

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING (INQUIRIES PROCEDURE) (ENGLAND) RULES 2000

APPEAL REF: APP/D0840/A/09/2113075/NWF

Land at Rostowrack Farm, Wheal Remfry, Goonvean and Parkandillick Dryers, St Dennis,

St Austell

Transport Summary of Jeremy Penfold MIHT AMICE AMIStructE

On behalf of SITA Cornwall Limited

February 2010

**WSP Development and Transportation
1st Floor
Keble House
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter
Devon
EX1 1NT**

**Tel: +44 (0) 1392 267500
Fax: +44 (0) 1392 267599
<http://www.wspgroup.com>**

1 The Witness

- 1.1.1 I am an Incorporated Engineer, a Member of the Institution of Highways and Transportation, an Associate Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers and an Associate Member of the Institution of Structural Engineers. I have over 25 years experience in transportation and civil engineering. I am a Technical Director with WSP UK, I have been employed by WSP since 1994.
- 1.1.2 I have been the Project Director for WSP's involvement in the CERC since September 2006, which has covered the transport strategy for the site, flooding, hydrology and surface water drainage and design of the access roads and haul road.

2 Summary

- 2.1.1 Within my proof, I address the transport strategy for the site and the transport implications of alternative scenarios for the waste strategy. I then consider the need for rail access to the site and finally I address how the network of footpaths are incorporated.

2.2 TRANSPORT STRATEGY

- 2.2.1 The transport strategy and the detail of the road access for the site was agreed with officers prior to the planning committee meeting on 26 March 2009.
- 2.2.2 Vehicular access is via the A30 Highgate Hill Interchange and New Stamps Hill (C184). A haul road will be constructed with an access approximately 1.5km south of the Gaverigan Roundabout. This crosses the River Fal and through the IMERYS

Wheal Remfry China Clay Works linking back into the C184 to the west of La Mount Corner.

- 2.2.3 The haul road will not be adopted highway road and is 6.5m wide with widening where necessary for passing vehicles, it will be owned and maintained by Cornwall Council as WDA.
- 2.2.4 The details of the haul road and the design constraints have been agreed with the Environment Agency and Cornwall County Council.
- 2.2.5 Access to the site is from the C184 at La Mount Corner, with an access road down to the site entrance.
- 2.2.6 The access road is designed to adoptable standard, it will be constructed with blacktop surfacing.
- 2.2.7 The majority of the waste vehicle trips to the CERC are not new trips and are currently on the roads in the daily transfer of waste. The CERC results in a redistribution of waste vehicles within the county's road network.
- 2.2.8 The daily vehicle trips to site are 216 two way trips for waste vehicles and 134 trips for staff and deliveries, giving a total of 350 total trips as agreed in the Statement of Common Ground.
- 2.2.9 Vehicles using the CERC will all be managed by SITA to ensure they comply with the routing arrangements agreed with Cornwall County Council. This routing will be controlled through a S106 agreement, with the majority of vehicles arriving from the A30 then using the C184, haul road and access road to the CERC.

2.2.10 Access to the haul road will be controlled by barriers and waste vehicles will be fitted with transponders to operate the barriers automatically.

2.2.11 The impact of the traffic on the key junctions has been agreed with the Highways Agency and Cornwall County Council.

2.2.12 It has been agreed that there will be two travel plans for the site, a Construction plan and an Operational plan.

2.3 POLICY COMPLIANCE

2.3.1 The Waste Local Plan (WLP), defines the requirements for the EFW facility in Policy L6, the specific transport related issues are

- a) *demonstrate reasonable proximity and accessibility to the Primary Route Network; and*
- b) *the Plant is to be served by rail;*

2.3.2 Issue a) - It has been included in the SOCG that L6 a) has been met.

2.3.3 With regards to Issue b) in my proof I have addressed a number of questions and have concluded that;

- a) There is potential for the EFW be served by rail. The site is adjacent to the existing rail line providing a link to the wider rail network.
- b) Transfer of waste by rail is feasible, although it requires substantial investment to achieve a network of compatible facilities.

-
- c) Other waste facilities within Cornwall do not currently include the ability to transfer waste by rail.
 - d) Whilst transport policies support rail transfer, the County Council, for financial reasons, directed SITA not to include rail in their proposals.
 - e) Rail access can be provided to the site in the future and I summarise this later,

2.3.4 Planning Policy Guidance 13 'Transport' (PPG13) includes the objectives to promote sustainable transport choices for people and freight and to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. The proposals ensure that this policy objective is met and that opportunities for non-car travel are maximised and managed through the travel plans.

2.3.5 The Local Transport Plan requires that heavy goods vehicles use the most appropriate roads. This will be managed through the S106 agreement which has already been agreed with the Highway Officers at Cornwall Council.

2.4 ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES

2.4.1 The CERC clearly meets the strategy in the WLP for a single EFW within the central area of search. It is therefore puzzling that the question of alternative scenarios has been raised within Cornwall Councils case.

2.4.2 The starting point is the WRATE assessment, the methodology of which is set out within the proof of Simon Aumonier. This considered 3 options.

- a) Single 240,000 tpa EFW at Rostowrack Farm

-
- b) Two 120,000 tpa EFWs at Connon Bridge and United Mines
 - c) Five 48,000 tpa EFWs at Connon Bridge, United Mines, Rostowrack Farm, St Erth and Launceston.

2.4.3 The mileage calculated indicates that the two multiple scenarios deliver a reduction in daily waste mileage. This reduction in traffic for the multiple sites has also been considered in the Fichtner Report prepared for Cornwall Council (CD O11), which noted that .

Between technologies, the single site options rank more highly than the multiple site options. This is because the transport advantages are outweighed by the increased costs and planning difficulties.

2.4.4 I have then considered what happens if the CERC does not get delivered, with the movement of waste similar to the current arrangements, but assuming all of the residual waste having to go to landfill sites, which from 2014 is out of County.

2.4.5 The calculation of daily vehicle mileage to the County boundary is 4471 miles, which represents a 33% increase on the laden vehicle mileage for the CERC.

2.4.6 I then considered the various landfill sites in the southwest and calculated an average distance to those, this was applied to the total daily trips, giving an additional 6,728 miles per day and a total of 11,199 daily laden miles, which is more than 300% higher than with the CERC.

2.4.7 In order to get a complete picture of transport sustainability I have then carried out calculations of mileage across the period from 2010 up to 2035. This has included looking at varying size EFW's only taking waste from within their own catchments as

well as the single size options included in the WRATE analysis. The following basic scenarios were used.

- a) **CERC**
2010 - 2014 to landfill
2014 – 2035 to CERC
- b) **2 SITES**
2010 - 2014 to landfill in Cornwall
2014 – 2019 landfill out of county
2019 – 2035 to new sites
- c) **5 SITES**
2010 - 2014 to landfill in Cornwall
2014 – 2019 landfill out of county
2019 – 2035 to new sites
- d) **NO CERC**
2010 - 2014 to landfill in Cornwall
2014 – 2035 landfill out of county

2.4.8 Within the scenarios there is an assumption of a 9 year period for any alternative sites to be delivered. I also considered the impact of an extension of timescale to Cannon Bridge to 2017. The calculations show,

CERC	21,885,496.89 miles
Best 2 site option	23,333,961.04 miles
Best 5 site option	22,813,093.23 miles

2.4.9 The conclusion of this work is that the CERC represents the most sustainable option in transport terms, which concurs with the view of the WPA in the planning committee report.

2.5 RAIL ACCESS

- 2.5.1 Moving on to the detail of rail access, the various studies produced for Cornwall County Council, demonstrate the potential for rail access for waste, but they also highlight that there are significant financial implications. I have previously stated that for financial reasons the County Council had not asked SITA to include waste by rail as part of their proposals.
- 2.5.2 The site is adjacent to the branch line and there are sidings along the frontage of the adjacent dryers. In discussion with the WPA we considered the use of the ACT system, which uses containers that are transferable between road lorries and rail trucks.
- 2.5.3 The infrastructure requirements for the system at the CERC are a suitable area of hardstanding at rail level and sufficient manoeuvring space to allow lorries to circulate around the CERC. I demonstrate that such infrastructure is deliverable within the site.
- 2.5.4 The conclusion is that rail access for waste is feasible and that when an appropriate investment regime is identified by the County Council then the flexibility that the location of the site and the current layout provides, would allow for future implementation.
- 2.5.5 Finally I have addressed the infrastructure improvements that are necessary for the footpath routes affected by the access road. For footpath 2, whilst we are providing an alternative route along the footway of the access road, the current footpath route can however remain.

-
- 2.5.6 For footpath 5, we are providing a diverted route along the access road footway, which whilst different in character will provide a safe diversion route.
- 2.5.7 The improvements improve the continuity of routes, maintaining accessibility and reducing severance.