

# DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING DATE: 1<sup>ST</sup> 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.