

Response to lorry park consultation

23-9-16

Question 1: Do you have any comments on the indicative layout of the lorry area?

This misguided proposed monster of a lorry park should be broken down into smaller overnight lorry parks located throughout the UK, not just in Stanford or even Kent. Stack may never be needed again, but there is an increasing 24/7 need for overnight lorry parking. It will not fix Op Stack and will simply put more strain on the already overburdened M20 in this location. A huge lorry park in any location will potentially be a single point of failure, especially placed too close to the Channel ports. Any incident on the M20 west of the proposed site will render the lorry park inaccessible.

The slip road from the M20 into the north side of the proposed site is illegally close to J11, meaning its closure during Op Stack. This will cause utter chaos and traffic on the smaller local roads. This is unacceptable.

There has been no joined together thinking with the new lower Thames Crossing or KCC's latest transport plan (nor any other existing or planned highways infrastructure). The A2/M2 corridor should be upgraded to keep freight flowing and flexibility in event of an incident, in preference to a monstrous lorry area on a single point of just one route to both ports.

The actual construction of this site and its slip roads is likely to cause far more disruption to the M20 and surrounding roads than any potential Op Stack enforced on the highway, as it is at present.

The site layout itself is far too vague and incomplete to comment on and HE representatives at the public consultations were unable to give any significant detail about location or extent of facilities, exact layout, positions for refrigerated or hazardous freight, booths, operation and maintenance, landscaping, width or height of outer bunding, how the high voltage cable would be avoided etc.

Question 2: Do you have any comments on the environmental impact of the proposals?

The proposed lorry area will be an environmental catastrophe for the Garden of England. It is insane to destroy 250 acres of prime farmland and almost unbelievable that a development of this magnitude could possibly go ahead with anything less than a full Environmental Impact Assessment.

Countless species of fauna and flora will lose their habitat, including the protected Great Crested Newt. Furthermore, views from the downs and adjoining AONB will be irreparably blighted.

So little detail has been shown to date, I fail to see how any environmental issues have been adequately addressed. They obviously have not, hence the HE attempt to proceed without a full EIA.

Air pollution is a major worry and there has been no serious monitoring of air quality at the site, nor projected drop in air quality as a result of the additional overnight lorry parking and worst case scenario of Stack. The deadly 2.5 particulates in the diesel emissions which a facility of this size could produce may cause premature deaths to those living in nearby communities, especially the vulnerable members of society.

Noise pollution during construction and operation appears not to be taken seriously by HE. This has not been given enough attention and needs further

Light pollution is another aspect which has been given insufficient consideration. It is unclear whether any measures are to be taken to monitor current levels or how to minimise potential light pollution of so many lorries coming and going.

Flooding is another real risk on this site, in addition to oil and diesel from lorries escaping into the local water courses. I am not happy that these issues have been properly addressed.

Question 3: Do you have any comments on additional measures we could take to further mitigate the environmental impact of the proposals?

No amount of bunding or landscaping could be high enough or far enough away from dwellings to make this hair brained proposal acceptable. No token plantings can replace the 250 acres of food producing crop or set aside currently in rotation on this plot of prime farmland and countryside. My colonies of bees cannot forage on concrete. We cannot eat tarmac.

Question 4: Regarding the management of the site, do you have any comments on: a) traffic management, b) security, c) operation of overnight parking, d) management in general?

No operator has been found to advise HE or input to the design and operation of the site, so how can we be expected to comment on these questions? Again, there is insufficient detail, but we have major concerns are on all levels:

- A. **Traffic management** – or more to the point, who will call Stack? The police clearly do not want to be involved, since they did not get paid last time. There were no answers given to this. The closure of J11 eastbound during Stack is unacceptable. This will cause more traffic to use the A20 and other local roads, resulting in additional inconvenience to those who have been most adversely affected.
- B. **Security** is of huge concern, especially to women. We have had no reasonable assurances of how thousands of mostly male lorry drivers will be contained, nor how prostitution will be excluded from surrounding areas. Terrorism and fire are other aspects which have not been satisfactorily addressed.

- C. **Overnight parking** and any charging or processing structure is still not thought through without an operator to advise, not enough information on which to comment
- D. **General management** – HE was unable to say how long it would take to mobilise. If past performance of HE is any indication, if stack is called, by the time the facility is recommissioned and fully staffed for use, the need for stack will likely have passed. At worst, staff may not even get to the site due to surrounding congestion.

HE have not been able to explain how the site will be manned (or not) when not in use, nor who will maintain it or prevent ingress of travellers.

Another worry is the rubbish and other antisocial nuisance associated with thousands of HGVs and drivers in one place.

Question 5: Do you have any comments on the facilities that should be provided at the site?

Again, not enough detail offered by HE on proposed type or extent of facilities to comment upon. We were told there may be portaloos, or maybe not. Maybe small permanent toilet blocks, maybe not. If objections to south side upheld, overnight facilities may be moved to the north. Way too vague!

Question 6: Do you have any comments on how the operation of the site should be kept under review?

Repeat of question 4. I would say 'Don't wait for it not to be used, just don't build it at all'.

Question 7: Do you have any other comments?

This consultation appears to be a tick box exercise. I feel HE are just 'going through the motions' and that our views are not sought at all. It is made to look that way because the simple fact is that HE are nowhere near having enough detail finished to launch a meaningful consultation.

We have been let down by those we elected to represent us and if this is allowed to go ahead, it will be an undemocratic and obscene waste of £250,000,000.

Submitted by Debbie Burton 23-9-16

Waverley, Stanford, Ashford, Kent TN25 6DL

burtons@live.co.uk