



## Minutes of Ewelme Parish Council Meeting held on Wednesday 10th January 2024

**Present:** Gemma Benoliel (GB/Chairman)  
David Solomon (DS) Sally Stockings (SS) Nigel Layton (NL)  
Barry Tindall (BT) Sue Cooper (SC) Joanna Brock (Clerk)  
5 members of the public

- 1/24 **Apologies for absence:** Roger Moore (RM) is away. Andrea Powell (AP), as SC is representing SODC.
- 2/24 **Declarations of interest:** None.
- 3/24 **Minutes of last meeting 13/12/2023:** These were agreed and signed.
- 4/24 **Public session:** No one wished to speak at this time but spoke later in relevant sections.
- 5/24 **County & District Councillor reports:** SC and AP sent a report before the meeting. SC attended the meeting and said the Joint Local Plan has been launched and they are inviting views on this.
- 6/24 **Airband:** DS has studied the legislation further concerning the application P23/S4022/T28, a discussion ensued. An article may be written for the EN.
- 7/24 **Planning**  
**MW.0171/23 & P23/S4255/CM:** Rumbolds Pit, Ewelme, OX10 6HF. Application for a CLEUD. RESOLVED EPC OBJECTS to this application for the following reasons listed in the *appendix*.  
**P23/S4268/HH & P23/S4269/LB:** High House, Ewelme, OX10 6HQ. Extend from the kitchen with a single storey building adjoined to the west side of the main house. RESOLVED EPC has no objections to this application.
- 8/24 **Accounts and Administration:**  
(a) RESOLVED finance report accepted.  
(b) RESOLVED new income and expenditure authorised. *See appendix*.  
RESOLVED all invoices to date authorised.
- 9/24 **The Pound:** This will be on the next agenda.
- 10/24 **Bus shelter:** This will be on the next agenda.
- 11/24 **Traffic:** DS has been conducting traffic counts using a camera. The SIDs temporarily ran at the Common and Cat Lane and it is hoped permanent poles can be erected in these locations. The SIDS are now back in their permanent site on Green Lane.
- 13/24 **Landslide:** RM did not attend the meeting and there was nothing to report.

- 14/24 **Car park:** This will be on the next agenda.
- 15/24 **Wilding:** Benson Area Nature Group have an exhibition in Benson on 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> March which includes the Ewelme area. The daffodils from Grundon are ready for collection.
- 16/24 **Health & safety:** Nothing to report.
- 17/23 **Village Maintenance including outdoor gym, pavilion, play area & the Common:**  
There is a loose plank on the bridge in the play area. The Clerk has asked a contractor to look at this.
- 18/24 **Reports from meetings, training and other events:** No meetings attended this month. The Clerk will ask that R. Lanigan attends the Benson Millstream meetings on behalf of EPC. The Clerk will ask the village hall manager for their meeting dates.
- 19/24 **Correspondence:** Nothing of note.
- 20/24 **Other items of interest:** The Ewelme – Nolay Twinning Society have asked for a grant towards their event. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 2105

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of next meeting – 14<sup>th</sup> February 2024

## Appendix

### Planning: MW.0171/23 & P23/S4255/CM

#### Concerns of Ewelme Parish Council regarding this application

1. Ewelme Parish Council (EPC) has major concerns regarding this application. This site has been a source of contention for many years, and has grown from a small unauthorised operation to a major industrial site, for the most part without planning consent and in a largely unregulated manner.
2. The application makes inaccurate statements regarding the existing CLEUD issued in 2002. For example, the applicant states that the 2002 certificate covers *"The use of land for reception, storage and transfer of materials, soil, plant and vehicles. Tip mining for ash, glass, brass and copper."* The applicant's use of inverted commas suggests that this is a verbatim quote from the original certificate. It is not.
3. What the certificate actually lists as lawful activity is *"The reception, storage, grading and transfer of waste materials on the Land"*; *"the reception, storage and transfer of barley on the Land"*; and *"the reception, storage and transfer of paper on the Land"*; plus the storage and distribution of various plant and vehicles. There are several conditions or limitations included in the CLEUD. The omission of the word "waste" from the list of activities presented by the applicant as covered by the certificate gives the impression that a wider range of materials, not considered as waste, are included.
4. The statement by the applicant that the certificate covers *"tip mining for ash, glass, brass and copper"* is strictly speaking true; however, this activity forms a schedule of activities that are certified as **not** lawful. While this activity is not included by the applicant in his list of recent activities, the implied suggestion that it was recognised as lawful by the 2002 certificate is misleading and suggests a wider range of lawful activities than was in fact the case. These inaccuracies must cast doubt upon the reliability of other statements made by the applicant.
5. The application fails to provide an accurate picture of the current and recent operations, and their impact on the local environment. It provides details of some activities at the site in commendable detail; for example monthly numbers of skips (assumed to be the number of skips of waste material arriving at the site); and the annual and quarterly *"waste streams in and out of the Waste Transfer Station"* (as reported to the Environment Agency). However, no figures are given for the number of large tipper trucks and the tonnages for material other than waste entering and leaving the site. Our own observations indicate that the scale of activity by large tipper trucks has increased significantly in the last few years. Due to their large size and weight these are rather more intrusive, and potentially more dangerous, than the skip trucks.
6. In the Planning Statement accompanying the application it is stated the *"vehicle numbers have been shown to be absorbed into the local highway network without difficulty"*. No evidence is offered to support this contention, which we consider to be quite wrong. The level of traffic travelling to and from the site along Eyres Lane and Green Lane in the last few years represents a severe disturbance and nuisance to the residents of these and surrounding thoroughfares. The continuous movement of such vehicles along Eyres Lane, which is narrow and does not have a walkway or pavement but which is regularly used by pedestrian traffic, represents a major road safety hazard.

7. Included in the “*list of current activities for which a certificate is sought*” is “*stationing of mobile trailer type living accommodation units for operatives based at the waste transfer station and recycling Centre*”. No evidence for the number of such units or the numbers of staff so housed, or on the history of this arrangement, is presented by the applicant.
8. We are very concerned by both the lack of quantitative data on the scale of operation (especially vehicle movements), and the deployment of static caravans for accommodation. If a CLEUD were to be issued using the description offered by the applicant, it would appear to give *carte blanche* for expansion of the operation without limit, and the running of a residential caravan site.
9. Given, *inter alia*:-
  - the considerable environmental impact of the recent and potential future developments on this site;
  - the lack of information regarding any material other than waste entering or leaving the site;
  - the lack of any meaningful evidence regarding the past and present numbers of large trucks entering and leaving the site;
  - the complete lack of detail and history of the deployment of “*mobile trailer type living accommodation*” on the site; and
  - the potentially irreversible nature of granting of a CLEUD,

**EPC requests that OCC refuses the current application.**

10. If this application is refused, and another application is received, EPC would request a longer consultation period than was granted for the present application. This is a very important and complex matter, and we are likely to wish to seek professional legal advice; this will take some time.
11. If, however, OCC is minded to grant a new CLEUD based upon this application, EPC would request that our concerns regarding the level of HGV traffic using the site, and the road safety hazard that this represents, are taken into account. We are concerned that unless strict conditions are placed upon such a certificate, it might represent a *carte blanche* for expansion of operations without limit.
12. We suggest that any new CLEUD should be based upon the earlier one. As no claim is made by the applicants regarding:-
  - the hours of operation;
  - import of material being done only by vehicles and skips owned by the operator; and
  - the maximum height of the piles of material;we suggest that the conditions covering these should remain as in the 2002 CLEUD.
13. We suggest that the lowest annual figures in the past ten years (as presented by the applicant) for
  - waste imported to the site (15,892 tonnes in 2020), and
  - the number of skip-loads imported (8502 in 2014)

should be used as a basis for setting limits as this is the highest level that the applicants can claim to have been consistently met in the past decade; the figures are shown in the table below. No numbers are given by the applicant for the number of movements of the 32-tonne trucks used to export the sorted waste and recycled waste so we have calculated this; our calculation and assumptions are shown in the notes following the table.

ACTIVITY	2002 CLEUD	Applicants claim
Waste out per week	206 tonnes	306 tonnes (a)
Vehicles in per day average	7	27 (b)
Max vehicles in per day	30	
Skip vehicles in per day		24 (a)
32-tonne trucks in per day		3 (c)

**Notes.**

- a) These figures are based upon the lowest annual totals in the past ten years (15,892 t in 2020 and 8504 skip movements in 2014) , being the highest levels that the applicant can claim as consistently met in the period.
- b) This is the total for skip vehicles (applicants claim) plus tipper lorries (our calculation, see c below).
- c) Our calculation based upon the applicant's claim for waste material brought to the site (15,892 tonnes in 2020), an assumption exports equal imports, and assumed 15 tonnes load per truck = 1060 trucks per year.

14. The conditions obtaining to traffic movements which were applied to the earlier certificate were given in the form of the maximum number of vehicles entering (seven) and leaving (seven) the site per day averaged over a calendar month, and a maximum limit of 30 in and 30 out for any single day (4.3 times the maximum averaged over the month). The level of activity claimed by the applicant (and for large trucks, calculated by us) to have taken place over the past ten years approximates to 24 skip lorries and three 32-tonne lorries in (a total of 27 vehicles in and 27 out per day). These figures are suggested as appropriate for a new CLEUD as daily maxima averaged over a calendar month.
15. If we apply the same multiplier (4.3) to these mean daily figures to create a maximum allowed on any single day we arrive at 104 skip trucks in (and out), and eleven 32-tonne trucks in (and out) - total vehicles 115.
16. These figures for vehicle movements are almost four times the figures set by the conditions attached to the existing licence.
17. We request that a differentiation is made in any new certificate with respect to the conditions (numbers) applying to the skip trucks and the 32-tonne trucks, as it is the latter that are of greatest concern to EPC.
18. The existing certificate limits the export of waste material off the site to 206 tonnes per week. The figure calculated above for 2020 is 306 tonnes per week. This could become the limit for the new certificate.
19. **We would ask that the EA are consulted to ascertain the findings of their own licensing arrangement. In this case this would be material to planning.**
20. There has been a lack of enforcement action over breaches of the existing CLEUD partly because of the difficulty in monitoring (say) mean numbers of vehicles over a calendar month or even a single day. We suggest that when vehicle maxima are set in a new CLEUD the operator should be required to make monthly returns to OCC of all vehicles in and out of the site each day, and in which direction they arrive at and leave the site (ie south via Ewelme or north via Benson).
21. The planning statement submitted with the CLEUD application states that the current operation involves “*stationing of mobile trailer type living accommodation units for operatives based at the waste transfer station and recycling centre*”. However, as no evidence concerning the history or numbers of such units is presented by the applicant, this activity should not be included in the CLEUD.
22. Ewelme Parish Council considers that the continued developments at the Eyres Lane Site represent a major threat to the very nature of our small quiet village and is very concerned

at the way that the activities have developed from a small unauthorised operation to a major industrial site, with greatly increased vehicular activity and an unstated number of staff living on site. This has taken place without the benefit of planning permission, and in a largely unregulated manner. We are further concerned that manner of development on this site could set a precedent for further development in the area. EPC also holds some further limited information regarding the history of large vehicle movements in and out of the site; this is not presented here as the applicant has not presented any figures that might warrant challenge. This information could be made available if necessary. For these reasons EPC asks to be closely involved in the process of developing any new CLEUD and any other initiatives to regularise this activity and development. We would be happy to attend meetings with OCC officers to discuss this important matter further. We would also wish to discuss a timetable which allowed us the option of seeking independent legal advice in a timely manner.

23. We cannot stress too strongly the concern and dismay that developments on this site have caused, and continue to cause, to the residents of Ewelme and to Ewelme Parish Council.

### Ewelme PC Payments & Receipts January 2024

Ref no:	Payments for authorisation:	
10.01.24.01	Administration costs	1,119.90
10.01.24.02	Grundon	14.75
10.01.24.03	R Luker	60.00
10.01.24.04	G Benoliel	139.71
DD	E-on	182.12
10.01.24.05	EN editor	75.00
	PC debit card payments (below)	695.99
		<b>2,659.05</b>
Date	Receipts since last meeting:	
	Nil	
		<b>0.00</b>

### EPC debit card purchases

Date	Item	Cost
29.12.23	Lenovo laptop	576.00
03.01.24	Microsoft Office	119.99
		<b>695.99</b>