

Minutes

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY 1 JULY 2019 IN MEZZANINE ROOMS 1 & 2, COUNTY HALL, AYLESBURY, COMMENCING AT 10.30 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 12.45 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms J Blake, Mr C Clare, Mrs B Gibbs, Ms N Glover, Mr R Khan, Mr D Shakespeare OBE and Mrs J Teesdale

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Ms M Rajaratnam, Ms C Kelham, Mr M Pugh, Ms S Taylor, Ms S Winkels and Mr D Periam

Agenda Item

1 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Mrs J Teesdale be elected as Chairman for the ensuing year.

RESOLVED: That Mr C Clare be appointed as Vice-Chairman for the ensuing year.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Apologies were received from Mr N Brown.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4 MINUTES

RESOLVED: The minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2019 were **AGREED** as an accurate record and were signed by the Chairman.

5 CC/0013/19 - APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING DEFUNCT SINGLE-STOREY DINING HALL IN POOR CONDITION AND ITS REPLACEMENT WITH A TWO-STOREY AND A SINGLE-STOREY CLASSROOM EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING SCIENCE BLOCK

Mr D Periam, Planning Consultant, advised that the total gross new floor space to be created by the development was 1,571 square metres. The site was in the Green Belt and a development of over 1,000 square metres; therefore, if the Committee were minded to support the application, it would need to be referred to the Secretary of State, as per the recommendation in the report. Mr Periam had circulated an addendum updating the report, appended to the minutes. Mr Periam stated he had also received comments from the Highway Authority who had no objection subject to conditions. The Flood Management Team Lead, Local Flood Authority had originally objected as noted in the report but now had no objection subject to conditions. The addendum, appended to the minutes and circulated to the committee members, provided the amended conditions including the conditions that had been requested by the two parties mentioned above.

Mr Periam provided a presentation and highlighted the following points:

- Photographs of the existing reception lobby and dining hall and the area proposed for the extension to the science block.
- The entrance to the school site and car park which would be improved.

A member of the committee requested clarification on the size of the proposed development. Mr Periam explained that the existing building to be demolished was 421 square metres, but the proposed total gross floor space of the new building was 1,571 square metres due to it being a two-storey building. As it was over 1,000 square metres and in the Green Belt it needed to be referred to the Secretary of State. The new building would have a slightly larger footprint but would provide much more floor space.

Ms Gibbs proposed the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendations as stated in the report. Mr Khan seconded the proposal.

For	7
Against	0
Abstention	0

RESOLVED: The Development Control Committee SUPPORTED application no. CC/0013/19 for proposed demolition of an existing defunct single-storey Dining Hall in poor condition and its replacement with a two-storey and a single-storey classroom extension of the existing Science Block at The Amersham School, Stanley Hill, Amersham, Buckinghamshire.

RESOLVED: The Development Control Committee AGREED the application be forwarded to the Secretary of State in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009.

RESOLVED: That in the event of the Secretary of State not intervening, the Planning Manager be authorised to APPROVE application no. CC/0013/19 for proposed demolition of an existing defunct single-storey Dining Hall in poor condition and its replacement with a two-storey and a single-storey classroom extension of the existing Science Block at The Amersham School, Stanley Hill, Amersham, Buckinghamshire subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1.

6 CM/0068/18 - APPLICATION FOR RE-CONTOURING OF AGRICULTURAL LAND USING INERT WASTE USE - LAND TO THE NORTH EAST OF PARK HILL FARM, BLETCHLEY ROAD, LITTLE HORWOOD, MK17 0NT

Mr D Periam, Planning Consultant, reported that this application was for the importation

of 40,426 tonnes of inert construction demolition and excavation waste; however, the applicant had clarified the intention was that it would be waste soils as opposed to other materials and the intention was to provide an agricultural improvement on land at Park Hill Farm.

Mr Periam advised that the applicant's agent had submitted a letter which had been circulated to the committee members and appended to the minutes. The applicant stated that additional information had been supplied in support of the application regarding the Land Advisor's comments in August 2018, contrary to the report. Mr Periam clarified that the Landscape Advisor had provided initial comments in August 2018, which the applicant had responded to. However, further comments, as set out in the report, still clearly raised considerable concerns and these were not responded to by the applicant. All the comments had been available on the website and there had been plenty of time for the applicant to respond.

Mr Periam provided some photographs of the site.

In response to a question from a member of the committee, Mr Periam confirmed the local member had not provided a response.

Mr Khan proposed the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendations to refuse application number CM/0068/18 for the reasons as stated in the report.

For	7
Against	0
Abstention	0

RESOLVED: The Development Control Committee **REFUSED** application number CM/0068/18 for the reasons as set out below:

Reasons for Refusal

- 1. It had not been demonstrated that the site would be restored to a high environmental standard contrary to paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy for Waste, saved Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan policy 31 and the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2016 – 2036) Emerging policy 26.**
- 2. The development would result in the disposal of waste by landfill contrary to the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy CS15 and the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2016 – 2036) Emerging policy 13.**
- 3. The development would divert waste from the restoration of mineral extraction sites contrary to Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy CS15 and the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2016 – 2036) Emerging policies 13, 14 and 15.**
- 4. The catchment area for the importation of waste to the site would result in a significant proportion of waste originating outside of Buckinghamshire contrary to paragraphs 1 and 4 of the National Planning Policy for Waste, Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy CS16 and the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2016 – 2036) Emerging policy 15.**
- 5. It had not been demonstrated that the development would be carried out without a significant adverse effect on the local landscape including the landscape character of the Whaddon – Nash Valley Local Landscape Area contrary to Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies CS19 and CS23, the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2016 – 2036) Emerging policy 21, the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan policy RA.8 and the**

Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2013 – 2033) policy NE5.

6. The development if permitted would intensify the use of an existing access on a section of an inter-urban principal road. The slowing and turning of vehicles associated with the use of the access would lead to further conflict and interference with the free flow of traffic on the highway and be detrimental to highway safety. The development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, the aims of Buckinghamshire's Local Transport Plan 4 and the Buckinghamshire County Council Highways Development Management Guidance document (adopted July 2018).

7 **CM/0018/19 - USE OF YARD AND BUILDING FOR WASTE TRANSFER AND WASTE PROCESSING WITH ANCILLARY STORAGE OF WASTE MATERIALS, SKIPS, OPERATOR CAR PARKING AND WELFARE FACILITIES - UNIT 25, OLD AIRFIELD INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, CHEDDINGTON LANE, MARSWORTH, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE, HP23 4QR**

Ms C Kelham, Senior Planning Officer, advised that application CM/0018/19 was seeking to use an additional unit on the airfield site for waste processing to diversify operations currently taking place on units 32, 32A and 33.

Camiers Waste Management Limited were a recycling and skip hire operator and Ms Kelham clarified that the site would be operating in conjunction with those three units, although the vehicle movements were proposed to be in combination with those units.

- Since the publication of the report the following had been received: Eight objections from members of the public.
- An objection from Wingrave with Rowsham Parish Council primarily due to the impact of traffic on the surrounding road network.
- A petition from local residents entitled "No more waste recycling on the airfield".
- A letter from the Member of Parliament for Hertfordshire regarding concerns from a resident in Gubblecote regarding the impact of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) from the site and the general impact of the site on the residents' health and amenity.
- Comments from the Heritage Consultant at Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) regarding this application and the other application on the airfield site (CM/0017/19). These comments concluded that there had been no change in policy or circumstances since the previous applications on the airfield site and as such the Heritage Consultant considered that it would be difficult to sustain a Heritage objection given that the route proposed for HGVs was the most direct route and was the same as used for previous applications. Overall, having sought advice from the Archaeology and Heritage Consultants, the Planning Authority was satisfied that the development would not lead to harm to a designated heritage asset.

Ms Kelham provided a presentation and highlighted the following points:

- The location of the site area and the footpaths.
- The Airfield Industrial Estate was granted a Certificate of Lawful Use in 1985 to be used for light industrial and storage purposes.
- Unit 25 was towards the back of the airfield site.
- In 2017 an application from Waste King Limited was granted planning permission on a site overlapping the current application site.
- In June 2018, AVDC granted planning permission for the demolition of a building and its replacement by an open fronted steel structure on Unit 25.
- A site monitoring visit in autumn 2018 discovered that the yard area had been separated by a fence. This application sought to use new buildings and a unit for

waste transfer and waste processing in conjunction with Camiers at Unit 32, 32A and 33. No additional HGVs were proposed in addition to those that already existed for those three units.

- Comments had been received regarding the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) but Ms Kelham confirmed the site was not within the AONB.
- There was a routing agreement for units 32, 32A and 33 and it was proposed to keep a similar routing agreement for Unit 25.
- Members of the public had expressed concern that if the throughput of the site increased and there was no increase in the number of vehicles that the size of the vehicles would increase. Currently, there were no restrictions on the size of HGVs to be used.
- The proposed changes to add an additional processing element were unlikely to change the nature of the business which was a skip hire business - waste would still be coming into the site in skips and it would be taken off in other containers depending on the nature of the material.
- There was already a sign requiring HGVs to turn right out of the Airfield Site.
- Photos showed that there was room for cars and HGVs to pass.
- Brownlow Bridge had been raised as a problem; it had been repaired and had a weight limit of 18 tonnes. Most skip vehicles weighed considerably less than 18 tonnes even when loaded.

Public Speakers

Ms P Thomas had been delayed so the Chairman invited Mr S Upson to read out a statement, appended to the minutes, on behalf of the applicant, Camiers Group Limited.

Members of the committee raised and discussed the following points:

- A member of the committee stated that she understood there would be no increase in the number of vehicle movements but asked for confirmation that the existing routing agreement had been adhered to. Mr Lupson stated that he was new to the company and had not received any complaints. Occasionally people within the villages required a skip and therefore a skip lorry would have to drive the route to where the skip was required. Mr Lupson acknowledged that occasionally there had been confusion between Camiers' vehicles and other vehicles on the site but as far as he was aware their drivers were strictly instructed to keep to the routing agreement.
- A member of the committee stated that Camiers wished to use 32 tonne vehicles. Mr Lupson advised that Camiers wanted to keep within the existing limitations already in place i.e. 82 movements a day; 41 in and 41 out. Mr Lupson agreed that the use of the bridge was not possible due to the 18 tonne limitation on the bridge.
- Clarification was requested on the location of Brownlow Bridge. Ms Kelham confirmed the bridge was over the canal and showed the location on the map and confirmed that a 32 tonne lorry would have to drive to the main road and turn left and go through Horton to avoid the bridge.
- A member of the committee asked what percentage of traffic would turn left. Mr Lupson explained that Camiers aimed to recycle as much of the material as possible and recycled material was called the 'light fraction' which was extremely light and therefore required a volumetric vehicle to be able to move it economically; it could be 50/50 or less depending on the day. A full arctic lorry of plastic and cardboard would weigh 10-12 tonnes; if laden with coca cola cans the weight could be 22-24 tonnes. All the arctic lorries were weighed before leaving the site and all were covered in environmental sheeting.

- A member of the committee referred to the comment that a 44 tonne full laden lorry would do less damage to the roads due to the way the lorry was sprung and asked if this meant the lorries would be less noisy. Mr Lupson confirmed that the 44 tonne lorries were quieter. 32 tonne lorries had metal spring suspensions and fewer axles and took on more weight per axle so were more abrasive and had more impact on the roads. The actual weight of an arctic per axle was lighter and they also had air suspension which was quieter. There was no difference in the width of the 44 and 32 tonne lorries.
- Mr Lupson confirmed that Camiers had a tracking system in the office and all the lorries were monitored to ensure they kept to the routing agreement. Sub-contractors also had tracking systems.
- A member of the committee summarised his understanding of the application. In response, Mr Lupson confirmed that the misting system was compliant with the Environment Agency and that Camiers were happy to work within the current vehicle movement and routing limitations.

The Chairman invited Ms P Thomas to read out her statement, appended to the minutes, in objection to the application.

Members of the committee raised and discussed the following points:

- A member of the committee commented that Ms Thomas had mentioned frequent bridge closures. Ms Thomas confirmed there were a number of bridges in the area, many of which had been closed recently; in particular Brownlow Bridge had been closed for a second time this year. There were chicanes in the road in Horton preventing two cars travelling along the road at the same time. It was pointed out to the speaker that several of the bridges mentioned were not on the routing agreement. Ms Thomas agreed but stated that she saw lorries every day driving along routes that were not in the routing agreement.
- A member of the committee commented that Ms Thomas' statement had clearly stated that HGVs were causing problems to the residents, however, the planning application was not intending to increase the number of vehicle movements.
- Ms Thomas stated it was confusing and difficult to understand what was being proposed without the planning officers' insight.
- A member of the committee provided a summary of her understanding in that the amount of waste being imported would not increase but the waste would be processed to enable more recycling. There would not be any increase in the tonnage coming in to the site or vehicle movements but the process would be carried out in a more suitable area of the site with dust mitigation measures in place. Ms Kelham confirmed that this was her understanding. More waste would be processed on site but it did not equate to more waste being brought into the site. Ms Gibbs stated that was her understanding when she visited the site.
- Ms Thomas asked if the company had permission for 82 vehicle movements and to process 87,500 tonnes of material; Ms Kelham confirmed that that was what was permitted at units 32, 32A and 33.

The Chairman invited the local member, Councillor A Wight to read out her statement, appended to the minutes.

Members of the committee raised and discussed the following points:

- A member of the committee commented that Councillor Wight had asked the committee to defer a decision until more detail was known on traffic movement; however it had been made clear that there would be no increase in vehicle movement. Councillor Wight added that one of the problems was that the current

routing agreements were not adhered to. According to a Section 106 agreement, GPS tracking information was to be available on request, but it appeared this had not happened. Councillor Wight stated she was not clear how the additional waste would be processed without additional vehicle movements.

- A member of the committee stated he was confused on the amount of tonnage of waste to be processed and the number of vehicle movements. When he first read the report he assumed the 87,500 tonnes and number of vehicle movements were part of the allowance of the partner organisation (unit 32). He had now heard of an additional 87,500 tonnes for the application site and requested clarification. Ms Kelham confirmed the site would manage waste in conjunction with unit 32 and commented that the tonnage which could be stored and processed at the site was limited by the Environmental permit. The amount referred to in the planning application was the amount of material that would be throughput on the site. There was the throughput of the site and the amount of material which was coming off the main highway network that came in through the entrance of the industrial estate. In terms of vehicle movements, if the material was moved from one unit to another it would not be generating additional vehicle movements on the public highway; there were two separate issues. Ms S Winkels, Planning and Enforcement Manager reiterated that there would be no increase in the amount of tonnage that the site processed. There would be an increase in the processing capacity on the site to increase the amount recycled.
- Ms Gibbs stated she had visited the site and seen the original waste site where the waste processing used to be carried out; there would be increased movement of the material but it would be within the airfield site. A large number of lorries used the airfield, but Ms Gibbs emphasised that the committee was only considering the vehicles for this application which all had tracking devices.
- A member of the committee stated that the limit of 82 vehicle movements, 41 in and 41 out, across units 32, 32A and 33 was an improvement. Councillor Wight did not feel putting a limit on the vehicle movements was helpful; she stated she was confused as to how the entire estate had a B1 Light Industry Permit from AVDC, yet was running a heavy industry estate which was not supposed to run anything except offices and little white vans.
- A member of the committee asked if there had been any enforcement on the site. Ms Kelham stated that the reason for the application was due to a visit by the Enforcement Officer who had identified that the site had been split into two. Mr Pugh, Planning Enforcement Officer, added that application number CM17/17 (Waste King) was for unit 25 in its entirety. There were two very similar delivery vehicles which were generating complaints against one operator but it was another operator that did not have planning restrictions that was causing the issue. The breach was regularised and Mr Pugh had not received any complaints since then on the application approved in 2017.
- A member of the committee asked Councillor Wight if she had met with the enforcement team. Councillor Wight confirmed she had met with Mr Pugh and Ms Winkels to discuss the site. Councillor Wight stated she was very familiar with the issue and had received reports of people using Brownlow Bridge despite the weight limit.
- Ms Gibbs stated that, legally, the committee was not retrospectively looking at whether the site was right for the work being carried out at the moment. Approval of the application would mean an improvement from the way the processing was being carried out before. There would be no extra lorries in and out of the site, the waste would be processed inside a unit resulting in less dust. Ms Gibbs' understanding was that the committee were regularising something that was being carried out. Ms Kelham stated that the said building was granted planning permission by AVDC and there had been changes to what had been permitted on the Airfield Site since the Certificate of Lawful Use development which was

granted in 1985. Ms Gibbs added that if there were to be a contravention, it would be dealt with by the enforcement team. Ms Kelham confirmed Ms Gibbs' summary was correct and that there should be odour abatement and less litter with the move to internal processing.

- A member of the committee mentioned that Councillor Wight had commented on the site being in an AONB. Ms Kelham advised that the site was 2.75 km away the edge of the AONB. Vehicles would travel through the AONB but there was no restriction in Buckinghamshire for vehicles travelling in an AONB when they were travelling on the public highway.
- A member of the committee asked for clarity on the legal framework for B1 Light Industrial and Storage. Ms Kelham explained that the airfield as a whole had a Certificate of Lawful Use which was granted in 1985 by Aylesbury Vale District Council for the continued use of the airfield for light industry and storage purposes. Since then, various units has sought planning permissions for change of use e.g. CM17/17.

Ms Gibbs stated that she proposed the committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the planning application, this was seconded by Mr Clare. All the members were in agreement apart from Mr Khan who abstained.

For	6
Against	0
Abstention	1

RESOLVED: The Development Control Committee **APPROVED** application number CM/0018/19 for the use of land at unit 25, Marsworth Airfield for waste storage and treatment subject to Conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning and Environment, and the conditions set out in Appendix A of the report and subject to completion of a Planning Obligation, with details, alterations, additions and deletions, to be determined by the Head of Planning and Environment, to secure the following:

I. Routing agreement to ensure that all HGVs involved in the importation and exportation of materials in connection with the Development

- a) Do not pass though Long Marston Village;
- b) Do not turn into or out of Mentmore Road/Cheddington High Street towards Cheddington and turning into or out of the road to the north west towards Mentmore at the double miniroundabouts between Long Marston Road and Station Road;
- c) Access the Land left-in only from Cheddington Lane;
- d) Egress the Land right out onto Cheddington Lane; and
- e) Proceed to and from the Land along Long Marston Road, Station Road, and the B488.

II. All HGVs within the applicants fleet that travel to and from the site and are involved with the importation and exportation of materials in connection with the Development are installed with GPS equipment in operation at all times for route tracking purposes, which will be available on request provided to the Council.

III. The provision and maintenance of a sign to the reasonable satisfaction of the Head of Planning and Environment at the point of access to the Land to inform drivers of HGVs accessing and egressing the Land of the routes they should observe the routing set out above.

8 CM/0017/19 - USE OF THE LAND FOR WASTE STORAGE AND TREATMENT - UNIT 25B, OLD AIRFIELD INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, CHEDDINGTON LANE, MARSWORTH, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE, HP23 4QR

Ms C Kelham, Senior Planning Officer, advised that application CM/00/17/19 had been submitted by the operator of CM/17/17. The application sought to reduce the area of the site. There would be no increase in the number of HGV movements i.e. 20 in and 20 out.

Since the publication of the report the following had been received:

- Eight objections from members of the public.
- An objection from Wingrave with Rowsham Parish Council primarily due to the impact of traffic on the surrounding road network.
- A petition from local residents entitled “No more waste recycling on the airfield”.
- A letter from the Member of Parliament for Hertfordshire regarding concerns from a resident in Gubblecote regarding the impact of HGVs from the site and the general impact of the site on the residents’ health and amenity.
- Comments from the Heritage Consultant at AVDC regarding this application and the other application on the airfield site (CM/0018/19). These comments concluded that there had been no change in policy or circumstances since the previous applications on the airfield site and as such the Heritage Consultant considered that it would be difficult to sustain a Heritage objection given that the route proposed for HGVs was the most direct route and was the same as used for previous applications. Overall, having sought advice from the Archaeology and Heritage Consultants, the Planning Authority was satisfied that the development would not lead to harm to a designated heritage asset.

Ms Kelham provided a presentation and highlighted the following points:

- Photographs of the site and entrance to the airfield.
- Photographs of the hill fort and footpath.
- Photographs looking into the yard and the inside the site.
- There was one skip lorry; the other vehicles were caged.
- The routing agreement was the same as for application CM/0018/19.

Public Speaking

The Chairman invited Ms P Thomas to read out her statement, appended to the minutes, in objection to the application.

Members of the committee raised and discussed the following points:

- A member of the committee stated that she appreciated Ms Piers’ statement had been written before the clarification of the B1 use had been provided in the previous item and felt that from her perspective she was unable to take any part of the presentation as valid. The member asked Ms Piers if she concurred that the B1 use had changed over the years. Ms Piers commented that her understanding was that AVDC had given the B1 classification and Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC) changed the use. The member explained that consent could change much the same way as an extension to a house could change the housing classification. Ms M Rajaratnam, Assistant Team Leader, Planning and Regeneration, HB Public Law clarified that the district council considered certain types of applications and the County Council considered waste related applications; it was not a case of BCC overruling AVDC. BCC had granted planning permission for waste storage and sorting

- having considered the information provided at the time of that application.
- Ms Thomas queried why the planning officer had relied heavily on the B1 use. Ms Kelham explained it was to do with fallback position. Ms Rajaratnam confirmed if CM/17/17 had not been implemented the fallback position would be have been the Certificate of Lawful Use.
 - Ms Thomas stated that the routing had not been addressed and asked why the whole focus had been on the site. Cllr Clare explained that as part of this application, there was no increase in HGVs proposed and the routing would be as existing.

The Chairman invited Mr A Cattigan, Director and owner of Waste King Limited to read his statement, on behalf of the agent.

- Waste King Limited employed 18 people.
- The application did not include a change to the use of the land, just the area the planning permission covered.
- The size of the site had reduced by over 50%.
- Waste King Limited was not applying for more vehicle movements.
- The site use was not changing.
- During planning application CM17/17 it was stated that Waste King Limited was not looking to grow the business physically in terms of more skip lorries but to streamline the business. Waste King Limited knew that with the limit of 20 HGV movements in and 20 vehicle movements out it would not be profitable nor viable to run a successful skip hire company so they concentrated their efforts on the other business, Skip Hire Limited which was a waste broker. The business did not physically collect and process the waste. If a customer in Glasgow ordered a skip, Waste King Limited would source a skip from a local company in Glasgow and process the order.
- The waste and skip hire business accounted for 30% of their income.
- Waste King Limited was surrendering over 50% of the site back to the land owners after being prompted to regularise planning.
- The vehicles were tracked; the limit of 40 vehicle movements per day and the routing agreement was adhered to.
- Waste King Limited were the sponsors of the Ivinghoe under 15s football team.

Members of the committee raised and discussed the following points:

- A member of the committee stated that the local parish councils had objected to the application and asked Mr Cattigan if they had invited him to provide more clarification. Mr Cattigan confirmed he had not been invited to speak to the parish councils.
- Ms Gibbs stated she had visited the site and wanted to clarify her understanding. Ms Gibbs advised there was a screen in the office and had been told its purpose was to track the vehicles. The vehicles whereabouts could be seen and Ms Gibbs asked if the company kept records. Mr Cattigan explained that the records were kept and that he submitted reports to Mr Pugh. The system sent an email alert if a vehicle travelled into an area that they were not allowed to enter (i.e. away from the agreed routing).
- Ms Gibbs stated she had also noticed that there were four secretaries taking calls. Mr Cattigan advised that the business was a 'hub' for skip hire. Members of the public contacted Waste King Limited who acted as a brokerage and contacted people on their books to supply the skip; this was 70% of their business. Mr Cattigan also mentioned that he had amicably let three drivers go as they were no longer needed with the change in focus of their business.
- A member of the committee asked how many skip lorries remained on the site.

Mr Cattigan stated that there was only one skip lorry; the other vehicles were small lorries with caged sides that were 3.5 tonne and did not require a specialist licence; there were no plans to increase the number of lorries.

- The member summarised that there would be no change in the number of lorries and there were fewer drivers which was better news for the residents. Mr Cattigan stated that a large number of vehicles were required to make that side of the business profitable and this was the reason that this area of the business had been downsized.
- A member of the committee stated he had sympathy with the applicant and felt he had no choice but to support the application.

The Chairman invited the local member, Councillor A Wight to read out her statement, appended to the minutes.

Members of the committee raised and discussed the following points:

- Mr Clare stated the committee understood the issues the community had and were trying to address them within the framework of the application. Mr Clare highlighted the following:
 - There would not be an increase in the number of lorries.
 - Waste King Limited did have planning permission.
 - There was a road through the AONB but lorries were allowed on roads in an AONB.
 - There was one canal bridge in the routing which was an issue and had been repaired.
 - The bridge had a weight limit but the HGVs would be well under the limit. Mr Clare could not think of anything else which would require clarification and asked the other members if they had any further points.
- A member of the committee commented that Councillor Wight had mentioned waste slipping into a stream but stated she had not seen a stream. Mr Pugh stated this was in relation to unit 32; the deposit was not within the application site. Ms Kelham reminded the committee that the units were adjacent to each other but were two separate applications.
- A member of the committee stated that everyone appreciated the number of HGVs on the country lanes but emphasised that the committee were looking at a specific application which would not put an additional HGVs on the road. Ms Kelham confirmed this was correct. Ms Winkels added that any assessment of the highway impact would look at the cumulative impact of the development on the highway network (i.e. the impact of all traffic from the site on the highway network). Due to the fallback position, in respect of the remainder of the airfield site, being that the Certificate of Lawful Use did not limit the number of HGVs then any application on the site that sought to restrict HGVs would provide a benefit. Ms Gibbs clarified that Waste King were permitted a certain amount of HGVs but they were not taking up their whole allocation of 20 vehicles in, 20 vehicles out.

Mr Clare stated that he proposed the committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the planning application, this was seconded by Ms Glover. All the members were in agreement.

For	7
Against	0
Abstention	0

RESOLVED: The Development Control Committee **APPROVED** application number CM/0017/19 for the use of land at unit 25B, Marsworth Airfield for waste storage and treatment subject to Conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning and Environment, and the conditions set out in Appendix A of the report and subject to completion of a Planning Obligation, with details, alterations, additions and deletions, to be determined by the Head of Planning and Environment, to secure the following:

I. Routing agreement to ensure that all HGVs involved in the importation and exportation of materials in connection with the Development

- a) Do not pass though Long Marston Village;
- b) Do not turn into or out of Mentmore Road/Cheddington High Street towards Cheddington and turning into or out of the road to the north west towards Mentmore at the double miniroundabouts between Long Marston Road and Station Road;
- c) Access the Land left-in only from Cheddington Lane;
- d) Egress the Land right out onto Cheddington Lane; and
- e) Proceed to and from the Land along Long Marston Road, Station Road, and the B488.

II. All HGVs within the applicants fleet that travel to and from the site and are involved with the importation and exportation of materials in connection with the Development are installed with GPS equipment in operation at all times for route tracking purposes, which will be available on request provided to the Council.

III. The provision and maintenance of a sign to the reasonable satisfaction of the Head of Planning and Environment at the point of access to the Land to inform drivers of HGVs accessing and egressing the Land of the routes they should observe the routing set out above.

9 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Monday 2 September 2019 at 10.00 am.

**10 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC
RESOLVED**

That the press and public be excluded for the following item which is exempt by virtue of Paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972 because it contains information relating to an individual

11 CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

12 ENFORCEMENT REPORT

CHAIRMAN

Development Control Committee 1st July 2019 - addendum for Item 5:

Application Number: CC/0013/19

Title: Application for demolition of an existing defunct single-storey Dining Hall in poor condition and its replacement with a two-storey and a single-storey classroom extension of the existing Science Block.

Site Location: The Amersham School
Stanley Hill
Amersham

Applicant: Buckinghamshire County Council

Highways Development Management:

No objection subject to conditions.

Flood Management Team:

No objection subject to conditions.

Appendix A - Schedule of Conditions

Time limit for commencement

1. The development shall commence no later than three years from the date of this consent. No later than seven days before the date of commencement, written notification of the date of commencement shall be provided to the County Planning Authority.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Approved Plans

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in complete accordance with the submitted documents and the following drawings:
 - Drawing no. 414.07296.00007.0004 Rev P1 Site Location Plan
 - Drawing no. 414.07296.00007.0005 Rev P1 Proposed Block Plan
 - Drawing no. 414.07296.00007.0003 Rev P03 Hardworks Proposals

- Drawing no. 414.07296.00007.0001 Rev P15 Landscape Strategy Plan
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-E-RF-GA-A-2006 D5 Rev P01 Planning - Block E GA Proposed Roof Plan
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-E-ZZ-EE-A-2016 D5 Rev P01 Planning - Block E Proposed Elevations
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-E-ZZ-SE-A-2050 D5 Rev P01 Planning - Block E Proposed GA Sections
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-N-00-GA-A-2006 D5 Rev P02 Planning - Block N GA Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-N-ZZ-GA-A-2008 D5 Rev P02 Planning - Site Block Plan
- Drawing no. 414.07296.00007.0002 Rev P03 Outline Softworks Proposals
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-E-00-GA-A-2006 D5 Rev P01 Planning - Block E GA Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-N-01-GA-A-2005 D5 Rev P01 Planning - Block N GA Proposed First Floor Plan
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-N-RF-GA-A-2006 D5 Rev P01 Planning - Block N GA Proposed Roof Plan
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-N-ZZ-EE-A-2017 D5 Rev P01 Planning - Block N Proposed Elevations
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-N-ZZ-EE-A-2018 D5 Rev P01 Planning - Block N Proposed Elevations
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-N-ZZ-SE-A-2052 D5 Rev P01 Planning - Block N Proposed GA Sections B-B,C-C
- Drawing no. AMS001-AHR-N-ZZ-SE-2060 D5 Rev P01 Planning - Site Sections
- Drawing no. 70042627-104 Rev P01 Proposed Levels
- Drawing no. 70042627-105 Rev P02 External finishes
- Drawing no. 70042627-107 Rev P02 Construction Details
- Drawing no. 70042627-100 Rev P04 Existing/Proposed Arrangement
- Drawing no. 414.07296.00007.0002 Rev P02 Outline Softworks Proposals With Arboriculture Information
- Drawing no. 100/B Arboricultural Survey
- Amersham School Cross-Sections (showing location of boundary fencing)
- Drawing no. 70042627-D-002 Rev P04 Dining Hall, Reception and Car Park Foul and Surface Water Drainage Layout (If Infiltration Is Feasible)
- Drawing no. 70042627-D-001 Rev P04 Science Block Extension Proposed Foul and Surface Water Drainage Layout
- Drawing no. 70042627-D-002 (Infiltration Not Feasible) Rev P04 Dining Hall, Reception and Car Park Foul and Surface Water Drainage Layout (if Infiltration Not Feasible)
- Drawing no. 414.07296.00007.0010 Rev P03 Indicative Cycle Storage Details
- Drawing no. 414.07296.00007.0011 Rev P02 Indicative Step Details
- Drawing no. 414.07296.00007.0012 Rev P02 Indicative Ramp Details

- Drawing no. 414.07296.00007.0020 Rev P03 Temporary Car Parking Plan
- Drawing no. 70042627-102 Rev P05 General Arrangement
- Drawing no. 70042627-D-003 Rev P04 Deep Borehole Soakaway
- Drawing no. 70042627-D-004 Rev P03 Manhole Details
- Drawing no. 70042627-D-005 Pipe Bedding Details
- Drawing no. 70042627-103 Rev P01 Vehicle Swept Path Analysis

Reason: To define the development which has been permitted so to control the operations in accordance with policy 28 of the BMWLP and policies GP.8 and GP.35 of the AVDLP.

Pre-commencement Conditions

3. Prior to the commencement of the development, an Arboricultural Method Statement including a tree protection plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The approved Arboricultural Method Statement shall be implemented thereafter throughout the construction period for the development.

Reason: To ensure that the trees and hedgerows to be retained are protected in accordance with policies GC4 and GB30 of the CDLP.

4. Prior to the commencement of the development, a scheme of landscape planting and grass seeding shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following:

- Detailed planting proposals and specification stating species size at time of planting; spacing/densities; total plant numbers; planting protection/fencing.
- Detailed proposals for all grassed areas including seed mixes and sowing rates.
- Design and long-term management objectives for existing and new landscape areas; an establishment management and maintenance programme for a minimum five years of aftercare for all new planting; and during the first five years of the programme, the replacement of all failed new planting (irrespective of cause) in the planting season immediately following failure.

Reason: In the interests of the local landscape, the setting of the Chilterns AONB and the amenities of local residents including those on Stanley Hill in accordance with policies GC4 and GB30 of the CDLP.

5. Prior to any works being undertaken at the site a sensitive lighting design strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The strategy shall:

- Identify those areas/features on site that are likely to be sensitive for bats including areas adjacent to Stanley Wood;
- Provide details of how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that impacts on bats will be avoided; and
- Align with recommendations provided in current guidance on bats and lighting;

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy.

Reason: To minimise disturbance to nocturnal wildlife including bats in accordance with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. No other part of the development shall commence until the off-site highway works have been laid out and constructed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The details shall include:

- A combined footway/cycle way to be provided between the site and Stanley Hill Avenue to connect the site with the existing cycle network;
- An approved scheme be provided for ensuring the efficient use of the access junction; and

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the development.

7. Prior to the commencement of any works on the site, a construction traffic management plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The CTMP shall provide for the following:

- the routing of construction vehicles
- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- loading and unloading of plant and materials
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- operating hours
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
- wheel washing facilities

The approved CTMP shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and prevention of congestion in accordance with policies CS25 and CS26 of the CSCD, and policy TR2 of the CDLP.

8. Other than demolition, no works shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The detailed scheme shall include:

- Ground investigations including:
 - Infiltration in accordance with BRE365 in the locations and geologies of all proposed infiltration components
 - Groundwater level monitoring over the winter period within the location of the deep bore soakaway
- Subject to infiltration being unviable, demonstration that an alternative means of surface water disposal is practicable subject to the hierarchy listed informative below:
 - into the ground (infiltration);
 - to a surface water body;
 - to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;
 - to a combined sewer.'
- Full construction details of all SuDS and drainage components
- Detailed drainage layout with pipe numbers, gradients and pipe sizes complete, together with storage volumes of all SuDS components
- Calculations to demonstrate that the proposed drainage system can contain up to the 1 in 30 storm event without flooding. (Any on-site flooding between the 1 in 30 and the 1 in 100 plus climate change storm event shall be safely contained on site.)
- Details of proposed overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance or failure, with demonstration of flow direction.

Reason: To ensure that a sustainable drainage strategy has been approved prior to construction in accordance with CSCD policy CS4 and paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that there is a satisfactory solution to managing flood risk.

9. Prior to the commencement of the development a “whole-life” maintenance plan for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The plan shall set out how and when to maintain the full drainage system (e.g. a maintenance schedule for each drainage/SuDS component) both during and following construction, with details of responsibility for carrying out the maintenance. The plan shall subsequently be implemented thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that maintenance arrangements have been arranged and approved before any works commence on site that might otherwise be left unaccounted for in accordance with CSCD policy CS4.

On-going Conditions

10. No other part of the development shall be occupied until the new means of access has been altered in accordance with the approved drawings and constructed in accordance with Buckinghamshire County Council's guide note "Commercial Vehicular Access Within Highway Limits" 2013.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the development in accordance with policies CS25 and CS26 of the CSCD, and policy TR2 of the CDLP.

11. The scheme for parking, garaging and manoeuvring indicated on the approved drawings shall be laid out prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and that area shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.

Reason: To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn clear of the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway in accordance with policies CS25 and CS26 of the CSCD, and policy TR2 of the CDLP.

12. Prior to the occupation of the development, details of the cycle parking provision shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure sufficient levels of cycle parking within the site to encourage sustainable travel in line with the NPPF.

13. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a demonstration (such as as-built drawings and/or photographic evidence) of the as-built surface water drainage scheme carried out by a suitably qualified person shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority to demonstrate that the Sustainable Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.

Reason: To ensure the Sustainable Drainage System has been constructed as per the approved drawings and is designed to the technical standards in accordance with CSCD policy CS4.

14. Measures for the mitigation of the impact on protected species and other ecological features of interest shall be implemented in accordance with the details set out in the *Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment* Report (Bernwood ECS Ltd, February 2019).

Reason: To ensure that protected species are safeguarded at all phases of development and to ensure a net gain for biodiversity in accordance with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

15. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, an updated school travel plan in general accordance with the 'Buckinghamshire County Council Travel Plan Good Practice Guidance' and any other reasonable requirements of the County Planning Authority shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The plan shall include:

- The appointment of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator;
- A programme for facilitating the monitoring of the Travel Plan;
- A parking strategy taking into account the requirements of full time staff and sixth form students;
- a full analysis of the existing modal split for staff and pupils at the school and detailed proposals for future sustainable transport promotion and provision, with the aim of securing no increase in the number of car movements generated on the school journey.

The approved School Travel Plan shall be implemented thereafter.

Reason: In order to influence modal choice and to reduce single occupancy private car journeys and so to promote sustainable methods of travel and to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway in accordance with policy CS25 of the CSCD.

16. Following the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the approved School Travel Plan shall be reviewed and updated and submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority, on an annual basis, at the end of each academic year. In the event of an increase in the number of car movements, the school shall set out the measures to be taken to promote a reduction in the number of car borne trips. The approved reviewed and updated School Travel Plan shall be implemented thereafter.

Reason: In order to promote sustainable methods of travel, to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway in accordance with policy CS25 of the CSCD.

INFORMATIVES

Compliance with Article 35 of the Town and County Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015

In determining this planning application, the County Planning Authority has worked positively and proactively in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, as set out in the Town and Country Planning

(Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. In this instance, this requirement can be demonstrated through the County Planning Authority working to highlight and seek to resolve consultee concerns with regard to landscape, arboricultural impact, surface water drainage and highways impacts.

Mud on the Road

It is an offence under S151 of the Highways Act 1980 for vehicles leaving the development site to carry mud onto the public highway. Facilities should therefore be provided and used on the development site for cleaning the wheels of vehicles before they leave the site.

Site Notice

Please remove any site notice that was displayed on the site to advertise this planning application.



Dear Members

APPLICATION NUMBER: CM/0068/18 Park Hill Farm Recontouring of Agricultural Land

This Statement is submitted to you in connection with the recommendation that invites the Committee to refuse the above referenced application for 6 reasons.

To be clear, this is not an application for landfill or land raise. This is an application for the recontouring of agricultural land, an engineering operation, using soils. The purpose is to improve productivity of the land and to ensure that the land can be farmed safely, without the risk of farm machinery overturning. The land sits at a high point of 148m AOD (eastern part) and falls sharply to its low point of 130m AOD (to the west). As a result of the steepness, the land does not have agricultural benefit and is of limited value to the farmer. The application is supported by an Assessment of Limitations to Agricultural land Quality, prepared by Reading Agricultural Consultants Ltd. The Assessment confirms that there is a clear agricultural benefit to reducing the gradient across the upper parts of the field to eliminate the safety hazard of operating machinery on the slopes, and to offer the opportunity to farm the land in a wider range of crops than is possible at present.

The soils that would be imported to the site would be from local construction projects, minimising the need for travel.

Additional information was supplied in support of the application, including information relating to landscape and visual impact, contrary to the Committee Report. There will be no permanent impact on landscape character as a result of the proposed development as the landform proposed (with reference to the plan excerpt in the Committee Report) will not be incongruous and will largely appear unchanged when restoration is complete.

The proposed reasons for refusal are neither robust nor justified:

Reason1: The site will be restored to a high quality. This is explained in the application and is supported by the above referenced Assessment, the proposed stripping and storage of sub and topsoils for use in restoration and plans showing an appropriately graded landform. Paragraph 7 (NPPW relates to landfill – this is not a landfill operation).

Reason 2: This is not a landfill operation.

Reasons 3 & 4: This is a small-scale engineering operation with a defined purpose and will utilise just over 40,000 tonnes of soils.

Reason 5: The proposed contours ensure that there will be no adverse or permanent change in the landscape character.

Reason 6: The Applicant has its own fleet of transport and can and will put in place the necessary arrangements for lorry routeing which would overcome the highways objection.

We respectfully request that the Committee rejects the recommendation and allows the landowner to put the land back into agricultural production.

Maureen Darrie, GP Planning Ltd, iCon Centre, Daventry NN11 0QB 26th June 2019

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING DATE: 1ST July 2019

APPLICATION No.: CM/0018/19

APPPLICANT: Amalgamated Industrial Park

SPEAKING: Camiers Group Limited
Mr Simon Lupson

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Development Control Committee for considering the contents of my submission supporting this application CM/0018/19 within their deliberations.

Due to recent publications in the local media and the review of the objections submitted in relation to the planning application, I would like to take this opportunity to clarify certain matters on behalf of the applicant and operator:-

1. Camiers Group Limited are the current operators of Unit 32, Old Cheddington Industrial Estate, Cheddington Lane. Marsworth, Buckinghamshire HP23 4QR. This site operates under granted planning permission 11/20007/AWD from 2012.
2. Under planning permission 11/20007/AWD there is an agreed routing agreement and vehicle movement limitations in place.
3. Under this application the applicant Amalgamated Industrial Park Ltd is looking to regularise Unit 25, so that it can operate as part of the existing operation of Unit 32.
4. As part of this application, the applicant agrees to adopting the existing routing and vehicle movement limitation agreements of Unit 32, to include Unit 25. It was never requested by the applicant to increase any vehicle movements, as part of this planning application. Therefore, any objections submitted in relation to: additional HGVs; Highway Safety; and Noise and Vibration from vehicles are misguided as no such request has been submitted.
5. The operator wishes to increase its contribution to the Waste Hierarchy, as does Buckinghamshire County Council. As an operator we understand the priorities in the order of managing waste materials. Unit 25 will enable the company to increase its recycling and recovery of materials for reuse.
6. The purpose of this planning application is to maximize efficiencies within the existing waste activities of the operator. The operator wishes to increase its recycling and recovery percentages, not its capacity. Please note that the Environment Agency have no objections to this application.
7. Unit 25 in the past was part of some land that had been used for waste management. However, the previous operation was done outside with no buildings by another operator.

I would like to clarify that all the proposed waste activities of this application on Unit 25, will be undertaken within the building with a fully compliant dust suppression misting system installed. Therefore, the objections with regard to litter from the site on the local amenity and the impact of dust/fumes from the site in surrounding and local wildlife has significantly reduced if not been negated compared to the previous consented operation.

8. In addition, the objection regard odour is also negated due to the proposed operation being inside a building and its considerable distance to local residential areas. However, as an extra precaution the misting system within the building has the ability of a fragrance additive that can be implemented, if the issue arises.
9. The objections of increasing capacity without increasing vehicle numbers to larger vehicles and greater impact are incorrect. Under this application the applicant is not looking to increase the current capacity.

The concern of a greater impact and the recommendation of a maximum vehicle weight of 36 tonnes is not appropriate. There is no standard lorry with a limiting weight of 36 tonnes. It would either be 32 tonnes or 44 tonnes, however 32 tonne lorries all have metal spring suspensions on each axle, while vehicles up to 44 tonne are all on air suspension axles. Therefore, 32 tonne lorries are more abrasive and create more vibration on the roads, as there is more weight on each axle. The proposed introduction of a lower gross weight would automatically increase vehicle movements on the existing routing agreement to be adopted.

Currently with the existing condition of vehicle limitations under the existing planning permission and routing agreement of Unit 32 (to be adopted) we are able to transport with one vehicle movement the same amount of material than the two vehicle movements being suggested within clause 18 of the Representations.

There is far less impact on the environment and carbon footprint combining the existing routing agreement and vehicle movement limitations of Unit 32 with Unit 25, as suggested by the Highways Development Management Officer as he states *"the traffic impact of this proposed development would not be material."*

CONCLUSION

This planning application does not require additional vehicle movements, is not looking to increase capacity, but to increase recycling. The applicant is in agreement to adopt of the Unit 32 routing agreement and vehicle movement limits in combination with Unit 25.

All the recycling activities are being undertaken in a purpose-built building meeting the environmental measures and expectations of the planning authority and environment agency.

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

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.

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

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.

CM/0017/19

I would like to state my objection to this planning application for 25,000 tonnes of waste to be processed on the site. I was uncertain as to whether this 25,000 tonnes is part of the 87,500 tonnes mentioned in the related application CM/0018/19 or whether it is in addition to that?

My residents have strongly objected to this application, bearing in mind the increase in residential housing which is proposed for Cheddington, Pitstone, Edlesborough and the other surrounding villages, this represents an entirely unacceptable amount skip trucks and industrial waste carrier movements on this site. Since CM/17/17 was approved, residents in all the surrounding villages have written to me to say they find the current HGV and skip truck movements from this site already bothersome, noisy, disturbing their rest in the mornings and they complain of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, ash, dust and grit.

Here are some examples of resident views

“I believe that the pollution this operation creates, including dust, rubbish and odor contributes to a loss of local amenity”

The recycled earth slip is subsiding down into the stream. We have had cause to complain to the environmental agencies regularly about this pollution. The waste companies only clear up once they've been visited by the relevant agency as a result of a complaint. “

“My house shakes as the huge HGVs drive past on Cheddington Lane. They cause havoc by trying to turn into Cheddington Lane from Tring road or Station road as it such a small narrow road.”

“The lorries already cause a massive issue in the village with several of the villagers reporting and filming lorries driving too fast, and scraping past their cars and houses causing damage as they turn the tight corners.”

“The lightweight plastic has also blown some distance from the site and now litters the surrounding crops/hedges, up to a half a mile away as the fields are open.”

“Surely a business like this would be better suited to a dual carriageway location like College Road a few miles away?”

“Traffic affects significantly the amenity of residents on Cheddington Lane and Station Road in the surrounding villages of Long Marston and Cheddington.”

There are pages and pages of similar comments which I trust the committee members have read.

The road network is even less suitable for industrial vehicles than when Waste King submitted CM/17/17 since the Brownlow Bridge now has an 18 tonne weight limit. The Bridge has been recently hit and damaged again this April, making two impacts in one year.

While this estate continues with its unrelenting intensification of use, it is incompatible with the character of the villages and small rural communities and cottage rows around it.

It is my understanding that this site was originally given permission by AVDC in 1985 as B1 Light Industrial and Storage, which means 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. However, B2 planning permission was subsequently granted to certain units, so I will tell my residents to get used to the noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit in their back gardens and homes as a consequence of that decision.

Through the process of planning creep this has become the third largest HGV movement generator in the ENTIRE COUNTY and

should not be allowed to continue. The emerging Bucks Freight Strategy should be consulted before granting this application.

Given the uncertain fate of the Brownlow canal Bridge in Ivinghoe, the unsuitability of the Cooks Wharf canal bridge, the complaints by residents of increasing pollution, noise, vibration and the impact that this likely to have on the AONB in Ivinghoe and its ecosystems, I ask the Committee to refuse this application.

However, if you are minded to agree with the officers' recommendations, I would ask that the the officers request GPS tracking information from the applicant to ensure routeing compliance. I would also request both a Traffic Impact Assessment and an Environmental Impact assessment be done to determine the impacts on the surrounding area and AONB.

Anne Wight
Local Member

