

Development Control Committee

Site:	Chiltern View Nurseries Wendover Road Stoke Mandeville Aylesbury Buckinghamshire
Proposal:	Extension to waste and recycling transfer station
Applicant:	Mr J Bone
Reference:	13/20003/AWD
Date:	4 Novemeber 2013
Author:	Nick Bowden 01296 387886
Electoral divisions affected:	Aston Clinton/Bierton
Local Members:	Bill Chapple
Recommendation:	The Development Control Committee is invited to REFUSE application number 13/20003/AWD for the following reasons:

1. The application site is located within open countryside and outside of any defined settlement boundary under the provisions of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan. The proposed development would result in the introduction of approximately 4,200 square metres of hardstanding in order to allow additional space for the existing waste transfer and recycling operation. It has not been demonstrated that there is any requirement for the provision of this hardstanding which would result in harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and result in a further urbanisation of a vulnerable area. The proposed development would provide significant capacity for the storage of untreated waste, well in excess of that which



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



could be reasonably expected for an operation of this scale, would be seriously detrimental to the character, appearance and environment of the countryside and fundamentally conflict with the waste hierarchy for achieving sustainable waste management principles. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policies CS10 and CS22 of the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, policy 36 of the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and policies GP35, RA2 and RA3 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan.

2. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application in order for the County Planning Authority to assess whether the development would result surface water discharge onto surrounding land or impact upon protected species. The application site is located adjacent to a potential habitat for great crested newts and introduces a substantial amount of hardstanding which could result in surface water discharge to surrounding land. Accordingly it has not been demonstrated that the development would not result in an unacceptable discharge of potentially contaminated water run off to the surrounding environment which may impact upon a protected species. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policies GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan and policy 36 of the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Resources Appraisal: None

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Summary

1. The subject site comprises an existing waste transfer and recycling facility together with surrounding agricultural land and nursery, located off Wendover Road and adjacent to the railway line. The application seeks permission to extend the area of the site through the laying of approximately 4,200 square metres of hardstanding to the southeast of the existing site.

Site Description

2. The site is bounded by the main Aylesbury to London railway to the north west, Wendover Road to the east and Triangle business park to the south. The area in the locality, whilst falling within the open countryside is nevertheless characterised by a mixture of agricultural uses together with linear residential development along the Wendover Road and the Triangle Business Park.
3. The overall Chiltern View Nursery site comprises the established nursery, associated agricultural land together with the recycling and waste transfer operation. The site features a variety of small to medium size fields and various developed areas including the 1,200 square metre nursery building (presently under construction), hardstanding for vehicle parking and the waste transfer yard with associated buildings. The site is

also presently characterised by a variety of mounds of material comprising topsoil and hardcore.



4. The application site itself comprises a 1.96 hectare parcel which includes the established waste transfer and recycling facility, a cleared area which was formerly laid to unauthorised hardstanding and pond to the north and grass scrub field to the south. The site has an authorised use as a waste transfer and recycling facility for the processing of 25,000 tonnes of waste per annum. At present this is provided for within the existing yard and includes one detached, part open sided building for the processing of waste, large areas of hardstanding presently used for the storage of heavy plant machinery, a concrete crusher, approximately 30 shipping containers, 50 skips, 12 waste containers and two portacabins. Other items at the site which appear to be otherwise unconnected with the principal use of the site as a waste transfer and recycling facility (but are not necessarily unlawful) include three light commercial vehicles, one truck with trailer, a caravan and bound and bailed agricultural product.
5. Planning permission exists for the construction of an additional waste and recycling shed along the south western boundary. This permission has not been implemented and remains extant until 14 February 2016.
6. The development proposed relates to a 0.42 hectare area of scrub grassland to the south of the waste transfer and recycling yard and set to the north of a recently constructed car park which serves the Triangle Business Park.

Site History

7. The site has a varied history with both the County Council and District Council having entertained numerous planning applications relating to the nursery, waste transfer and recycling use. Both Authorities have also had cause to investigate unauthorised uses including but not limited to the burning of waste material and use as a car park.

Enforcement notices have been issued albeit that matters alleged in these notices have subsequently been resolved. The following comprises a summary of these:

85/01401/AV: Widening of gateway. Permitted by the District Council.

96/1410/APP: Erection of agricultural storage buildings and polytunnels. Permitted by the District Council.

97/00352/APP: Erection of agricultural storage buildings and polytunnels. Permitted by the District Council.

99/02457/APP: Relaxation of Condition 5 of consent no. 97/0352/APP to allow agricultural retail sales from the site. Permitted by the District Council.

00/01074/APP: Erection of agricultural buildings for the storage of hay and machinery. Refused permission by the District Council.

ENF/03/15: Enforcement notice issued by the County Council directed against the use of the land for the importation and deposit of inert demolition waste; the importation, deposit, processing and burning of green waste; and the importation, deposit, processing and burning of household skip waste. Appeal withdrawn, notice complied with.

04/02229/APP: Telecommunications equipment comprising 20m sectored column, two antennas, 1600mm microwave dish, equipment cabin and ancillary development. Withdrawn.

05/00073/APP: Telecommunications equipment comprising 20m sectored column, two antennas, 1600mm microwave dish, equipment cabin and ancillary development. Withdrawn.

06/02928/APP: Use of part of existing barn as farm shop with associated ancillary storage/workshop, use of part of land for siting of four containers for storage and siting of portacabin for office use associated with the nursery, provision of parking and turning, creation of bays for the storage of compost, fertiliser and other similar products. Permitted by the District Council.

EN8/2008: Enforcement notice directed against without planning permission the change of use of land from agricultural to a mixed use including (inter alia) the storage, parking, repair and sale of motor vehicles, the storage of containers and other items, and the siting of touring caravans for residential use. Appeal withdrawn, notice complied with.

09/00990/APP: Erection of building incorporating storage, potting shed, office and toilet. Withdrawn.

10/20000/AWD: Change of use from former railway yard and agricultural machinery yard to a waste and recycling transfer station. Withdrawn.

10/00047/AWD: Change of use of adjacent agricultural field to a car park. Permitted by the District Council.

10/02564/APP: Erection of replacement nursery building and yard and extension to car park. Withdrawn.

11/00630/APP: Erection of replacement nursery building and yard and extension to car park (retrospective). Permitted by the District Council.

11/20002/AWD: Change of use from former railway land and agricultural machinery yard to a waste recycling and transfer station. Permitted by the County Council.

11/20006/AWD: Erection of a waste recycling shed. Permitted by the County Council.

12/01224/APP: Erection of glasshouse (amendment to glasshouse approved under 11/00630/APP) and canopy over approved nursery display and service yard. Permitted by the District Council.

12/02044/APP: Erection of replacement nursery building and yard extension to car park (amendment to 12/01224/APP). Permitted by the District Council.

12/20003/AWD: Erection of waste recycling shed. Permitted by the County Council.

13/20002/AWD: Proposed extension to waste and recycling transfer station. Withdrawn.

Proposal

8. The application seeks planning permission to extend the existing recycling and waste transfer operation to the south east. The operational works comprise the laying of approximately 4,200 square metres of hardstanding in order to provide a storage area for waste processed through the site.

Planning Policy

9. Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan policies 14, 28 and 36.
Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies CS9, CS10, CS14 and CS22.
Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan policies GP8, GP35, GP38, GP39, GP40, RA2, RA3, RA29 and RA36.
National Planning Policy Framework.

View of the District Council

10. Aylesbury Vale District Council raise no objections provided that the County is satisfied that any adverse impact resulting from the proposal in terms of visual impact in the countryside and impact on the amenity of nearby occupiers is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, and that the additional vehicle movements associated with the proposal would not result in adverse impact on the safety and convenience of road users. Consideration should be given to whether the applicant should be required to carry out and submit an ecological survey of the site and to whether ALUTS contribution is required in association with this development.

Consultations

11. The **Environment Agency** have no objections to the proposed development as submitted.
12. If existing permitted activities are intended to be conducted on the new extended concrete area, then a variation of your permit will be required.

13. This site is covered by discharge exemption EPR/YE5591AX/A001. Please ensure that any potential increase in sewage discharge for this site stays below the maximum of 5 cubic metres per day.
14. It is suggested that larger areas of hard standing e.g. walkways/car-parking are constructed following the recommendations set out in Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems guidance. This can be continued with designs for open space and landscaping within the area. The use of SUDS can attenuate the disposal of water and reduce the impact of pollutants to nearby watercourses.
15. Please ensure that any contaminated liquid from the installation of the concrete area or other building material does not enter any watercourses.
16. The Council's **flood management** officer notes that the proposal is to dispose of surface water via two gullies connected to a NSFP 80 Klargester Full Retention Separator to the east of the site. Concerns are raised over the efficiency of this due to the topography of the site and the lack of information provided regarding the volume of runoff and discharge rate. The applicant should calculate the existing and proposed volumes and rates at the site and demonstrate the proposed drainage system can manage the surface water volumes and rates for all rainfall events up to the 1 in 100 year rainfall event.
17. In order to assess the impact of the proposed extension to the waste and recycling transfer station it would be expected to receive sufficient evidence to demonstrate there will be no increase in flood risk.
18. The consultant **ecologist** comments that the site plans of the existing habitats on site are not recorded in a manner that allows for any potential impacts on protected habitats or species to be determined. The ecology paragraph contained within the Design and Access Statement is very limited in detail and it is unclear whether this paragraph was produced by a suitably qualified ecologist, or having sought the advice of a suitably qualified ecologist.
19. The previous planning applications for development of the waste recycling and transfer station have been reviewed (11/20002/AWD RSK Ecology Report, 2010) and it is considered that the potential impacts on great crested newt (GCN) of the current proposals have not been fully explored. It is understood that GCN were found by RSK in a pond approximately 95m away from the site (RSK, 2011). The close proximity of a great crested newt population and the presence of two bodies of water (wildlife pond and ditch) on the boundary of the development suggest that the opinion of a suitably qualified ecologist should be sought before any impact assessment is made. This is largely due to two breeding seasons having passed between the 2011 surveys and the current application.
20. It is understood that there are potential issues relating to the hydrology of the site. The impacts of changes in hydrology of the site and nearby habitats with the potential to support protected species must also be assessed by an ecologist. Without this information any potential effects on downstream habitats may not be identified. The ecological assessment should also include the potential impacts of flooding events.
21. At present there is no evidence in support of the conclusions of the Design and Access Statement paragraph relating to ecological consideration. The previous surveys carried out by RSK in 2010 and 2011 are out of date and it is considered inappropriate to base

current impact assessments on these findings. Jacobs are therefore unable to determine whether there will be any impact on protected species caused by the development. It is therefore considered that an ecologist should visit the site in order to assess and report on any likely impacts and mitigation that may be required. This should include an assessment of any impacts caused by changes in hydrology of the site and flooding events. The report should also include information on any mitigation measures that have already been put in place. In the interim we recommend that a planning decision is deferred until such information has been provided.

22. The Council's **landscape** adviser comments that understanding the proposals in the application is hampered by a lack of information. Although a sample section drawing has been submitted showing the construction/composition of the 'extended concreted area'; there needs to be a section drawing of the site showing site levels before and after development. This is essential to understanding how the site functions, including the gradient for the run off of water and contaminants into the gulleys.
23. A comprehensive planting schedule should be submitted detailing plant species, quantities/densities, size (in the case of trees and hedge planting) together with planting methodology and maintenance plan. Some details of planting has been provided in a piecemeal way – annotated on the plans, but should be more.
24. From what can be discerned the selection of trees is fine, although we would recommend that common ash - *Fraxinus excelsior* should not be included in the scheme because of the threat to Ash trees from ash dieback disease (*Chalara fraxinea*). Alternatives or substitutes for planting could be lime, alder or silver birch.
25. For the planting of a meadow, it is recommended that applicant uses a mix that's in character with the local landscape. As for the planting of reeds, these should be in the pond rather than planted around it, their function is as a means of filtration and cleaning the pond water.
26. There needs to be clarification as to what constitutes 'native country hedging'? Hedging species should reflect the character of enclosures in the surrounding landscape, which is chiefly common hawthorn – *Crataegus monogyna* or blackthorn - *Prunus spinosa*.
27. The **Highway Authority** comments that the application does not propose to increase the amount waste being processed at the site.
28. Mindful of the above, satisfied that there would not be any material impact on the surrounding highway network as a result of the proposed development, and as such, have no objection to the proposal from a highways perspective, subject to conditions in any planning permission you may grant.
29. **Network Rail** has no objection in principle to the above but due to the proposal being next to Network Rail land and infrastructure and to ensure that no part of the development adversely impacts the safety, operation and integrity of the operational railway we would request that the following are issued as conditions to the applicant in the decision notice, should the proposal be granted. The applicant should be made aware of the proposal's potential to impact seriously and negatively upon the operational railway and as such including the following comments as conditions in the decision notice would ensure that no works could take place on site without the conditions being discharged and thus prevent any adverse impact upon Network Rail land.

30. All developments within 10 metres of the operational railway line and Network Rail land should be flagged up to Network Rail by the applicant. The applicant is to supply a risk assessment and a method statement for the works on site to the Asset Protection Engineer for review and approval. No works are to commence on site without the approval of the Network Rail Asset Protection Engineer and a condition should be included in the planning consent to ensure that the construction and subsequent maintenance of the proposal can be carried out without adversely affecting the safety, operational needs or integrity of the railway.
31. **Natural England** does not wish to comment on this development proposal. We would, in any event, expect the LPA to assess and consider the possible impacts resulting from this proposal on the following issues when determining this application: Protected species, soils, land use and reclamation, local wildlife sites, biodiversity enhancements and landscape enhancements.
32. **Stoke Mandeville Parish Council** raise no objections to the planned development but note that there had been a great deal of incremental development on this site. There does not appear to be provision for containment of waste, will measures be put in place to ensure there is no contamination to neighbouring agricultural land.
33. The **Aylesbury Vale District Environmental Health** Officer has reviewed the information as submitted by the applicant and has no comments to make from an environmental health perspective.

Representations

34. Two objections to the proposal have been received comment that the amount of dust and noise coming from the site increased greatly over time and that bonfires have been observed from the site on at least one occasion. Concern is also raised about on-going incremental development.

Principle

35. The application site is located within the open countryside and is set outside any defined settlement. The provisions of policies GP35, RA2 and RA3 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (AVLP) generally seek to restrict development which could encroach onto the countryside. Policy GP35 relates to general design and promotes development which is appropriate to its surroundings whilst policy RA2 aims to preserve the open nature of the countryside with particular regard to coalescence of neighbouring settlements. Policy RA3 refers to residential curtilages and "other developed curtilages". Notwithstanding that the issue of "a curtilage" does not occur in planning law beyond land associated with a dwellinghouse; it is presumed that the thrust of this policy refers to the extension of other developed planning units.
36. Policies of the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (BMWLP) and Core Strategy (BMWCS) are broadly supportive of the expansion and utilisation of established waste transfer and recycling operations, particularly where these can contribute to the County's overall waste management capacity and ensure net self sufficiency. This is nevertheless qualified in that such sites will be identified and tested in the Waste Local Plan in line with criteria relating to size, intensity, suitability and location. Proposals that support objectives for local waste processing and recycling in accordance with the waste hierarchy are also generally supported.

37. Development proposals must also have regard to other material considerations including, but not limited to, neighbours amenity, environmental considerations, flooding and traffic generation and management.

Impact upon character and appearance of the area

38. The proposal comprises the expansion of the existing, lawful and established waste transfer and recycling operation through the extension of the existing yard. The operational works involved comprise the laying of approximately 4,200 square metres of hardstanding which is indicated in the application to be used for the purposes of storage. The extended area would be planted to the boundaries and have additional landscaping introduced in the remaining grassed area to the south east between the developed site and Triangle Business Park.

39. The subject site is located within the open countryside wherein there is a general policy presumption against general piecemeal expansion of the built form onto rural land. In particular development which does not respect the natural qualities and features of the area, should avoid situations where settlements may coalesce and restrict encroachment of developed areas.

40. In this instance the existing site is set between the villages of Wendover and Stoke Mandeville. Whilst the site is separate from both these settlements, it does lie within an area heavily characterised by piecemeal urban development including houses, offices, farms, nursery and the like in addition to the railway line and A413. Whilst the area does not present a typical rural environment, the site clearly forms a part of this partially developed tract of countryside which preserves some degree of separation between Wendover, Stoke Mandeville, Weston Turville and Aylesbury, which if left unchecked, could easily amalgamate through piecemeal development into one predominantly developed frontage.

41. The proposal would introduce a large area of hardstanding, which in itself would not be readily visible, but would facilitate open storage of waste material. Furthermore the built envelope would be enlarged and whilst mitigated by a certain amount of planting and landscaping would clearly erode the vulnerable urban rural fringe.

42. Given the above, it is considered that the development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, would result in the introduction of a further urban feature in an already vulnerable location to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area and local environmental quality. The site would be easily visible from the railway at a gateway point to the Aylesbury Vale, from the Triangle Business Park and to a certain limited sense from the A413. The development is thus considered contrary to the aims of policies GP35, RA2 and RA3 of the AVLP.

43. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the objection to the impact upon the open countryside, consideration must be given as to whether there are other material considerations which would warrant approval of the application. Indeed, the car park extension to the Triangle Business Park to the south east (approved by the District Council in 2010) encountered a similar issue. Here the balance was tipped in favour of approving the construction of the car park given that the Triangle Business Park is an established major employer to the District which makes a noteworthy contribution to the local economy and suffered from a serious shortfall of parking with no reasonable public transport alternatives. On balance it was judged that the wider benefits outweighed the harm to the countryside and thus the application was approved. Accordingly a similar such assessment is warranted in this case.

Demonstrated need for the development

44. As noted, the subject site comprises an established recycling and waste transfer operation amongst other uses. The overall site extends to 1.92 hectares including the yard and surrounds, however the established yard itself (ignoring access road, pond and landscaped areas) has an area of around 0.55 hectares or 5,500 square metres. The proposed area of hardstanding would be around 0.42 hectares or 4,200 square metres giving a total developed site area of 0.97 hectares. The existing and extended area is, and would be, licenced and consented to process 25,000 tonnes of waste per annum.
45. The established yard features an existing shed and sorting facility together with office, staff accommodation and storage. An extant permission exists for an additional building with dimensions of 84 by 15 by 8 metres indicated to be used for concrete storage and crushing, soil storage and screening, metal store, skip store and bailing shed also within the footprint of the established site. Turning and manoeuvring for plant and trucks remains available within the site for vehicles to process waste materials together with additional parking and storage areas.
46. The applicant states that the additional area of hardstanding is required to store waste materials for processing on the established site. It is cited by the applicant that previous unauthorised encroachment onto surrounding agricultural land were as a consequence of there being insufficient space within the lawful part of the site to operate. Further, it is submitted that the site has seen historical growth in employment and throughput with projected increases over the forthcoming years. The following table summarises the applicant's submitted actual and projected tonnage of waste through the site.

Table 1: Submitted actual and projected tonnage

Month	Waste in/treated (projected/actual)
May 2013	31.24 tonnes
June 2013	73.57 tonnes
July 2013	76.02 tonnes
August 2013	99.08 tonnes
September 2013	140.46 tonnes
October 2013	170 tonnes
January 2014	250 tonnes
March 2014	300 tonnes
June 2014	380 tonnes

47. On the assumption that the maximum projected volume of waste processed through the site (June 2014) is achieved, this still falls well below the permitted capacity of 25,000 tonnes per annum (which, at capacity, would relate to around 2,100 tonnes per month).
48. At present, excluding the area for the existing building (635 square metres) this allows for just short of 0.5 hectares to accommodate the storage of waste together with other reasonably allowed space for vehicle and equipment manoeuvring and storage. The approved but unimplemented shed has a floorspace of 1,200 square metres which would erode this space and allow for only 0.35 hectares of uncovered storage. However within the building it is indicated on the submitted plans that internal storage and sorting facilities would be available to easily accommodate the maximum projected volume of waste and arguably accommodate most of any individual months entire permitted capacity of 2,100 cubic metres of waste at any one time. Indeed, it was submitted to the

Council in justification for the proposed shed that internal storage space was far more desirable than outdoor storage due to the vagaries of weather, promote efficient re-use of recyclable materials and to assist in dust and litter suppression.

49. Accordingly the requirement for an additional 4,200 square metres of external storage is questioned especially when ample external storage is already available within the application site.

50. As explored above, the current site has an area of 0.55 hectares with a throughput of 25,000 tonnes of waste per annum. Given that the applicant's case appears to rest on the requirement for additional space a rough comparison of Chiltern View Nursery with other similar consented sites within the County that process waste and recycling is detailed below.

Table 2: Annual permitted waste transfer tonnage and site area of operational sites*

Site	Tonnes	Site area	10,000 tonnes/hectare
Shanks Waste Management, Griffin Lane, Aylesbury	243,504	0.93	26.18
ASM, Griffin Lane, Aylesbury	160,000	0.7	22.86
Wycombe trade Waste and Skip Hire, 44 Binders Industrial Estate, High Wycombe	5,000	0.04	12.50
Wycombe Skip Hire, 53 Binders Industrial Estate, High Wycombe	15,000	0.12	12.50
Camiers, 32 Airfield Industrial Estate, Cheddington	75,000	0.65	11.54
Hawes Plant and Tool Hire Coronation Road, High Wycombe**	75,000	0.91	8.24
Chiltern View Nursery Wendover Road, Stoke Mandeville (current)	25,000	0.55	4.46
Chiltern View Nursery Wendover Road, Stoke Mandeville (extended)	25,000	0.97	2.23

*Site selection based upon available data for current operational and authorised sites with comparable size and/or volume of processed material. The list is not intended nor purported to be exhaustive.

**Incorporates plant and tool hire storage and rental in addition to waste transfer.

51. As can be seen above the existing Chiltern View Nursery site sits at a mid-point in terms of site size and below average in terms of processed material. The proposed extension would render the site the largest of those sampled but remain below average in terms of material processed. Whether extended or not, the site demonstrates the least efficient use of available space of the compared sites by a wide margin, particularly when mindful that the current maximum projected figure of 380 tonnes per month is only the equivalent of 4,500 tonnes per annum.

52. It is clear that the additional area of hardstanding would result in a significant overprovision of waste storage and hardstanding that, if filled, could not be processed on the site under the terms of the existing consent. Indeed, it would be highly undesirable to engender a situation where unprocessed waste could be given over to open storage. Once this situation was permitted it would be considerably more difficult for the Authority to enforce against inappropriately stored waste. Further, it is considered that granting permission for this extended area would not be conducive to encouraging a more efficient use of the established site.

53. Reference is made by the applicant to site constraints, including taking into account the position and consequent remaining space on the site, of the unimplemented shed (ref. 12/20003/AWD). It should be noted that this building, in its own right is far from small by reference to that which would be required for the established operation. Furthermore, its size and position could readily be varied as, in previously granting permission for this building, the Council has demonstrated a willingness to accommodate the reasonable needs of any waste transfer and recycling operation.
54. Whilst a modest expansion of the waste transfer and recycling facility in a considered manner may well be supported, it has not been demonstrated in this instance that the established use cannot be accommodated on the existing site. The proposal represents an excessive expansion of hardstanding, nearly doubling the size of the site, to the disbenefit of the character and appearance of the countryside and accordingly cannot be supported.

Landscaping

55. It is proposed to landscape the boundary of the extended site to mitigate views of the enlarged site. Whilst such landscaping would clearly be necessary to mitigate any impact upon the visual amenity of the locality, it is considered symptomatic of the inappropriate nature of the development in this countryside location.
56. The Council's landscape officer does not raise objection to the proposal per se, but does indicate that the details submitted with the application are lacking in detail and require more information. This could be secured by way of condition in the event that planning permission is granted.

Ecology and flooding

57. The application site incorporates a pond area to the north which has been identified as a habitat for great crested newts. The recently withdrawn application 13/20002/AWD did seek to regularise an unauthorised extension to the yard which was set adjacent to this pond. This was deemed unacceptable and has, in part, been remediated albeit that the land in question has been raised and remains surfaced with a mixture of topsoil and hardcore which may have been imported as construction waste.
58. Nevertheless, the presently proposed extension to the yard to the south represents a somewhat more preferable location in respect of surface water run off and ecological implications in principle (notwithstanding the objections expressed above).
59. Ecological and flood management advice does however indicate a need for further information in order to assess the ability of the extended site to accommodate surface water run off in a controlled manner and to avoid consequent discharge to surrounding land which may be inhabited by protected species.
60. These issues may, of themselves, not be insurmountable but in view of the general lack of information submitted with the application in this regard and the fundamental implications with regard to flood management and statutorily protected species the application cannot be supported in this regard.
61. Were the committee minded to approve the application on the basis that there is a requirement for the extension of this facility, it is recommended that the application be deferred pending the submission of information which better addresses the flooding and

ecological implications of the proposal. In the absence of this detail however, the application is recommended for refusal due to conflict with policy 36 of the BMWLP and policy 35 of the AVLPL. Where the committee may be minded to refuse the application on other grounds, objection to the proposal on these grounds is also recommended.

Neighbours amenity

62. The nearest residential properties are located along the opposing side of the Wendover Road to the east, approximately 200 metres away. Neighbours have expressed concern regarding increases in noise and activity at the site over the course of time including the burning of waste. Such activities have not been established as recently occurring and in any case are caught by the terms of the extant enforcement notice.
63. The concerns expressed are noted, however it is not considered that this extension would give cause for increases in noise and activity over and above that which may be expected from the lawful use of the site. Indeed, mindful of the distance and intervening A413, it is considered that such instances would largely be indeterminate. Nevertheless, concerns regarding the incremental enlargement of the site are noted.

Parking and access

64. More than ample parking space exists within the site to accommodate staff and visitor vehicles together with space for the turning and manoeuvring of plant and equipment, albeit that no swept path diagrams have been included within the application.
65. As noted by the highway engineer, no increase to the amount of waste processed within the site is proposed and as such there should be no material increase in the number of vehicles accessing and egressing the site. In any case, the access with Wendover Road benefits from adequate width and visibility to safely gain access to the site.

Other matters

66. It is noted that the submitted plans do not scale accurately when compared to dimensions given on the plans. Furthermore, numerous plans appear to have been annotated at the wrong scale. Any discrepancies in dimensions and areas given in this report may be attributable to errors on the submitted plans.
67. The County Planning Authority has been notified by the District Council of an application which has recently been submitted for determination by the District which seeks to widen the existing access road to the site from 3 to 6 metres in width. This application is seeks to improve the existing access to the established waste transfer and recycling station. This, arguably, should be determined by the County Planning Authority as the relevant determining body for dealing with minerals and waste applications. However Section 286 of the Act provides that the determination of a planning application should not be called into question where it should have been granted, made or given by some other local planning authority.

Conclusions

68. Whilst the County Council, as Minerals and Waste Planning authority, is broadly supportive of proposals to enhance the County's self-sufficiency in terms of waste processing in accordance with the waste hierarchy, however this is only in such instances where such proposals can be achieved without a deleterious effect of the

amenity of the environment. In this particular case, the proposal is not regarded as being a well-considered or judicious expansion to an established site. It is considered that the foregoing has shown that this proposal is a seriously premature expansion of an under-utilised site which already has ample space to accommodate the waste transfer and recycling operation.

69. The development presents a serious risk of allowing the unrestricted storage of excess untreated waste in amounts which could not be processed within the terms of the site's consent.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Supporting documentation to application 13/20003/AWD

Consultation responses dated October 2013

Planning applications and enforcement notices listed under the planning history to the site detailed above with particular regard to 10/00047/APP, 11/20002/AWD and 12/20003/AWD

Saved policies of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan

Saved policies of the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy

National Planning Policy Framework