

Karen Breadmore

From: Penny Stoodley on behalf of Development Control
Sent: 20 January 2016 09:55
To: Planning Enquiries
Subject: FW: Objection to planning Application Number: 153172 ~[UNCLASSIFIED]~
Attachments: Letter to WBC.doc

From: Meriel Johnson
Sent: 20 January 2016 09:49
To: Development Control
Cc: Graham Vaughan
Subject: Objection to planning Application Number: 153172

Dear Sir,

Please see the attached objection letter in relation to Planning Application Number: 153172. This is for Variation to condition 7 of planning consent 340429 in order to extend the time for the deposit of non-inert waste from 17 years from the date upon which the deposit operation commenced to 20 year, to extend the time for the deposit of engineering/restoration materials (inert waste) from 17 years from the date upon which the deposit operations commenced to 21 years and to extend the time for the completion of the sites restoration from 19 years from the date upon which the deposit operation comments to 22 years.

Yours faithfully,

Meriel Johnson

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

*Meadow View
Star Lane, Knowl Hill, Berkshire RG10 9XY*

19th January 2016

Development Control
Wokingham Borough Council
PO Box 157,
Civic Offices,
Shute End
Wokingham,
Berkshire

Dear Sir,

Re: Application Number: 153172

I write to object to the application by Grundon Waste Management Services to extend the time for the deposit of non-inert waste from 17 years from the date upon which the deposit operation commenced to 20 year, to extend the time for the deposit of engineering/restoration materials (inert waste) from 17 years from the date upon which the deposit operations commenced to 21 years and to extend the time for the completion of the sites restoration from 19 years from the date upon which the deposit operation comments to 22 years for the following reasons:

1. Odour As the owner of a house in close proximity to the Star Lane site, I am frequently affected adversely by the foul, often acrid, odour emanating from this site during the present operating periods and worry that sufficient care to cover the waste as required by the operator's present approvals might not be being fully complied with. I find that I am sometimes unable to enjoy my house or garden and on multiple occasions have left my home to get away from the nuisance. Frequent complaints have been made to Environmental Health regarding this matter. To extend the applicant's operations would be wholly unacceptable.

2. Noise The management of waste around this site incurs not only movements of heavy trucks in what is an very narrow roadway, but heavy machinery to spread it on site, which generates a constant background noise throughout the week and weekends. This noise from 7am (sometimes earlier) to late affects residents on a daily basis. This can only be exacerbated if permission granted.

3. Hazard I own a small area of woodland next to my house and adjoining the site through which the by-way runs. This is unfenced and used by hikers, dog-walkers and cyclists for recreational purposes. The waste material is a magnet for large birds and other wildlife, which have carried many items from the tip into my land. This is well-known to the site operators. In the past such items have included sanitary and dangerous sharp waste, which suggests that controls may be suboptimal. This has already posed a problem for dogs off the lead, and apart from being a potential health

hazard, is also visually unacceptable. It is likely to be worse if increase in the time of uncovered landfill is permitted.

4. Traffic Weekends are the time when families with young children and residents are able to enjoy the rural amenity provided by Star Lane and linked pathways. Access is commonest from the A4 end of the lane. Continuation and potential increase of movements of large trucks must create an additional safety problem to walkers.

5. Visual amenity The site can be seen from public footpaths and bridleways. The eyesore is only too evident in its full extent from the top of the lane which skirts the perimeter of the site. There is also a public footpath through the site.

6. Change in EU Legislation Due to these changes it is more than likely that Grundons will not meet their targets and that landfill will continue to diminish.

For these reasons, I urge you to reject this application.

Meriel Johnson