

Subject: SPR presentation to Kirton & Falkenham Annual Meetings
Date: Thu, 11 May 2017 13:56:50 +0100
From: clerk <clerk@kirtonfalkenhampc.bbmax.co.uk>
To: Young, Joanna <jyoung@ScottishPower.com>

Dear Joanna,

Thank you for your response, however we have continued concerns and would suggest a meeting in order to identify workable solutions at your earliest convenience.

In the mean time perhaps you could note and respond to the following with regard to the original points raised:

2) Your Traffic Management Plan

<http://content.yudu.com/web/2it8t/0A3zd2u/OutlineTrafficManage/flash/resources/index.htm> describes

your approach to Local Community Liaison (Section 1.4, page 8). We do not feel that sufficient has been done to meet this requirement in respect of Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council and local residents. In fact if the PC had not taken the initiative to invite you to present to us on 10th April we think that we would still be blissfully unaware of your plans regarding traffic management.

Under 'General Principles' (Section 1.3, page 8) you state that "All Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) deliveries would be made to the Primary CCSs with onward transfer to Secondary CCSs using vehicles suited to the local network". As the Kirton site is a Secondary CCS, and you intend using Trimley Road as a means of accessing Park Lane (instead of the designated route for HGVs along Innocence Lane), we would expect you to comply with the 7.5 Tonne weight limit. Note that the 'For Access' exception only relates to traffic accessing locations within the weight limit restriction, and does not include the Secondary CSS site 0.5 miles beyond it.

4) The Compound at Park Lane, could you please provide details of the nature & scale of the Compound as previously requested.

9) Recycled bulk aggregates: We are completely aware of the end-of-waste protocols and when carriers licences are needed. We do not recall mentioning carriers licences either verbally or in our written response so are somewhat surprised that your answer has focussed on this.

At issue is the fact that we do not believe there to be sufficient material available that has been recycled in accordance with the end-of-waste (WRAP) protocols. We know this local market well. We are aware that there are several waste contractors that routinely offer material for resale as non-wastes that have not been adequately tested

and processed. As such they remain waste and are subject to waste regulation. We are concerned that SPR will accept such material on the say-so of unscrupulous waste management companies without adequately auditing the suppliers in accordance with best practice.

In our opinion, weekly testing for "quality" is wholly inadequate. There should be a visual and olfactory validation process in place for each load as recommended by the Environment Agency. In accordance with the waste protocols, and WM3, waste characterisation is required at source at a sufficient frequency to validate its safe use. With the rate of supply intimated, we suggest that, as a minimum, SPR have a per/1000 tonne testing regime that includes tests for asbestos and coal tar in addition to standard characterisation tests.

Unfortunately your verbal and written responses on this matter have increased our concern, not alleviated it.

Kind Regards

C A Shaw
Clerk

cc P O'Brien (CC)
S Harvey (DC)
Trimley St Martin PC
SCC Hlghways
SCDC Planning