

MENDIP DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Full Council held on Monday, 17 December 2018 in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Shepton Mallet commencing at 6.30 pm.

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT: Dick Skidmore (Chairman) and Bryan Beha (Vice Chairman)
 Joanna Beale, Eve Berry, Adam Boyden, John Brunsdon MBE, Carole Bullen, John Carter, Rachel Carter, John Coles, Shane Collins, Nick Cottle, Edward Drewe, John Greenhalgh, Stina Falle, Philip Ham, Des Harris, Bente Height, Nigel Hewitt-Cooper, Damon Hooton, Alvin Horsfall, Claire Hudson, Lloyd Hughes, Tom Killen, Roy Mackenzie, Jeannette Marsh, Clive Mockford, Terry Napper, Graham Noel, John North, John Parham, Mike Pullin, Tom Ronan, Adam Sen, Harvey Siggs, Helen Sprawson-White, Nigel Taylor, David van Dyk, Nigel Woollcombe-Adams, and Ros Wyke

OFFICERS

PRESENT: Tracy Aarons	Deputy Chief Executive
Stuart Brown	Chief Executive
David Clark	Group Manager Law and Governance
Paul Deal	Section 151 Officer
Jason Kirkwood	Principal Licensing Officer
Donna Nolan	Deputy Chief Executive
Beth Price	Strategic Marketing and Media Manager
Jane Sharp	Project & Improvement Officer
Ben Sugg	Committee Officer
Laura Thomas	Marketing and Media Officer

Agenda Item Number	Subject	Actioned by
1	<p>Opening comments</p> <p>The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p>	
2	<p>Evacuation Procedures, Induction Loop and Turning Off Mobile Phones</p> <p>The Chairman explained the evacuation procedures and informed everyone on the use of the induction loop. He requested that mobile phones be switched to silent.</p> <p>Councillor Coles was asked to offer an opening prayer.</p>	
3	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Peter Bradshaw, Simon Davies, Steve Henderson, Linda Oliver, John Osman, Tim Rice and Alan Townsend.</p>	

<p>4</p>	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>Councillor John Greenhalgh declared a personal, prejudicial interest in Item 12 as his residence was adjacent to a site that was referred to in the plan.</p> <p>Councillor Ros Wyke declared a personal, prejudicial interest in Item 12 as the report contained a reference to land opposite her property. She noted that she would leave the room during the discussion, as she had done at every other meeting where the report had been raised for discussion.</p> <p>Councillor Philip Ham declared a personal, prejudicial interest in Item 12 as he owned land that was referred to in the report.</p> <p>Councillor Mike Pullin declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in the Item 16 motion 'Transport in the Mendip Area' as he was a Junior Cabinet Member of Somerset County Council.</p> <p>Councillors John Parham and Nigel Hewitt-Cooper declared personal, non-prejudicial interests in item 16 as they were members of the Somerset County Council Regulation Committee.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Chairman's Engagements, Communications and Announcements</p> <p>The Chairman noted that along with the Vice Chair he had attended nearly 40 events, and thanked the Vice Chair for his assistance.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p>Public Participation</p> <p>a) Items on the agenda</p> <p>Duncan Skene had requested that he speak about item 12 Proposed Changes to the Mendip Local Plan II. He was represented by Mr Joe Hannam-Maggs.</p> <p>Joe Hannam-Maggs explained that he was speaking on behalf of the Friends of Little Keyford, and expressed concerns that without amendments to three sites on the edge of Frome the Local Plan Part II was not sound. Mr Hannam-Maggs remarked that submission of the current plan represented a risk to Mendip District Council. He noted that several key parties had not been consulted regarding the three sites, including Natural England. Additionally, Mr Hannam-Maggs remarked that planning principles had not</p>	

	<p>been adhered to, due process had not been followed and there were significant inaccuracies in the plan. He noted that local authorities had an obligation to consider cross-boundary issues and the Local Plan Part I had drawn criticism for not addressing this. Mr Hannam-Maggs commented that Frome did not need more housing, as it already had a surplus of commuters. He urged the Council to amend the plan in order to mitigate the risk of rejection.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Mr Hannam-Maggs for his comments.</p> <p>Kevin Davis had also requested that he speak about item 12 Proposed Changes to the Mendip Local Plan II.</p> <p>Mr Davis noted that the proposed changes to the local housing allocation in Street included 232 dwellings, and identified two sites. A consultation had identified a requirement for 200 homes on the site to the West of Somerton Road, however the Council intended to increase this figure to 280 in line with comments from the developer. Mr Davis noted that the local plan identified a site West of Street and East of Walton as suitable for 300-500 dwellings, however this site had only been designated as a Future Growth Area. He remarked that the plan presented no evidence why this site should not be included in the housing allocation for Street. He further noted that the site was large enough to provide the infrastructure required for new homes, and asked the Council to carefully consider amendment of the Local Plan Part II.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Mr Davis for his comments.</p> <p>b) Items not on the agenda There were no speakers</p>	
7	<p>Previous Minutes of Council</p> <p>The minutes of 24 September 2018 were agreed.</p>	Claire Dicken
8	<p>Update from the Leader of the Council</p> <p>The Leader noted that there had been good news regarding the government settlement, as a rates retention trial had begun for Somerset authorities. He thanked the Section 151 Officer and his team for their work in representing Somerset</p>	

authorities. The Leader noted that extra resources had been allocated to counteract rate support tariffs, which would have led to Mendip District Council effectively subsidising other authorities. He remarked that he was pleased to see some relief for the County Council, and noted that demand for services could not be reduced, and essential services must be funded and delivered. The Leader further remarked that Mendip District Council would offer any assistance it could render to Somerset County Council, and he and the Chief Executive would be meeting with the County Council to engage in a clear and open discussion about how to best serve the District's residents.

The Leader explained that he and the Chief Executive had met with the Chair and Chief Executive of the Citizens' Advice Bureau. Mendip District Council would provide additional funding to the CAB for 18 months to support the continued delivery of services across the District.

The Leader noted that it had been made clear that there would be no reorganisation of services without a unanimous decision unless a service failure occurred.

The Leader explained that the Council's investment strategy continued to be implemented thanks to the work of the Phoenix Board. Efforts had been taken to ensure that the investment strategy had been rigorously followed, and a significant number of opportunities had been turned down to ensure that the Council developed a balanced portfolio. The Leader remarked that the Saxonvale development was an opportunity to demonstrate leadership and tackle an important site, and he hoped that Frome Town Council would collaborate on the project.

The Leader thanked Members and Officers for their work, and thanked the Chair and Vice Chair for their representation of the Council at events around the District.

Members remarked that they were pleased that the Council was supporting Somerset County Council and the Citizens' Advice Bureau. Members noted that there had been cuts to children's services at the County level. Members also noted that there would inevitably be a range of views regarding the potential establishment of a unitary authority, but authorities should work together to support the process. Members further remarked that there was a need to establish a clear car parking strategy.

The Chair noted that funding for the CAB was a significant issue and the Council was looking at the measures that it could take. He advised Parish Councils to let Mendip District

	<p>Council address the matter, as the service was better funded at the District level.</p> <p>The Leader welcomed Councillor Tom Ronan, noting that he would join the Scrutiny Board.</p>	
9	<p>Membership of Boards Committees and Panels</p> <p>Members welcomed newly elected Councillor Tom Ronan to the Council.</p> <p>It was resolved that Councillor Tom Ronan would join the Scrutiny Board.</p>	Claire Dicken
10	<p>Treasury Management Strategy – Mid Year Update</p> <p>The Portfolio Holder for Governance, Finance and Corporate Services presented a report which reviewed the treasury performance for the first 6 months of 2018/19.</p> <p>This report had been reviewed by the Audit Committee on 31 October 2018 who agreed the report without additional recommendations.</p> <p>The Section 151 Officer noted that the report had been submitted to Cabinet and the Audit Committee, and was presented to Full Council for noting only.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the half-yearly performance against 2018/19 investment strategy, • the current treasury activity and the midyear report. 	Paul Deal
11	<p>Set Council Tax Base 2019/20</p> <p>The Portfolio Holder for Governance, Finance and Corporate Services presented a report which explained that the passing of a formal resolution was required to set the Council Tax Base for the forthcoming year.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To approve:</p>	Paul Deal

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the provision for losses on collection is set at 2.0%. 2. That the report for the calculation of the Council's Tax Base for the year 2019/20 be approved. 3. That pursuant to the report and in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulation 1992, as amended, the amount calculated by the Council as its Council Tax Base for the year 2019/20 shall be £40,496.05. This figure includes the adjustments made as a result of the Council tax support scheme. 	
12	<p>Proposed Changes to Mendip Local Plan II</p> <p>The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Growth and Housing Services presented a report which asked to full Council to agree the Proposed Changes to Local Plan Part II. These changes (also known as 'modifications') followed a detailed review of responses to consultation on the Pre-submission version held in January and February 2018. The report set out the broad approach, the substantive individual changes and details of the examination process.</p> <p>Approval, was sought for the Pre-submission Plan, Proposed Changes and supporting documents to be submitted the Secretary of State for to commence public examination in January 2019. Proposed Changes were not subject to formal consultation but Cabinet had clarified that any responses received before 14 January 2019 on the changes would be included with the submission documents.</p> <p>Cabinet had resolved on 26 November 2018 to endorse the draft proposed changes to Local Plan Part II (text changes and maps) and authorised the Deputy Chief Executive, in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Growth and Housing services, to finalise the proposed changes and submission documents.</p> <p>It was also resolved to recommend approval of the proposed changes to Council and submission of Local Plan Part II, Proposed Changes, and representations received and supporting documents to the secretary of state for examination.</p> <p>In response to questions raised at Cabinet it was explained that any submissions on Proposed Changes would be marked accordingly but all submissions would be sent to the Inspector. These would form part of the 'bundle' of submission documents.</p>	Andre Sestini

This report was being brought to Council to enable submission of Local Plan Part II before 24 January 2019 as development plans submitted before this time can be examined under the March 2012 NPPF. Submission after this date increased the risk of the plan not being found sound and adds weight to objector arguments that a complete review of Local Plan Part I should commence instead. This would add uncertainty to the Council's plan-led approach and defer consideration of the registered individual and community representations.

The Portfolio Holder explained that changes to the Local Plan Part II would not be discussed at this meeting. All representations that had been submitted would be considered by the inspector, who would make a determination as to which issues warranted further investigation. Any such decision would be made by the inspector, not Mendip District Council, and Members were being asked to approve the recommendation to submit the plan to the inspector.

The Chair thanked the Principal Planning Policy Officer for his work on preparing the Local Plan Part II.

Some Members remarked that they did not recall being presented with an opportunity to provide any input, as they had not sat on the advisory group and had not been invited to comment at Cabinet.

The Chair explained that both Members and the public were still able to submit written representation for consideration by the inspector.

The Leader and the Portfolio Holder confirmed that the minutes of this meeting would be submitted to the inspector with the plan, and would include public speakers' comments.

Councillor Nigel Woollcombe-Adams proposed that the report be approved in line with Officer recommendations. The motion was seconded by Councillor Nigel Taylor and carried with 23 votes for, one vote against and nine abstentions.

RESOLVED

- (1) Approve the Proposed Changes to Local Plan Part II as set out in appendices 1(text) and 2 (policy map changes);
- (2) Authorise the Deputy Chief Executive, in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Growth and

	<p>Housing Services, to finalise the proposed changes and submission documents;</p> <p>(3) Request that officers bring an updating report for Cabinet on examination progress and changes following submission;</p> <p>(4) Approve the submission of Local Plan Part II and the Proposed Changes in this report to the Secretary of State for examination, together with supporting documents, representations received and any additional submissions.</p> <p>REASONS FOR THE RESOLUTION</p> <p>To ensure that progress continues to be made on the delivery of an up-to-date Development Plan for Mendip and to provide certainty for developers and local communities.</p>	
13	<p>Wells Recreation Ground Trust new Scheme and Governing Document</p> <p>Councillor John Parham, Chairman of the Wells Recreation Ground Trust Committee presented a report which explained that the Council was the Trustee of the Wells Recreation Ground.</p> <p>The report sought Trustee approval of a New Scheme and supporting Governing Document for the charity Wells Recreation Ground. It was proposed that the latter would be a replacement to Section 24 of the Council's Constitution.</p> <p>These new governance documents would provide the charity with a modern set of rules for day-to-day operations, rather than a reliance on Victorian conveyances which do not contain any governing provisions.</p> <p>Both documents were endorsed by the WRGT Committee at their meeting on 25 September 2018.</p> <p>Once approved by the Council as Trustee, the Charity Commission would be updated and asked to publish the New Scheme.</p> <p>Members congratulated the Trust on its work to date, and noted the efforts of two volunteers from Wells City Council. Members noted that page 189 of the report stated that 'council' referred to Mendip District Council, however the</p>	Jane Sharp

	<p>next section did not draw a clear distinction between District and City Councillors.</p> <p>The Deputy Chief Executive remarked that this was a valid point that would be addressed by the Officer.</p> <p>The Leader asked for clarification of point 9.4 on page 193.</p> <p>The Deputy Chief Executive explained that this was a form of wording that was used in legal documents where a word was missing, and this would be addressed by the Officer.</p> <p>It was proposed by Councillor John Parham that the report be approved in line with Officer recommendations. The motion was seconded by Councillor Harvey Siggs and carried unanimously.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Pursuant to section 70(2)(a) of the Charities Act 2011 that, it being in the best interests of the charity, the Trustee should apply for a new Scheme in order to confirm the charitable purposes of the charity and to confirm the powers of the Trustee in relation to the disposal of the charity's land. 2. That the Trustee approves the draft New Scheme and supporting Governing Document and then asks the Charity Commission to publish the Scheme in accordance with its usual scheme-making process. 3. That Section 24 of the Council's constitution be replaced with Appendix B of the report. 	
14	<p>Heart of the South West – Joint Committee Update</p> <p>The Leader of the Council presented a report which explained that in January 2018, the Heart of the South West (HotSW) Joint Committee was formally established by the constituent councils and organisations involved since 2015 in the devolution partnership. The Committee had been tasked with improving productivity across the HotSW area in collaboration with the HotSW LEP and other organisations as necessary.</p> <p>The Committee has met formally three times in 2018, in March, June and October. In addition to this the management structure that sits behind the Committee and involves Chief Executives and senior officers from across the partnership has met regularly to drive the business of the Committee. The Committee is chaired by</p>	Stuart Brown

Cllr David Fothergill, Leader of Somerset County Council and the Vice-Chair is Cllr John Tucker, Leader of South Hams District Council.

This report summarises the progress made by the Committee over recent months in key areas of activity and sets out actions proposed in the coming months. As part of this report there are specific recommendations for the constituent authorities to consider.

Councillor John Parham explained that he had attended a HotSW meeting with the Deputy Chief Executive and was pleased to see that the programme was still in place. He noted the target to double the GDP of the South West over the next 20 years, which represented a huge expansion of output. He further noted that increasing productivity was key to achieving this goal, and the South West was around 15% less productive than the rest of the UK. An increase in productivity would help to reduce the gap between housing prices and earnings. Cllr Parham further noted that doubling GDP without a significant increase in productivity would place further strain on housing.

Members noted the inclusion of aerospace engineering in the delivery plan. Members also noted that the LEP had already committed its funds for the next two years, and asked what could be done to provide further funding. Members remarked that an 11% reduction in emissions was required and asked whether an increase in GDP would be decoupled from CO2 emissions.

Councillor Tom Killen noted that the drive for productivity could accommodate work to address climate change. He further noted that the Council's participation in the HotSW partnership was necessary to avoid a loss of influence. The District must work with other authorities due to its location, and was well represented in the South West due to good relationships with other Councils. Cllr Killen noted that increasing productivity was key to improving residents' lives, and was essential if poverty was to be tackled. The need for skills and infrastructure improvement would have to be addressed to ensure that the District's businesses could compete in the national economy. He explained that the Council was providing support to businesses and the Local Plan Part II would provide more premises in the District. Cllr Killen noted the need to retain young people within the District and improve the local economy.

The Leader remarked that the proposed increase in GDP was an ambitious target but it was an issue that must be addressed. He noted that the District was losing its young people due to reductions in jobs and housing, and the

Council must consider new solutions as a result. The Leader noted that modernisation must recognise the dangers posed by climate change.

It was proposed by Councillor Harvey Siggs that the report be approved in line with Officer recommendations. The motion was seconded by Councillor John Parham.

RESOLVED

That Council:

1. Note the progress report setting out the work of the Heart of the South West (HotSW) Joint Committee since its establishment in March 2018;
2. Agree to delegate the development and endorsement of the HotSW Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) to the HotSW Joint Committee (noting that final approval of the HotSW LIS rests with the HotSW Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the Government);
3. Note the Budget statement for 2018/19 set out in Appendix B and that in accordance with the decisions taken at the time the Committee was established, the Council will be asked to make an annual budgetary provision to meet the support costs of the Joint Committee in line with the 2018/19 contribution. Final clarification on any additional 2019/20 budget requirement will be provided following the completion of the review of the Joint Committee's role, function and management support arrangements and development of its work programme for 2019/20.
4. To agree the Budget and Cost-sharing Agreement set out in Appendix B to this report.

REASON FOR THE RESOLUTION

It is essential that the local authorities contribute to the development and approval of the LIS working in collaboration with the LEP. The LIS will be a natural development of the Productivity Strategy and Delivery Plan for which the Joint Committee already has delegated authority, and therefore it would seem appropriate to formally extend this authority to the development and approval of the LIS to the Joint Committee on behalf of the constituent authorities.

It is important that the constituent authorities are kept up to date on the Committee's budget situation and make

	<p>provision for the 2019/20 budget commitment. It is also important that the Budget and Cost Sharing Agreement is formally agreed by the constituent authorities as part of the Committee's governance arrangements.</p>	
<p>15</p>	<p>Waste Board Constitution and Membership 2019-20</p> <p>The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood Services presented a report which set out the proposed revisions to the Waste Board's constitution and membership for 2019/20 as a result of the future amalgamation of Taunton Deane Borough Council and West Somerset Council to create the new Somerset West and Taunton local authority.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the constitution and board membership would require the Board to recommend to all partner authorities the dissolution of the current Board and agreement to establish a new Waste Board with an amended constitution to reflect the revised membership. Subject to the Board's approval to the proposals within this report.</p> <p>In response to questions from Members, the Portfolio Holder explained that Councillor Peter Bradshaw was responsible for undertaking scrutiny of the Waste Board.</p> <p>It was proposed by Councillor Nigel Woollcombe-Adams that the report be approved in line with Officer recommendations. The motion was seconded by Councillor Nigel Taylor and carried with one abstention.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Endorse the proposed revision to the draft Constitution (Appendix A) for the Somerset Waste Board and recommend this for approval by all partner authorities and the new Somerset West and Taunton Shadow Authority by 1 April 2019. 2. Delegate authority to the Board's Treasurer in consultation with the Administering Authority's Monitoring Officer to update the Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA) to reflect the various changes agreed previously by the Board. The Board is further requested to agree for the amended IAA to be recommended for approval by all partner authorities and the new Somerset West and Taunton Shadow Authority by 1 April 2019. 	<p>Donna Nolan</p>

	<p>3. Recommend to the partner authorities and the new Somerset West and Taunton Shadow Authority that with effect from 1 April 2019 the current Board and its membership (comprising six partner authorities) is dissolved and to then agree the formation of a new Somerset Waste Board (comprising five partner authorities) and appoint members to that Board.</p> <p>4. Delegate authority to the Monitoring Officer of the Administering Authority to take forward the above recommendations in conjunction with the partner authorities and Somerset West and Taunton Shadow Authority.</p>	
<p>16</p>	<p>Motions to Council</p> <p>Fracking in the Mendip Area</p> <p>This motion was proposed by Cllr Damon Hooton and seconded by Cllr Nick Cottle:</p> <p>This Council notes that on 30 September 2013, Council agreed a cross-party motion to safeguard the Mendip District Council area from the potential negative impacts of Shale Gas Exploration and Extraction (Fracking), in order to preserve and protect our District from harm in light of the recent earth tremors in Blackpool attributed to (but not yet proven) to be as a result of fracking in that area.</p> <p>The agreed 2013 motion could be found at https://adamboyden.mycouncillor.org.uk/2013/10/01/joint-motion-agreed-on-fracking-at-mendip-district-council/</p> <p>Council resolves that, in light of more information becoming available in the 5 years on fracking, and climate change, this country, indeed the world, must now look seriously and urgently at renewable energy rather than yet another fossil fuel for our energy needs.</p> <p>Therefore Council reconfirms the agreed 2013 motion, and will robustly defend our District by objecting to any current or future attempts to secure licenses for fracking both within the District Boundaries and that could affect ground under our District and immediate surrounding areas, the potential impact on Hinckley Point Nuclear Reactor Sites and the spoiling of the natural beauty of our area both within and outside the AONB.</p> <p>Council also notes and supports the Local Government Association's objection to the Government's proposed</p>	

inclusion of shale gas production projects in the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project regime, which would bypass local democratic planning system – as stated here: <https://www.local.gov.uk/parliament/briefings-and-responses/lga-response-beis-consultation-inclusion-shale-gas-production>

During the discussion that followed, the Portfolio Holder noted that Mendip District Council was not the planning authority responsible for fracking, as this was the within purview of the Somerset County Council Minerals Authority.

Councillor Nigel Hewitt-Cooper declared an interest as he was a member of the Somerset County Council Regulation Committee.

Members noted the presence of the Hinckley Point power station and questioned the suitability of the area for fracking.

Councillor Tom Killen remarked that he agreed with the spirit of the motion which had previously been approved and still carried resonance. He noted that previously there had been a number of licences to frack within the district, but no such licences were still in place. Cllr Killen urged caution and recommended that applications be individually considered as they were submitted.

The Leader questioned the recommendation that the Council object to future applications for fracking licenses, as the Council did not have the power to do so. He suggested inclusion of a reference to the proximity of sensitive sites such as Hinckley Point.

The Chief Executive remarked that the last paragraph of page one should be amended to read ‘therefore the Council reconfirms the agreed 2013 motion and acknowledges the potential impact on the Hinckley Point nuclear power station’.

Councillor Damon Hooton proposed that the report be endorsed. The motion was seconded by Councillor Nick Cottle and carried with four abstentions.

Transport in the Mendip Area

Despite EDF’s assurances in recent Press Releases that all is on track for Europe’s largest construction site, the crucial pier that was projected to receive 80% of Mendip’s quarry traffic by train / sea has been delayed by almost 2 years. The consequence has been that the roads and communities of Mendip have borne the brunt of this traffic. Recent EDF and Somerset County Council releases ignore the pier delay, and

demonstrate the lack of priority attributed to roads and communities of Mendip.

Notwithstanding the delay, even when finally completed and operational, the roads of Mendip will still be used to support the growing supply chain. Whilst it is recognised that this clearly supports our local economy, there is an impact on the local transport infrastructure and our communities, and begs the question as to why Mendip has not been included in any SCC / EDF / Highways discussions?

In consideration of this, Council Officers and Members (particularly those who are also Somerset County Councillors) and other County Councillors representing Mendip Divisions are requested by Mendip District Council to work together to ensure:

- that there is appropriate Mendip representation on the joint EDF / SCC Committee, the Transport Review Group
- that there is recognition by EDF of the volume and type of Hinckley related traffic travelling across Somerset to the **east** of the M5, including that associated with the supply chain
- that there is recognition and action from EDF to encourage supply chain companies to acknowledge the local sensitivities associated with this increased traffic and to plan their routes accordingly. This should include, where appropriate, explicit route instructions.
- that the allocation of EDF community funds are made in consideration of the impact that the development has had / is having on Mendip communities

Proposed by: Cllr Ros Wyke

Seconded by: Cllr Harvey Siggs

The Leader expressed support for the proposal which addressed a long-standing issue. Reductions in traffic volumes were expected following completion of the planned jetty, however continued pressure was required. He remarked that he hoped Members who also sat on the County Council would support the motion. The Leader remarked that the Council sought to have input on decisions that effected rural communities. He noted that the District's quarries were significant employers, but some of the benefits of the Hinckley Point project should be shared more widely.

He further noted that a meeting with Somerset County Council and EDF had been requested.

Councillor Philip Ham noted that multiple problems had resulted in delays to the construction of the planned jetty. Contractual obligations to complete the project on time had resulted in additional lorries using the District's roads, which had disproportionately effected a number of smaller villages. Trains were scheduled to begin running from Whatley in mid-February, and it had been agreed that the Council would receive some money from the community fund.

Members noted that industry was also effected as engineers working on the Hinckley Point project were invariably paid more than those working for local companies. An additional 10,000 people moving to the area would also lead to a large number of new houses going to the rental market.

Councillor Nigel Hewitt-Cooper suggested that a Members' visit to Hinckley Point be organised.

Councillor Ros Wyke noted that the figure of traffic movements cited in the report was a figure from 2017 and 2018 and represented only one quarry. The total number of all HGV movements was likely to be significantly higher.

Councillor Nigel-Hewitt-Cooper noted that Pilton Parish Council carried out a regular traffic count and would be happy to circulate the results to Members.

Members suggested requesting that Whatley quarry alter their routes to avoid villages.

Councillor Nigel Taylor noted that 46% of aggregate came from Cheddar, and empty lorries travelled through Wells. The planned train service would alleviate problems in Glastonbury but would not solve the issues in the wider District. He remarked that Members who also sat on Somerset County Council were already holding discussions with the various involved parties.

Members noted that lorries had been observed travelling in convoy, which was not permitted.

Councillor Tom Killen remarked that the Council should not send the message that it was against the economic benefits from the Hinckley Point project. He noted that over 200 Mendip businesses were within the project's supply chain. Cllr Killen further remarked that the Council was not against business but it must seek to alleviate the problems experienced by residents.

	<p>The Chair sought the affirmation of the meeting that Members were in agreement with the motion, noting the statement of Councillor Killen. The motion was affirmed.</p>	
17	<p>Questions from the Public</p> <p>The following question had been raised by Tessa Munt:</p> <p>Please could I have a copy of the approved event management plan and health and safety risk assessment documentation for the markets held in Wells market place, including the Christmas market.</p> <p>The Portfolio Holder explained that a 30 page report had been produced on the matter, and had been scheduled for publication on 18 December 2018.</p>	
18	<p>Questions from Members</p> <p>The following question had been raised by Cllr Nick Cottle:</p> <p>Historic landfill sites are a ticking time bomb. As was highlighted on a recent Country File television program.</p> <p>I understand that before 1992 no records were kept concerning the contents of landfill sites, and possibly their location. Considering the huge environmental consequences that could result from these reckless acts of environmental vandalism, could members be informed of all information that the council hold regarding the location and possible contents of these sites, within the District of Mendip?</p> <p>A particular site of interest would be the historic landfill site at Asham Wood. I understand that large amounts of chemical waste was tipped there over a period of years. It would also be of interest if members could be informed if the Council has contingency plans in place, should some unknown situation arise in the future that causes damage to the environment, in any way shape or form, that has a proven direct link to historic landfill sites.</p> <p>The Council's Response for updating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information held on Historic land fill sites <p>The council has a database of sites in the district which may hold potential risks for contamination and the iShare mapping software holds data relating to location of these</p>	

sites. A particular category on the mapping identifies the location of former historical landfill sites. The information on these sites is retrieved from imported information formerly held by Somerset County Council in their waste regulatory function prior to transfer to the Environment Agency when the latter formed in 1995. Any information which is discovered about a particular landfill site including anecdotal information is noted on the council's sharepoint data storage system and allocated a unique number which identifies the particular landfill site in question. If and when evidence comes to light, its validity is considered as to whether it improves the knowledge on the extent and location of a particular landfill site. Consequently it may be used to update the plotting of the landfill site on the mapping system.

The council's Contaminated Land Strategy endorsed by Cabinet 23.07.18, identifies aim, objectives and priorities reliant on collection, analysis and implementation of data and other information held. The strategy is published on the Mendip DC website here [Contaminated land strategy](#)

- **Asham Wood**

The Asham wood landfill site is managed by Natural England as it has special status due to its ecological importance. Management is in conjunction with the owners, Hanson and Aggregate Industries. The former landfill site is plotted on iShare and referenced as site 1497 for MDC purposes. Our information suggests that it was used for quarry spoil. It also has an unlicensed site reference as US246 and can be found on the Environment Agency public register although there is no information documented under the various categories of waste types as to the nature of wastes which were actually deposited. This is unfortunately a common scenario with unlicensed sites. In determining the level of concern the following is relevant:

1. Our records do not show any historical evidence of contamination affecting the nearby environment
2. We have no intelligence that leachate observed above ground or evidence received from the Environment Agency of any pollution to ground or surface waters from the site.
3. Unless disturbed deliberately by development or naturally by land slippage, the significance of likely contamination from sites may be deemed to be a low risk.

	<p>We have no evidence currently that Asham wood site represents a significant risk of harm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulatory Role and Contingency Plans <p>Chapter 5 of the councils contaminated land strategy outlines the approaches to dealing with contamination based on the polluter pays principle.</p> <p>The strategy highlights how the Council prioritises potentially contaminated land sites within the district, in order that it can determine if resources need to be focussed on ensuring that particular sites are investigated whether in council or private ownership.</p> <p>For development control purposes the developer is responsible for ensuring that brownfield sites are redeveloped to be fit for proposed and future use so that the risk of contamination affecting users and the environment is adequately addressed. With respect to contamination, the National Planning Policy Framework guidance is endorsed through Mendip Local Plan Policy and in particular DP 8 - Environmental Protection.</p> <p>If significant contamination likely to cause harm is discovered at other sites (outside of the development control process) there are powers through legislation which can be used to require persons responsible to carry out investigations and carry out works to remedy the issue. The powers also allow the Environment Agency or local authority to carry out investigations and works and reclaiming costs where environmental damage has been caused. However if the original polluter or person deemed responsible (as defined in the legislation) cannot be found, then the local Authority may end up bearing the significant costs of clean up .</p> <p>Councillor Nigel Taylor noted that Natural England undertook regular monitoring of historic landfill sites.</p>	
20	<p>Urgent Business</p> <p>None.</p>	

The meeting closed at approximately 8.30 pm.