REP 43

Name Joyce Maskell

Question		Answer
Q37:28	This consultation contains 28 policies, including details including details on implementation & monitoring ('supporting text') for each policy. Respond to Policy W4 – Locations and Sites for Waste Management	Policy W4 - Locations and sites for waste management
Q303x	Into which of the following categories does your representation fall regarding the preferred waste area (Appendix C) - BROOKSIDE BUSINESS PARK, SWALLOWFIELD (Support OR No view either way OR Objection)	Objection
Q305i	Into which of the following categories does your representation fall regarding proposals for supported appropriate locations, where the site has good connectivity to the strategic road network and MARKETS FOR THE TYPES OF WASTE TO BE MANAGED AND THERE IS A CLEAR PROVEN AND OVERRIDING NEED FOR THE PROPOSED FACILITY TO BE SITED IN THE PROPOSED LOCATION (Support OR No view either way OR Objection)	Objection
Q307:2	An objection must relate to either the local plan not complying with the legal requirements or it not being sound in relation of at least one of the tests of soundness. If you are objecting, under which criteria is this objection (select all that apply) - Not meeting the test of soundness	Not meeting the Test of Soundness

REP 43

Name Joyce Maskell

Question		Answer
Q308:2	If you are objecting to the policy on the grounds that it does not meet the test of soundness, what test of soundness do you consider that it fails (select all that apply) - The justification test	The justification test

REP 43

Name Joyce Maskell

Question		Answer
Q309	If you are objecting to the policy on the grounds that it does not meet the test of soundness, please include below your comments on how the policy does not meet the test of soundness	I object on the grounds of Justification to the inclusion of Brookside Business Park, Swallowfield as a suitable site in principle for Category 3 Waste. Its inclusion is not based on proportionate evidence and it is not a site that meets the criteria for Appropriate Locations as set out in Policy W4. Section 3: Appendix B Waste Facility Categories, Section 4: Appendix D Evidence Base and the Waste Background Study all reference that good transport infrastructure is considered to be an essential requirement for Appropriate Locations for Waste Facility Categories & Activities and that sites with existing access issues should be avoided where possible. In reality and as stated in the JMWP, traffic from and to Brookside Business Park 'will likely navigate through the village of Swallowfield to gain access to B3349 (Basingstoke Road)'. The Swallowfield village roads which would be directly impacted by increased traffic are residential, narrow and unsuitable for larger vehicles. These village roads do not constitute 'a good transport infrastructure' and access issues will be compounded. Narrow or non-existent pavements already pose accident risk and inconvenience to residents when larger vehicles approach each other or have to negotiate a cyclist, wheelchair user, pram/buggy or horse rider. The bridge on the B3349 Basingstoke Road was not built for frequent use by larger vehicles and has already required extensive repair works in recent years. There is no practical alternative access to Church Road from Farley Hill and/or Arborfield as this route includes two small bridges, neither built for frequent use by larger vehicles and one of which has a 7.5 tonne weight restriction and is adjacent to a notorious hairpin bend. The site's proximity to sensitive receptors such as housing, schools or community facilities has also not been given due consideration and the JWMP statement that 'the site is located in a rural environment away from the nearest residential area' is not evidenced. The map on P114 of the Waste Proposal Study illustrates that Brookside Business Park is close to (and requires access via) residential areas and community facilities including the village hall (which

REP 43

Name Joyce Maskell

Question		Answer
		accommodates a pre-school), local Post Office and Medical Centre. In addition to two private houses adjacent to the site itself and a number of others in close proximity, the rear of Brookside Business Park extends to Part Lane in Swallowfield which backs onto a number of residential roads including Foxborough, The Naylors and Curly's Way. Appendix D Evidence Base in Section 4 of the JWMP claims under Site Allocations that specific sites identified for minerals and waste activities in the Plan i) 'have the support of landowners and ii) are likely to be acceptable in planning terms'. The owners of Brookside Business Park do not support its inclusion and this site is highly unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms given that local residents would have to suffer the intimidation of large vehicles on its unsuitable roads causing inconvenience, danger, pollution, damage and noise.
Q310	Are you seeking a change to the policy? Yes OR No	Yes
Q311x:3	If you are seeking a change of policy, please indicate the issues under which you are seeking this or these change(s) - BROOKSIDE BUSINESS PARK, SWALLOWFIELD - TRANSPORT	Transport
Q311x:6	If you are seeking a change of policy, please indicate the issues under which you are seeking this or these change(s) - BROOKSIDE BUSINESS PARK, SWALLOWFIELD - AMENITY IMPACTS	Amenity impacts (noise, dust, etc)

REP 43

Name Joyce Maskell

Question		Answer
Q312	If you are seeking a change, please elaborate further on the change(s) that you are seeking	The withdrawal of Brookside Business Park as a suitable site in principle
Q492:13	There are 15 documents included in the Plan's evidence base, as well as a Policies Map, all of which can be found listed in Appendix D (page 185) of the Proposed Submission Plan document. I wish to comment on the Waste: Proposal Study	Waste: Proposal Study
Q504	There are 15 documents included in the Plan's evidence base, as well as a Policies Map, all of which can be found listed in Appendix D (page 185) of the Proposed Submission Plan document. What are your comments on the Waste: Proposal Study?	Brookside Business Park should be withdrawn from Table 16 Potentially Suitable Sites. Its inclusion is not based on proportionate evidence and it is not a site which meets the criteria for Appropriate Locations as set out in Policy W4. The Comments on Page 113 relating to Traffic & Access and Sensitive Human & Environmental Receptors do not adequately or objectively consider inevitable access issues, imply that this site meets the essential requirement of good transport infrastructure for Appropriate Locations for Waste Facility Categories and Activities and suggest that its rural location precludes any detrimental impact on the residential village community of Swallowfield.