

**An Open-Letter to
The Environment Agency
& Martin Warner at Michelmersh PLC, from.....**

Mr & Mrs Curtis, Marlyn Cottage, Ley Hill, HP5 1UN
Mr & Mrs Ralph, Hamilton House, Ley Hill, HP5 1UN
Mr & Mrs Holroyd, One-Day Farm, Ley Hill, HP5 1UN
Mr & Mrs Ward, Tall Firs, HP5 1UN

10th June 2015

Copy: Noel Brown, County Councillor, Bucks County Council
Andrew Garth, Parish Councillor, Latimer & Ley Hill Parish Council
Barbara Perrot, Chair, Latimer & Ley Hill Parish Council
Members of the Ley Hill community (via the village website, email, village noticeboard, Facebook and village magazine)

Re: Proposed In-fill of Meadham's Farm Brickworks, Blackwell Hall Lane, Ley Hill, HP5 1UW.

As immediate neighbors of the Meadham's Farm Brickworks site, we are writing this 'open letter' in order to share our views on the plans submitted by Michelmersh Brick Holdings PLC with respect to the proposed in-fill of this site.

Our understanding is that the current proposal and requirement from Michelmersh PLC is to vary the site's existing (approved) landfill environmental permit to change the types of waste that the site can accept. The existing permit would be extended to add asbestos wastes but also limited to exclude non-inert household waste.

To further clarify this, our understanding is that extending the permit to include the disposal of asbestos would result in the exclusion of the disposal of commercial and industrial wastes (sometimes referred to as C&I wastes) as well as the exclusion of household wastes that are collected at household waste recycling centres (which are visited by the public).

As the most immediate neighbors of the site, with gardens and property immediately adjacent to the site and/or to the access track we believe that we are at most risk from any negative environmental factors arising out of in-fill activity on the brickworks site.

Our ideal position would be to fill the whole site solely with inert materials and no household waste. We appreciate that this is not part of the current or extended plan by Michelmersh, however we would ask that in the first instance Michelmersh seriously consider investigating the potential disposal of spoil

from the HS2 project as a means of meeting their planning obligations to fill and restore the site.

However, given that HS2 is not yet a guaranteed option and that this may introduce delay in the process, **we are writing this 'open letter' in order to communicate our positive support for the proposal from Michelmersh Brick Holdings PLC to the Environmental Agency to modify the permitted waste types** and to ensure that this position is communicated and understood by other impacted households in the Ley Hill community.

Our support for the proposal is based on the following requirement and assumptions:

- 1) If the infill is to go ahead, then we would like this work to be completed and the site returned to woodland and pasture as fast as possible.***
 - Our assumption is that permission to fill with asbestos as well as inert builders waste will speed up the fill process
- 2) As immediate neighbors we are concerned about pollution into our properties from toxic underground seepage, wind-blown debris and wild animal carried debris from the site.***
 - Our assumption is that permission to fill with asbestos as well as inert builders waste will not attract wild animals, will reduce the risk of wind-blown debris and will not create any risk of underground toxic seepage.
- 3) As immediate neighbors we are concerned about the presence of a household waste landfill increasing the risk of fly-tipping, illegal waste disposal and other associated risks to the security and peace of mind of the immediate neighbors.***
 - Our assumption is that permission to fill with asbestos will make the site a 'highly-controlled' and monitored environment, which will reduce the risk of fly-tipping and illegal disposal of materials.
- 4) As immediate neighbors we are keen to see that the site is finished to the highest standard, creating a space that adds value to the community***
 - Our assumption is that permission to fill with asbestos is fundamentally more profitable operation for Michelmersh PLC, which ultimately will reduce the risk of costs being cut as part of the finishing process.

Our support is however contingent on Michelmersh being supportive of a number of specific requirements which we are open to discuss in more detail with the company. These are as follows:

- Above all, we seek to ensure that absolutely no odour is created by the infill operation that may negatively impact the quality of life in our properties and gardens.
- Noise pollution is also a key concern for us. In line with the last planning permission granted, we seek that all efforts are made to ensure any

- vehicle is fitted with white noise reversing warning and no "beepers"!
- Where possible, local risk assessment should be conducted to establish whether 'reverse warning' is needed at all and could therefore be isolated.
 - We also understand that further noise reduction is achievable if soft tracks are fitted to bulldozers as opposed to metal ones.
 - We wish to confirm that no infill is permissible outside Monday to Friday within designated existing times.
 - The last planning permission recommended regular liaison with local residents. This was never instigated by Duntons, but we request that this is instigated from the start of the operation. Our proposal is that this should be quarterly for the first year and 6 monthly thereafter. This will allow us to put down any markers we see as necessary early in the process.
 - We would also endorse some penalty / compensation in the event that operations are not concluded at the expiry of 5 or 6 years, whatever we collectively as a community deem fair.
 - Maybe Michelmersh can take insurance to cover necessary and pre-agreed compensation should the work not complete in the planned 5/6 years.
 - We would like to see steps taken to reduce the impact of noise and dust pollution as a result of HGV's using the access road, possibly to include refurbishment of the current boundary fences, barriers and road surface.
 - We would like to see steps taken to 'eliminate' rather than just 'reduce' the risk of HGV's turning right at the end of the access road, possibly with the use of a barrier/bollard arrangement.
 - We would also like Michelmersh PLC to help reduce the risk of field water run-off coming down a modified access road and into the grounds of Marlyn Cottage and Hamilton House.
 - We would also like agreement from Michelmersh to sell the finished land as one single plot rather than break it up for sale as smaller plots.
 - The public footpath which has been temporarily re-routed around One-Day Farm is to be re-instated on it's original route straight from the gates of the brickworks to the rear of the quarry area.

Failure to co-operate on these conditions will result in the loss of our goodwill and support for the project.

We welcome any questions and look forward to any feedback related to the content of this letter.

Sincerely:

Clive & Cheryl Curtis

David & Deborah Ralph

Richard & Liz Holroyd

Tim & Linda Ward