

Planning Application Group
First Floor Invicta House
County Hall
Maidstone
Kent
ME14 1XX

18th March 2008

Dear Sirs,

Re Planning Application YO7/0124/SH, Otterpool Quarry, Ashford Road, Sellindge

Sellindge is a small rural farming community divided by the A20, with estates and various sized groups of residential development both sides of the main road. It has a Primary school, doctors surgery and village hall within the centre of the village.

Extending out are various businesses and shops, all these are bounded on one side by the M20 motorway, international high speed rail link between France & the UK, the domestic rail link between Dover & Charing Cross and an electric converter station, on the north side of the village lies an ANOB.

Adjacent to the proposed development site sits the Lympne Industrial Estate that accommodates businesses and haulage depots for many companies. Within the last few months more land is under construction with the permission of 'The Link Park'. Immediately opposite is the Folkestone Race course and leisure facility.

Without exception all of these very large activities have an adverse impact on the life of the residents of Sellindge and the Parish Council strongly object to further industrial development of this scale in the village and the reasons for this objection follows.

1. With all the development - as mentioned above – there are days when the air quality appears to be poor. Given that the application states there will be a slight odour this will add to the discomfort of local residents and what happens if the odour becomes more than 'slight' members of the Parish Council feel that it will prevent residents being able to have their windows and doors open especially in the summer.

These odours and particulates will come from the increase movement of HGV's especially when they are waiting to be weighed before entry and exit of the site. And from the emission of gas, which will be significant enough to warrant a Regulation PPC Permit to be issued by the Environment Agency (EA). In addition it appears that the proposed factory contravenes Policy W2 of the Kent Waste Local Plan with reference to un-quantified levels of Air quality Odours and Air Bourne dust Particles neither does it comply with waste processing and transfers operations identified in Policy W3 and Policy 9/10/18.

2. Traffic issues. Noise of traffic through what is essentially a small village can also be bad. When operation stack is on lorries trying to circumvent the queues also pass through the village causing even more disruption and congestion, this is made worse by drivers being told to return to the back of the queue and are directed back

through the village instead of down the motorway. Given these comments how can the applicant state that 'no adverse traffic impacts as a result of the development' (page 13)

3. The speed of traffic in general is a serious concern for the Parish Council and adding to this with the extra movements of HGV's will add to this concern and the possibility of accidents. KCC data state that within the last 5 years there have been 41 vehicle related accidents with 3 fatalities all within a 3 Kms of the site.

As there are to be traffic lights at the junction of Otterpool Lane and the A20, already agreed, (for the 'Link Park' which was given permission last year,) it will in effect contribute to the congestion in that when the traffic is stopped to allow vehicles to leave Otterpool Lane traffic will back up in both directions on the A20 and prevent HGV's from entering the site.

The planning application states that all vehicles will be to and from junction 11, considering that one of the planning conditions for the Lympne Estate was that lorries should leave Otterpool Lane and turn right and access the motorway from junction 11 is not happening and a large number of lorries turn left through the village can you tell the PC how this will be policed and who will police it.

4. The water table is very high within this development area and as there will be sludge waste how will this be prevented from entering the ground. Again who is policing this and how.

The entrance to the site is opposite a local and well used café. All water from the site entrance will run across the road and in to the car park of the café opposite.

5. PP10 states that Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) should be sought, and although the application is quoting PPS10 which BPEO is not mentioned however, in a document from 2005 it states that similar principles are retained within the new guidance and that the development should be sustainable. Therefore members object to the statement on page 10 para 1.34 that there is a move away from BPEO.

6. With regard to landscaping the site, the site is now exposed due to tree felling of the existing tree screening; this is taking place to erect the traffic lights. Trees only screen in the summer when they are in leaf.

The above issues are numbered for ease of reading only and does not infer that the comments are weighted in any way.

For these reasons as stated the Parish Council strongly objects.

If the application is to be given permission then the following should be considered:

1. If odour and particulates becomes a problem within the village extra measures should be taken to prevent them escaping and the site should be shut until these extra measures are put in place.

2. Traffic should be monitored by both the KCC and Shepway to prevent vehicles accessing the site through the village. Any companies that allow their drivers to do this should be fined. There should be a green transport plan in situ for staff.

3. According to appendix 'D', and I quote '...has not been able to supply any specific groundwater level information'. It is hoped that the EA are aware of an aquifer that is known locally to exist. Ways to prevent sludge from entering the aquifer and to prevent run off water into the café car park should be investigated and the outcome should be included in the conditions of the permission and be in place before the site is in use.

4. Landscaping needs to be revisited to ensure it is sufficient and of the right kind.

5. Any 106 agreements that may be included within the application should also be discussed with the Parish Council to ensure that they are relevant and will have a benefit to parish.

6. If for any reason the recycling plant should close what plans are in place to return the site back to its former state. There is no mention made of the area not being developed. Is this to be left or will this be taken over as more space is required if the development is given permission, details are required of what is to happen in this area.

It was also felt that a letter of intent would have been helpful or an outline application, there is what appears to be an amount of haste in this application given that the final document was only presented to KCC in January. In fact speaking to the District and local County Councillors neither were aware of the proposal.

With all the guidance on Waste Recycling Applications mention is made in the 'SEA' of the 'Statement Under Regulation 16' of consultation with local residents and other stake holders. This did not happen and all of the above issues should be discussed in detail with the Parish Council before any development takes place.

Any assurances given should be written as conditions into any permission given

Yours Sincerely

Linda Hedley

Locum Clerk to the Parish Council

cc

Chief Executive SDC

Susan Carey KCC Member

Jenny Hollingsbee Ward Member

Michael Howard MP