

CM/0018/19

Poor and deteriorating roads surround the Airfield causes

- Frequent bridge closures
 - Weight restrictions on bridges
 - Roads too narrow to safely allow two commercial vehicles to pass each other.
-
- The Airfield generates 3rd largest amount of HGV traffic in whole of Bucks county. (1st College Rd, 2nd entire town of HW incl all industrial parks)
 - Long Marston and Station Road have 3 to 5 times the proportion of lorry traffic compared to the motorway network.
-
- 100 houses are now being built in Cheddington along the route to the site with
 - No access to Long Marston Road as there were concerns about highway safety.

So there is no acceptable route for commercial HGVs from the Airfield Site to the Strategic Highway Network.

The officer's report is confusing at best and smoke and mirrors at worst. The applicant is seeking to process a minimum of 87,500 tonnes annually with no approved lorry movements.

The report refers to relying on operating in conjunction with an unnamed operator at Unit 32 who has permission for 82 movements but it would appear no approved processing capability?

Is this a joint application? If so, why is the operator of Unit 32 not named?

It's also unclear if 87,500 tonnes is an increase or the total volume of waste to be processed annually. And is this between one or two operators?

Where is this waste coming from? It can't be just local!

Aren't there more suitable waste processing sites along the route to the Airfield without the Airfield's access issues ?

Pier Thomas

1/7/19

The numbers don't stack up.

In 2017, the Council approved 25,000 tonnes which equalled 40 daily movements.

Yet we're asked to believe that an extra 87,500 tonnes (3.5 times 25k) could be processed with just 82 movements by a third party operator.

We say that the unnamed operator is Camiers with its long history of planning breaches.

In 2008, Camiers were refused an application to increase their daily movements from 82 to 124. The Planning Inspector was very clear. Quote

- "... Given the poor quality of the links to the strategic highway network, I consider that **encouragement should not be given to increase traffic flows on the local road network to and from the appeal site**, particularly when a proportion of the waste arisings being dealt with already originated well outside the local area. **To do so would clearly add to the harm presently being caused to the living conditions of local residents and the users of the local highway network.** "

To reach this volume of 87,500 tonnes, 140 daily movements would be required. A number pretty close to the 124 refused.

Is this application a step towards getting those 140 movements? Absolutely!

When does it end?

Approving these applications means a minimum of 112,500 tonnes of waste processing per year at the Airfield.

Given

- All the road issues
- the negative impact on people's lives, and,
- just 3 miles away exists a heavy industrial site MUCH more suited to this type of industry.

Where is the officer's consideration of alternative options?

Why doesn't the Council consider reducing the amount of HGV traffic at this site?

11 years ago, we were promised

- no increase in lorry traffic as the road network was wholly inadequate,
- the site was in the wrong location and
- any increase in lorry traffic would have a HUGE negative impact on homes and health of villagers living alongside the routes.

You need to honour that promise and refuse this application.