

PLANNING APPLICATION CM/0017/19

I understand that the Committee considers applications separately.

But the Planning Officer has interlinked planning applications CM/0017/19 and CM/0018/19. So they should be considered together against the overall impact of more HGV traffic and waste processing on the local infrastructure and villages.

It's virtually the same report for both applications.

The Committee has a responsibility to all residents affected by these applications to ensure that they will be protected in accordance with Policy 28 of the BMWLP (Bucks mineral and waste local plans) which clearly states that *"..... planning permission will not be granted to any proposals which likely to generate significant adverse levels of disturbance, both near the site and on routes to and from it, from noise, vibration, dust, fumes, gases, odour, illumination, litter, birds or pests"*.

These 2 applications will definitely (not likely) have a devastating impact on the surrounding villages.

The Planning Officer relies heavily on the site having Class B1 business use with unrestricted lorry movements. But B1 is for a LIGHT industrial process which can be carried out in any residential area.

Waste storage, processing and transfer is not a B1 business. It's best suited to a HEAVY industrial site.

So waste processing is in direct contravention of the B1 licence the site holds.

An online **petition** was recently set up to test the strength of local residents' feelings about "no more waste recycling at the Airfield".

304 people signed the petition in less than a week,

People support local businesses at the Airfield consistent with a LIGHT industrial estate. Not waste processing.

Over 300 people would have been here to tell you themselves but they are working

Quote

"Local rural roads are not build for high volume of HGV traffic. "

"Our roads cannot cope with these huge lorries who constantly thunder through our hamlet ignoring the speed limit, tooting at all hours and using abusive language when they have problems negotiating the width restriction. Most importantly I'm fed up with my house shaking"

Why is there no mention in the reports of how much lorry traffic is being generated by the Airfield.

Why is there no assessment of whether the local roads can cope with the Airfield generating the 3rd largest lorry traffic in the whole of Bucks.

Instead the reports make much of routing arrangements, trackers in vehicles etc.

Has anyone on this Committee been to visit the site and our local villages to see what we face on a daily basis?

Has the officer seen our reality ?:

- Speeding lorries spilling out of the Airfield in every direction
- Traffic jams caused by 2 vehicles not able to pass each other.
- Houses rattling and shaking
- Being woken up at all hours by noisy lorries
- Cars navigating narrow, windy country roads dodging the recurring large potholes
- Frequent road diversions due to bridge closures (got hit again) or roads needing to be repaired - yet again. Or sometimes both

How is the Council planning to ensure that operators keep to an agreed route? By keeping records. And this will be monitored by ONE single enforcement officer for the whole of the County? We think this is neither possible nor credible.

11 years ago we were promised no additional HGV traffic. You need to honour that promise and reject this application.