reductions are compatible with this allocation and therefore submit this is not a minor impact. | |
| M5 – Policy 3 ‘Strategic Site Allocations’ | | | |
| 922693, Henham Parish Council, 27 | No | Please accept this letter as an objection to the WLP modifications which is submitted on behalf of Henham Parish Council. It concerns site W8 Elsenham (inert waste recycling) to which objection was raised in the written statement and participation at the Examination in September 2016. Modifications are proposed and the Authorities have made a request to the Inspector to make several modifications to the Plan which would make it suitable for adoption. No Inspectors Report has yet been published. A modification has been proposed to policy 3 which merely amends the site's reference number. We object to the omission from these modifications because the site should be deleted as a strategic allocation, not just renumbered. New information has now been presented which fundamentally affects the suitability of the site; this has been submitted post submission of the Plan and post Examination. It is contained in the modifications to the Sustainability (SA) 2 at page 70 (emphasis added): An amendment has been made since the SA of the Revised Preferred Approach (2015) regarding historic environment impacts at W8 - Elsenham. Uncertain impacts were previously highlighted for certain facility types due to moderate issues regarding the historic environment (SO5), however a re-assessment of the site has led to a major impact issue (which may be acceptable subject to mitigation) being highlighted for all facility types. As such impacts are now negative. Our submissions on this site show that the site affects the setting of a Grade 1 Listed Building and made reference to NPPF para | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>132 which includes: Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional. Two points flow from the re-assessment in the December 2016 SA. Firstly, because the impact on the Grade 1 listed building (and other Grade 2 listed buildings) has been raised to a major impact issue from the previous moderate issue the bar for the fundamental test of should be wholly exceptional has been raised, such that the site which previously ranked 11 out of 12 in the LUC assessment 3 must surely now be considered fundamentally unsatisfactory. Secondly, this re-assessment states that mitigation may make the site acceptable'. The importance of the buildings and their setting means that the level and nature of the impact is such (as now acknowledged) that may be unacceptable. Moreover, as this is a matter of principle, the nature of the mitigation should have been established, illustrated and agreed to be acceptable before the site was allocated, not at some time post-adoption. We therefore request that the modifications should include the deletion of site W8 at Elsenham. Please keep us advised of the progress on the Waste Local Plan. Attached to this letter are relevant parts of the response form. 1 Schedule of Modifications January 2017 2 Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Addendum November 2016 3 LUC Site Assessment Report Dec 2015</p> | |
| M8 – Policy 5 ‘Enclosed Waste Facilities on Unallocated Sites or Outside Areas of Search’ | | | |
| 1060507, Coggleshall Neighbourhood Plan Committee, 89 | No | There is a significant question over whether the proposed Rivenhall site would still be classed as CHP following the s73 planning permission granted by ECC in early 2016. The incinerator capacity was increased by 65% but the primary user of heat the on-site paper pulping unit capacity was reduced by 53%. Given that at the previous tonnages (360,000 tpa for both CHP and the pulp unit) the site was said to use all | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>the heat produced, it is not clear how the same would be true at 595,000 tpa for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp. Furthermore, the environment agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 primarily because of the failure by Gent Fairhead to demonstrate bat for the incinerator/CHP unit. ECC should demonstrate why this change is minor in stating that There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.</p> | |
| M13 - Policy 10 'Development Management Criteria' | | | |
| 1063440, Natural England, 503 | Yes | <p>Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Addendum (November 2016) Recommendation - revision to text on water resources.</p> <p>Appendix 11 Policy 10 Development Management Criteria. Recommendation. We recommend making the clear distinction between water quality and water quantity; the current additional text is unclear. We advise amending the text from:</p> <p>b. the quality of water within water bodies, with particular regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preventing the deterioration of their existing status; or • failure to achieve the objective of good status, and • the quantity of water for resource purposes within water bodies. <p>to the following:</p> <p>b. water resources, with particular regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the quality of water within water bodies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ preventing the deterioration of their existing status; ○ or failure to achieve the objective of good status, • and the quantity of water for resource purposes within water bodies | |
| M17 – Morses Lane, Brightlingsea | | | |
| East of | No | The Society maintains an in principle objection to the proposed | Proposed Amendment - insertion of bullet point: "The |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|--|--|
| England Co-operative Society 990357 (71) | | <p>inert waste recycling facility at Morses Lane, Brightlingsea. However these representations respond specifically to the proposed modifications to the allocation, in the context of the current consultation on post examination modifications. Main Modification 17 - Table 14 Morses Lane, Brightlingsea to strengthen the intended protection of amenity, particularly for proximal land uses. However whilst the justification text appears to recognise the proximity of the allocated site to several sensitive receptors, including its location immediately adjacent to a retail store and the nearby school, this is not adequately reflected in the suggested amendments to the text. There is very little information provided on how the Council derived the suggested bullet points and why other requirements suggested previously by the Society were not included. As highlighted previously through the Examination Hearings and letter dated 14th October 2016, should the allocation proceed there are a number of absolute minimum requirements of measures that should be incorporated within the Development principles for the site. It is considered that the proposed amendments do not go far enough, as set out below in more detail. Proposed Modifications: Morses Lane Site Assessment Scores It is noted that the Council suggested modifications to the Morses Lane Site Assessment Scores "to accommodate information raised at the Hearings. In particular it amends 3D proximity to Sensitive Receptors to Amber 2. These modifications are particularly referred to within the Site Assessment and Selection Report Addendum: Rationale for Preferred Allocations (January 2017). It states that during the hearing sessions a number of elements in the site assessment proforma were inaccurate. However it then states Although updating these inaccuracies would not result in the exclusion of the site; the Authorities consider it prudent to maintain an accurate evidence base as it may be helpful to the future planning application process. However there is no discussion</p> | <p>inclusion of a statement that the facilities will be enclosed" The modification seeks to insert the following text to bullet point 5: it is expected that operations would be enclosed within an appropriate building. This is considered too ambiguous. The modification does not provide sufficient detail for the requirement to be deemed effective and it does not offer satisfactory assurance that neighbouring uses will be protected in terms of amenity. As such, it fails to meet the tests of soundness as set out in Paragraph 182 of the NPPF. The need to specify the enclosure of the facility was highlighted as a necessary requirement at the Examination Hearing session, however, to ensure this is effective and the requirements are clear, the Society considers that the aforementioned text should be amended to specify the following: The following mitigation measures will be established in the interests of protecting local amenity: All crushing, processing or other physical handling of inert waste, including all transfer of waste between vehicles to be enclosed within suitably designed and located building(s); The storage of waste or recovered materials should also be fully contained within buildings, with no external storage permissible; All vehicles carrying inert waste should have such waste fully covered, whether arriving at or leaving the site, to avoid dust entering the atmosphere on the approaches to and from the facility; The buildings should include the incorporation and maintenance of effective dust extraction technologies, to prevent the escape of dust from the process and the premises with a specific and particular emphasis on silicates; and Limits on duration (hours of operation) and noise standards (from noise sensitive properties) (as per existing text in table 14). Proposed Amendment: "Additional Bullet Point regarding the need for new development not to impact</p> |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>of the inaccuracies identified and the reasons why it does not alter the inclusion of the site. Similarly, in the Schedule of Modifications Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Addendum November 2016) for the modifications it simply states " There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA as a result of this modification. There is no discussion how this conclusion is reached. Given the inaccuracies identified, it is considered that further justification is required to justify the modifications, and the reasoning why the additional measures suggested by the Society were not incorporated. Summary The Society remains concerned, that despite inaccuracies and shortcomings identified in relation to this allocation at the Examination Hearing, the proposed modifications fall significantly short in ensuring that the site allocation would not result in demonstrable harm and an unacceptable impact on the surrounding area, in particular to the existing East of England Co-operative retail store.</p> | <p>on the nearby retail use" The second amendment to table 14 seeks to insert the following text to bullet point 6: The configuration and operation of the proposed facility shall have regard to impacts on neighbouring land uses, including the potential impacts on the adjacent retail use. The impact on the retail use is of great concern to the Society and this additional bullet point again provides very little information or clarity on how the Council would seek to ensure this is enforced. It should be more specific as to the requirements sought. In addition to the facility being fully enclosed as set out above, the following points are also considered necessary in relation to the impacts on the neighbouring retail use: The specification of buildings and operations are to include noise mitigation materials and measures, having regard to appropriate maximum standards at the boundary of the site; The design of any buildings to have regard to the landscape setting of the site, and its location on the fringe of the settlement; The siting of any buildings and processes on the site should have particular regard to safeguarding the health, safety and amenity of customers and staff at the immediately adjacent retail store, including the avoidance of unacceptable impacts on the rear servicing arrangements for the store, which includes the transfer of food products; The installation and maintenance of additional soft landscaping measures such as an enlarged earth bund, in addition to substantial tree planting (already specified in the submitted Plan), having regard to the effective mitigation of noise, dust and landscape and visual impacts; Sufficient vehicle parking and traffic management measures to be provided on site, including delivery reception and arrival management protocols, in order to prevent vehicles stacking and parking in Morses Lane (potentially including the</p> |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | | identification of an off-site location for the stacking of vehicles away from the settlement and other sensitive receptors); This should be reinforced by the introduction of effective and enforceable parking restrictions on Morses Lane, to ensure that access to the rear servicing and staff parking areas at the adjacent retail store are kept clear at all times. |
| M18 – Newport Quarry | | | |
| 1063440, Natural England, 502 | Yes | Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Addendum (November 2016) Support. | |
| M19 - Rivenhall | | | |
| 985065 (47), 1060507 (89), 477311 (98), 618724, 516 | No | <p>Accompanying SA/SEA Environmental Report – this document makes assessments on whether the proposed Modifications have significant (as opposed to minor) sustainability impacts</p> <p>Table 16 Rivenhall CHP</p> <p>360,000 tpa 595,000 tpa</p> <p>There is a significant question over whether the proposed rivenhall site would still be classed as chp following the s73 planning permission granted by ecc in early 2016. The incinerator capacity was increased by 65% but the primary user of heat – the on-site paper pulping unit capacity was reduced by 53%. Given that at the previous tonnages (360,000 tpa for both chp and the pulp unit) the site was said to use all the heat produced, it is not clear how the same would be true at 595,000 tpa for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp. Furthermore, the environment agency refused the permit application for the rivenhall site in december 2016 primarily because of the failure by gent fairhead to demonstrate bat for</p> | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>the incinerator/chp unit.</p> <p>Ecc should demonstrate why this change is minor in stating that “There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.”</p> | |
| 1061659, 186 | No | <p>There have been changes to size and scale of the site and output which seem to conflict each other. There is a significant question over whether the proposed rivenhall site would still be classed as chp following the s73 planning permission granted by ecc in early 2016. The incinerator capacity was increased by 65% but the primary user of heat the on-site paper pulping unit capacity was reduced by 53%. Given that at the previous tonnages (360,000 tpa for both chp and the pulp unit) the site was said to use all the heat produced, it is not clear how the same would be true at 595,000 tpa for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp. Furthermore, the environment agency refused the permit application for the rivenhall site in december 2016 primarily because of the failure by gent fairhead to demonstrate bat for the incinerator/chp unit. Ecc should demonstrate why this change is minor in stating that there will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the sa, as a result of this modification.</p> | |
| 988283, Bradwell with Pattiswick Parish Council, 239 | No | <p>There is a significant question over whether the proposed Rivenhall site would still be classed as CHP (combined heat and power) following the s73 planning permission granted by ECC in early 2016. The incinerator capacity was increased by 65%, but the primary user of heat the on-site paper pulping unit - capacity was reduced by 53%. Given that at the previous tonnages (360,000 tpa for both CHP and the pulp unit) the site was said to use all the heat produced, it is not clear how the same would be true at 595,000 tpa for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp. Furthermore, the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 primarily because of the failure by Gent</p> | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | Fairhead to demonstrate BAT for the incinerator/CHP unit. ECC should demonstrate why this change is minor in stating that There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification. | |
| 1062089, Coggeshall Parish Council, 332 | No | <p>The capacities and proportion changes for Rivenhall need to be reviewed and clarified. The current view is based on the existing application and this has been rejected by the EA therefore the EIA etc. with the report is incorrect, the plant required a redesign, new stack and as such all the air quality data from the receptors the dispersion profiling and the subsequent conclusions with respect to the health impact are incorrect therefore the health risks and summaries reported are wrong We believe ECC should demonstrate why this change is minor in stating that " there will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification. " Based on the S73 application the plant has changed significantly and will change again based on the EA permit refusal and the inevitable subsequent planning applications. This means ECC simply do not know what the final plant at Rivenhall will actually be and yet they state that there will be no significant effects and are a) Allocating it in the plan despite the fact it is incomplete and currently unpermitted b) Relying on the Rivenhall plant with little or no alternatives should it (the incinerator) not come to fruition We believe there is a significant question over whether the proposed Rivenhall site would still be classed as CHP following the s73 planning permission granted by ECC in early 2016. The incinerator capacity was increased by 65% whereas the on-site paper pulping unit capacity was reduced by 53%. Given that at the previous tonnages (360,000 tpa for both CHP and the pulp unit) yet the site was said to use all the heat produced, it is not clear how the same would be true at 595,000 tpa for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp with no increase in energy produced and a significant increase in CO2 outputs thereby questioning the energy from waste element aspect.</p> | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | Furthermore, the changes in proportions are not reflected in the accompanying Environmental impact reports (these use the 2010 proportions). The new proportions for the plant are not clearly explained, evaluated and the required stack height | |
| 743809, 469 | No | Accompanying SA/SEA Environmental Report this document makes assessments on whether the proposed Modifications have significant (as opposed to minor) sustainability impacts would the proposed rivenhall site still be classed as chp following the s73 planning permission (granted by ecc early 2016)? The incinerator capacity was increased by 65% but the primary user of heat is only the on-site paper pulping unit the capacity for which was reduced by 53%. Given that at the previous tonnages (360,000 tpa for both chp and the pulp unit), the site was said to use all the heat produced, it is not clear how the same would be true at 595,000 tpa for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp. The applicant needs to be asked for details on this please nb the environment agency has already refused the permit application for the rivenhall site (2016) primarily because of the failure by gent fairhead to demonstrate bat for the incinerator/chp unit. Ecc must demonstrate why this change is minor. They currently state that There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification. | |
| 1063344, 477 | No | Accompanying SA/SEA Environmental Report this document makes assessments on whether the proposed Modifications have significant (as opposed to minor) sustainability impacts ECC SHOULD DEMONSTRATE WHY THIS CHANGE IS MINOR IN STATING THAT There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification. | |
| 911132, Cressing Parish Council, 526 | No | Accompanying SA/SEA Environmental Report this document makes assessments on whether the proposed Modifications have significant (as opposed to minor) sustainability impacts There is a significant question over whether the | |

| Respondent ID | Do you agree with the proposed modification? | Brief explanation of why you agree / disagree with this particular proposed modification. | Details of what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issue raised. |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>proposed Rivenhall site would still be classed as CHP (combined heat and power) following the s73 planning permission granted by ECC in early 2016. The incinerator capacity was increased by 65% but the primary user of heat the on-site paper pulping unit - capacity was reduced by 53%. Given that at the previous tonnages (360,000 tpa for both CHP and the pulp unit) the site was said to use all the heat produced, it is not clear how the same would be true at 595,000 tpa for the incinerator and 170,000 tpa pulp. Furthermore, the Environment Agency refused the permit application for the Rivenhall site in December 2016 primarily because of the failure by the applicant to demonstrate BAT for the incinerator/CHP unit. ECC should demonstrate why this change is minor in stating that There will be no significant sustainability effects, or changes to the SA, as a result of this modification.</p> | |
| Unrelated | | | |
| 1064243, Historic England, 531 | Unrelated | Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Addendum- We have no comments to make on the modifications to this document. | |