

CM/0018/19

I object to the processing of 87,500 tonnes of waste on this site on behalf of my residents.

I believe this application lacks sufficient information. The officers' report is scant on the detail required for the Committee to take an informed decision.

Specifically, why hasn't an Environmental Impact Assessment been completed prior to this application coming to committee in view of the proximity of the AONB in Ivinghoe and many complaints from residents? Why hasn't a Traffic Impact Assessment been carried out?

How will waste arrive and be removed from the site? I find the officers' report confusing and possibly erroneous in the following respects.

In the officer's report for CM/17/19, line 16 states that throughput will be 25,000 tonnes of waste and line 19 says it will require 40 HGV per day to operate that. However, the officers report for this application states on line 19 that throughput will be 87,500 tonnes but on line 21 that this will be done without generating any extra HGV movements? How is that possible? A ratio of 40 movements for 25,000 tonnes of waste equate to 140 movements for 87,500 tonnes— 140 heavy goods vehicles, not including the heavier bulk waste carrier units required to transport the processed waste out.

Line 21 also states that this will somehow be possible because the plant will be used in conjunction with unit 32 but no further detail is given on how this will work. Unit 32 is occupied by Camiers Waste and it would be hard to believe that they have this capacity given their allowances. I will remind committee Camiers applied in 2007 to increase their HGV movements to 124 which was rightly refused and I remind committee that this was lost at appeal. Even if it had been allowed, it would be insufficient to deal with the literal mountain of waste this application seeks to permit.

Whilst my residents will welcome a routing agreement, this begs the question as to why officers are proposing one when they suggest no increase in traffic?

I am informed by officers that this Estate is now rated as the third largest HGV generator in the entire county. This site was originally intended for B1 Light Industrial and Storage, never for heavy industry. That is office use or any use which could be carried out in a residential area without detriment to the amenity through noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit. Yet residents have to endure heavy industry literally in their back gardens in some cases due to retrospective planning creep.

The surrounding road network is already inadequate for heavy industry but is becoming more limited as the Brownlow Bridge on the B488 has an 18 tonnes weight limit for an indefinite —and possibly permanent—period. Traffic from the site diverts through Cheddington High Street and Cooks Wharf, taking HGVs past Cheddington School and the terraced cottages.

Why should local residents effectively “subsidise” these businesses using this site when in many cases skip lorries pass by more suitable sites at College Road, Aston Clinton and Newton Longville adjacent to the strategic HGV road network?

Residential housing is increasing in Cheddington, and surrounding villages. This increase in housing is totally incompatible with increasing heavy waste processing industry.

The AONB in Ivinghoe is covered under the Revised National Planning Policy Framework which states “planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes” How can processing 87,500 tonnes of industrial waste which then has to travel through the AONB possibly enhance this valued landscape in Ivinghoe and its surrounds?

Residents have complained to me and on the planning applications of dust on the fields and near their homes from the site, as well as noise and bad smells/fumes coming from the site routinely.

Residents have noticed an increase in HGV and traffic movements from the site over the past 18 months, prompting BCC to instigate Freight Strategy workshops in the area as Ivinghoe Division is a freight hotspot across the county.

I ask the Committee to refuse this application. But If you are minded to agree with the officer recommendations, at least defer until full details are available on vehicle movements, and the inconsistencies in the officer reports have been resolved. I would also entreat the entire Committee to undertake a site visit to fully comprehend the inadequacy of the surrounding road network and residential character of the area.

Anne Wight
Local Member