

**The Rookery South (Resource Recovery Facility) Order 2011**

Petition of General Objection

To the House of Commons.

THE PETITION of MARSTON MORETAINE PARISH COUNCIL

Declares that:

1. Your Petitioner, Marston Moretaine Parish Council, have powers under the provisions of various enactments and their concerns include the protection of the environment. Your petitioner represents the interests of the residents of Marston Moretaine parish ("the Parish"). The Resource Recovery Facility and associated development ("the Facility") proposed to be authorised by the Rookery South (Resource Recovery Facility) Order 2011 ("the Order") is almost entirely located in your petitioner's parish. Your petitioner is one of 25 town and parish councils or meetings who came together to object to the Facility through the Infrastructure Planning Commission ("IPC") examination process.
2. Your petitioner alleges that it and its property, rights and interests in the area of the Parish and the inhabitants of the Parish would be injuriously and prejudicially affected by the provisions of the Order and it accordingly objects to the Order for the reasons, amongst others, appearing in this petition.
3. The Order grants development consent for the Facility, that comprises an energy from waste electricity generating station with a gross electrical output capacity of 65 MWe, together with associated development including a post treatment materials recovery facility at Rookery South Pit in Marston Moretaine in Bedfordshire in close proximity to local houses and the Millennium Country Park.
4. In order to generate this amount of electricity, the Facility is designed to burn 585,000 tonnes of waste per year which is significantly in excess of the waste treatment needs of Central Bedfordshire thus requiring the transportation of waste into the area from a wide but undefined waste catchment area. Although the site is close to two rail lines there are no immediate plans to transport waste to the Facility by rail.
5. Because of the size of the Facility the application for the Order has been considered by the IPC. That harm would be caused to residents by the proposed development was accepted by the IPC in the Statement of Reasons for the decision to grant the Order.
6. The negative effects on the residents of Marston Moretaine would come from noise, the Facility's visual impact, increased traffic, re-industrialisation, emissions and anxiety about safety and the blight associated with living so close to it.
7. Your Petitioner objects to the Order because—
  - (a) It is not compliant with the adopted local plans for our part of Bedfordshire that have been properly developed through an exhaustive planning process reflecting the aspirations and needs of local people, nor with the emerging minerals and waste core strategy for Central Bedfordshire and Bedford Borough.
  - (b) The proposed development will damage the regeneration and restoration of the Marston Vale, which has suffered decades of the effects of brick manufacturing and landfill operations. The Order provides no security that the applicant or its American parent company will complete the long awaited restoration of the Rookery site. Since brick

making ceased, and with reduced land filling that is coming to an end, there have been major improvements in the vale. It is now a rural peaceful landscape, and it is no longer a scarred industrial landscape. This development would lead to the re-industrialisation of the Vale.

- (c) The Facility is of an inappropriate scale and design, out of keeping with what is a rural area and of a size and bulk that would have a severely detrimental visual impact on residents of the Parish. The bulk and mass of the Facility, the chimneystack and plume would be clearly visible, intruding on the parish, a constant reminder of its presence.
- (d) Visual impact would be particularly adverse on the Millennium Country Park, which lies immediately to the west of the site, within the Parish. It is the centre of the successful regeneration of the Marston Vale, one of 12 Community Forests in the UK, and an important popular amenity.
- (e) It has become clear that a facility of this size would need to process waste from a wider area than that proposed in the planning application. The residents of the Parish have had to endure the importation of waste from London for landfill for many years with all of the associated problems and this incinerator would represent a backward step.
- (f) Building incinerators of this scale reduces incentives for increasing recycling. Only a small proportion of the waste to be burnt can properly be considered as renewable, so the Facility would only go a small way to helping achieve the country's renewables target and it will stifle innovation in the development of more effective waste facilities.
- (g) There are no immediate plans for the transport of waste to the site by rail. The Facility would generate a significant number of additional HGV journeys on already congested roads over a wide area, waste may need to be transported to the Facility on roads as busy as the M1, M25, A1 and A14 to fill its capacity. We have seen no properly thought out plans for the redirection of vehicles when main highways are blocked because of accidents or road works or sheer weight of traffic as frequently occurs. The large volume of HGV movements would have a significant adverse impact on the local roads in the Parish.
- (h) Residents of the Parish are fearful of the risk to their health from emissions into the atmosphere, particularly given the effects of temperature inversions in the Marston Vale on the dispersion of the emissions, something that the population of the surrounding area is only too familiar with from years of brick making in neighbouring Stewartby when noxious fumes were regularly trapped near the ground. Even if these emissions can be controlled the risk to health that they could cause will be a cause of anxiety and stress for residents both of which cause health problems.
- (i) The Facility will cause a risk to the quality of the water supply if the foul water treatment plant, which was a late addition to the proposed development, fails. This would be needed as there is insufficient capacity at the local sewerage works for a facility of this scale. This could also lead to polluted water running into Stewartby Lake which is a popular local water sports and leisure amenity.
- (j) In addition to the risk to health from emissions into the atmosphere from the stack there would be a risk from wind blown dust from bottom ash that will be stored on site in the open. The National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy requires the ash to be stored in enclosed buildings.
- (k) There will be general noise disturbance and intermittent noise that, despite the measures included in the order to control noise, will disrupt residents' peaceful enjoyment of their lives.
- (l) We believe the proposed development will have a negative economic impact on the area reversing its regeneration. It is contrary to the local plans for the area and would not

assist in achieving the objective of fulfilling the potential and enhancing the Marston Vale.

8. Another reason your Petitioner objects to the Order is that this is the only opportunity under the Planning Act 2008 for your Petitioner to have its inhabitants' elected representatives consider the merits of the proposed development and decide whether the benefits to the wider population that it might provide outweigh the harm that the development will cause to the local population. Such a decision should not be imposed on the local population by unelected commissioners, a practice that in future will come to an end when the Localism Act comes into force.
9. For all these reasons, your Petitioner believes that the Order should not be approved.
10. The petitioner therefore requests that, should a joint committee consider this Order, it, or someone representing it in accordance with the rules and Standing Orders of the House, be given an opportunity to give evidence on all or some of the issues raised in this petition.

And the petitioner remains, etc.

16 December 2011

SUE CLARK, Agent for Marston Moretaine Parish Council

Cranfield Court  
Wood End  
Cranfield  
Bedfordshire  
MK43 0EB

01234 752672

IN PARLIAMENT  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
SESSION 2010-12

THE ROOKERY SOUTH  
(RESOURCE RECOVERY  
FACILITY) ORDER 2011

PETITION of MARSTON  
MORETAINE PARISH  
COUNCIL

Petition of General Objection

SUE CLARK  
Cranfield Court  
Wood End  
Cranfield  
Bedfordshire  
MK43 0EB