

# Regulation Committee

## Thursday 3 October 2019

### 10.00 am JMR - Somerset West and Taunton Council



To: The Members of the Regulation Committee

Cllr J Parham (Chair), Cllr N Hewitt-Cooper (Vice-Chair), Cllr M Caswell, Cllr J Clarke, Cllr S Coles, Cllr M Keating, Cllr A Kendall and Cllr N Taylor

Issued By Scott Wooldridge, Strategic Manager - Governance and Risk - 25 September 2019

For further information about the meeting, please contact Michael Bryant on 01823 359048 or [mbryant@somerset.gov.uk](mailto:mbryant@somerset.gov.uk)

Guidance about procedures at the meeting follows the printed agenda **including public speaking at the meeting.**

This meeting will be open to the public and press, subject to the passing of any resolution under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972.

This agenda and the attached reports and background papers are available on request prior to the meeting in large print, Braille, audio tape & disc and can be translated into different languages. They can also be accessed via the council's website on [www.somerset.gov.uk/agendasandpapers](http://www.somerset.gov.uk/agendasandpapers)



**RNID typetalk**

## **AGENDA**

- Item      Regulation Committee - 10.00 am Thursday 3 October 2019
- 1          **Proposed Materials Reprocessing Facility and Ancillary Development at Springway Business Park, Springway Lane, Westonzoyland TA7 0JS (Pages 3 - 6)**

Ms Maureen Darrie  
Somerset County Council  
Development Control  
County Hall  
Taunton  
Somerset  
TA1 4DY

**Our ref:** WX/2018/131941/03-L01  
**Your ref:** 1/53/18/00012/LH  
**Date:** 26 September 2019

Dear Ms Darrie

**MATERIALS (INERT) REPROCESSING FACILITY AND ANCILARY DEVELOPMENT  
AT SPRINGWAY BUSINESS PARK, SPRINGWAY LANE, WESTONZOYLAND,  
BRIDGWATER**

Thank you for consulting us on the above application on 6 September 2019. I am responding on behalf of my colleague Mark Willitts.

We note Somerton Environmental Ltd have incorrectly titled the requested Waste Containment Plan, a "Flood Water Containment plan". Whilst we do not fully agree with the findings of the submitted FRA or (Flood Water) Waste Containment Plan, on this occasion, we do not consider this sufficient to object.

**Environment Agency Position**

We have no objection to the proposal subject to the comments outlined in this letter, and the inclusion of the below conditions to demonstrate compliance in the granting of any planning permission.

**Condition**

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) ref 1709-01 Revision F Westonzoyland Towns dated 11 July 2018. All materials stored and processed on site must be safely secured in accordance with the submitted Flood Water Containment Plan dated 04 September 2019 document reference SEL.0447.FCP.V1.

**Reasons**

To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants. To prevent mobilisation of stored materials.

**Condition**

At any time, if there are any changes to on-site operational activities (including any change to the type of waste stored), the site operator, within 1 month shall submit an updated Waste Containment Plan to the Waste Planning Authority, for their written approval. The development shall thereafter be operated in full accordance with the approved details.

**Reason**

To reduce the possible risk of stored waste materials from becoming mobilised during a flood event.

**Note to Waste Planning Authority**

If you are minded to approve the application, contrary to the above advice, please re-consult the Environment Agency.

In accordance with the planning practice guidance (determining a planning application, paragraph 019), please notify us by email within two weeks of a decision being made or application withdrawn. Please provide us with a URL of the decision notice, or an electronic copy of the decision notice or outcome.

Please be advised that our position on all aspects aside from the Waste Containment Plan remains as set out in our previous response dated 16 August 2018. Please refer to this response for all other conditions which must be imposed.

Please contact the undersigned should you have any queries regarding the above,

Yours sincerely

**Richard Jenkyns on behalf of Mark Willitts  
Sustainable Places - Planning Advisor**

Direct dial [REDACTED]

e-mail [REDACTED]

**Application** 1/53/18/00012  
**Proposal:** Materials reprocessing facility and ancillary development.  
**Location:** Springway Business Park, Springway Lane, Westonzoyland, Bridgwater, TA7  
OJS

### **General**

We are long time residents of Westonzoyland, and have lived on the main route through the village for 48 years. This is our home and we have lived with and accepted the 'steady' increase in the traffic volume as it passes through, as this is our home

The applicant is based in W-S-M and that is their business area, they do not serve the area around the village or indeed in the district or even provide for local employment. Therefore all their traffic has to come all the way from W-S-M via the M5, and will use Parkway in Bridgwater. This is one of the most densely populated areas of Bridgwater, past 4 schools, a run of local shops, 2x 20mph areas, a park, all before it gets here to the village. Whos looking after the interests of all those people who will be impacted by this overnight increase in HGV traffic?

### **Traffic**

The applications traffic Statement paints a 'rosy' picture of a minimal effect. It just refers to Parkway as a convenient dual carriageway link. The photographs used to illustrate its route show very little if any traffic or people.

If you have ever been there when schools coming out it is far from that 'rosy' picture.

Likewise the centre of the village here, where previously I had witnessed a queue of the applicants lorries attempting to negotiate the double bends whilst the school bus was unloading and some elderly residents were trying to cross the road to the shops.

The statement tries to minimize the extent of extra HGV's on the route by referring to them as 'two- Way movements of 11.4 average, which really means 24 HGV's passing your windows every day. This average is increased by 5x at peak times which amounts to approx. up to 60 HGV's passing through, each working day, 48 weeks a year, forever. Many of the residents that have made objections have experience of what 60 lorries in a day can mean when the applicant set up site and commenced operations without planning or license a couple of years ago.

It talks of a lorry every 6 minutes at peak times, the reality is that they never come at intervals but come in waves. Empty container and skip lorries are incredibly noisy.

With the present day issues of climate change we are all being held responsible for minimizing our 'carbon footprints' and reducing diesel emissions in residential areas, but this application will significantly increase both. We should be seeking ways to decrease these not to keep unnecessarily adding to them.

Yet, nowhere in all the documentation covering this application is this referred to or considered. The 'competent Officers' reports, by raising no objections just negates all of the residents concerns for those that adjoin the site and those that are affected by the traffic.

### **Summary**

There is an admirable need for materials recycling with all its 'eco' credentials but not at this cost and in this place. This use should be in one of the established Business Parks that follow the M5 corridor through Somerset all of which have direct links to the M5 and motorway network. You would not achieve planning permission for a new Business park without that road network link in place. A road that takes you through the centre of large residential areas is not a road link. This would not happen anywhere else.

If you approve this, what next for the old airfield site? SDC have already approved the establishment of a road chippings storage site and the village has to now endure these chippings HGV's through the village all summer. The floodgates will be opened.

**Please note** :Members of the public who had made representations to the application have been denied the right to put their case to the committee as **none** of the significant number of objectors had been notified of the meeting. This is understood to be a basic right to those affected but has not happened in this case.

Mr and Mrs Tucker Westonzoyland.

