

## **F/YR23/0069/F | Change of use of site for the purposes of wood processing (B2 use) for a period of 2 years**

I wish to object to this application for a number of reasons listed below. Also, I do not understand why the applicant has only applied for a temporary period application?

This site has been fully operational for many months without any planning permission, so residents have had a long time to observe site behaviours and the level of nuisance. A number of residents, including myself, also offered to form a liaison group with AW Jenkinson via Fenland District Council to discuss our concerns, but I understand this was rejected, which shows a very poor level of engagement and interest towards the local community.

### **Notes on the buildings**

The shed mentioned in the submission documents is in a dreadful state of repair and appears to have had no maintenance since the brickworks shut and the chimneys were demolished. The structure is full of holes and the gutters are overgrown. It is not a viable structure to contain noise, dust and odour. If anything, it now just acts as an echo chamber.

### **Notes on noise**

The applicant uses digger buckets to scrape the floors, generating a lot of noise. Not all vehicles are fitted with low noise/directional reversing beacons, which also makes more noise. External shredding operations generate dust and noise. Operations within the shed also generate noise.

Has there been any form of noise monitoring or assessment for the various operations to see if further mitigation is required / is possible? The Cambs waste and minerals plan calls for low noise directional reversing beepers on plant, for example. I could not see any noise monitoring reports in the application?

### **Comments on the health impact statement and dust**

We have learned that the pit topography can act as an echo chamber to enhance noise and create strong wind currents. The Environment Agency (EA) has recognised this fact. The report is wrong to simply say that the 'pit void' screens the operation from properties. The tree line / amenity line also continues to be degraded (especially in the winter months). The receptor area for noise, dust and odour (from real-world experience) is much wider than the report suggests. The Lego wall mentioned in the reports is much lower than the stored material and at times material has been allowed to flow outside that area (see photos).

Virgin wood dust is considered to be a possible carcinogen. According to the working-of-timber-and-manufacture-of-wood-based\_products-process-guidance-note-6-02\_12, there should be zero visible emissions of dust from the site. From the A605 I have seen very significant fine dust clouds moving across the site heading east at high level. Residents have videoed and photographed some of these dust clouds and provided significant evidence to the EA, FDC and Whittlesey Town council. The EA has found wood dust in samples taken from peoples' houses. Many residents (including myself) believe there has been more dust on cars and windows in the last year since AW Jenkinson started their operation. The incoming vehicles to the site are often uncovered so dust and debris can escape. Given there are scientific peer reviewed reports stating breathing wood dust particles may cause allergic respiratory symptoms, mucosal and non-allergic respiratory symptoms, and cancer, the fact the site appears to be unable to control dust levels while being so close to houses (and noting the prevailing wind tends to be in the direction of the town) is a very grave concern.

## **F/YR23/0069/F | Change of use of site for the purposes of wood processing (B2 use) for a period of 2 years**

### **Comments odour management**

We have endured significant odour from the site. I am 1000m from the site and have reported issues to the EA on a number of occasions, from a wet mouldy wood smell to a sickly pine/fern smell. I find it can make my nose run and I worry it could lead to an allergy or worse. I do not see how the materials on site can be being handled and turned and monitored as described in the plan given the level of odour endured by myself and other local residents. The low odour levels detailed in the applicant's plan is not what I have experienced in the last 12 months, so it appears to just be a paperwork exercise for the application. I also do not understand how just two full time employees (as listed in the application) can carry out the level of maintenance and monitoring needed 24/7 for the thousands of tons of material being handled and stored on site?

### **Flood risk**

The EA has said in writing to the site owner that water should not be pumped into Kings Dyke and that there is no permit in place for that to happen. A permit would be required to pump water into Kings Dyke. The flood risk plan with the application states that water is being pumped into Kings Dyke, which is a clear breach of that instruction. It seems odd to a layperson that a known illegal act can be used to facilitate a planning application.

### **Fire statement**

Given the amount of combustible material and the reports of odour, dust and steam (which implies heat is being generated), the fire statement looks very minimal. Has the fire brigade reviewed the site? There also appears to be items like vehicle tyres and fuel stored on site, which are not mentioned in the report.

### **Transport plan.**

Given the significant amount of material handled on site and delivered by HGV trucks why is there no traffic plan or consideration to a further increase of HGV traffic to the A605? Other operations on site have committed to a no-right turn / no HGV traffic via Whittlesey town which the site land agent also supports as a standard rule for any new HGV based operations at Saxon Pit to reduce noise, damage risk and nuisance in the town. Can this be a stipulation for any new planning approvals?

### **Overall site management for Saxon Pit**

Has any thought been given to how this site can be managed if planning is granted? Johnsons Aggregates are next door. They are under the control of the EA. The industrial bottom ash they handle has to be tightly controlled. Their dust, noise and odour plans are all being changed post planning and, so far, they have failed to meet their permitted targets. It has already been noted that dust and noise from AW Jenkinson might be impacting their monitoring results.

Fenland District Council is not as well equipped as the EA and one can see a scenario where AW Jenkinson, likewise, say issues from their monitoring are being caused by Johnsons Aggregates. Is it practical to have two large industrial sites producing dust, noise and odour in close proximity being run by separate agencies – how will monitoring and readings be controlled? This is a critical health issue with residents living so close to the site.

**Example photos of the site passed to me by a concerned resident follow.**

F/YR23/0069/F | Change of use of site for the purposes of wood processing (B2 use) for a period of 2 years

