

REP 49**Name** Rachel Stockton**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

Q303y Into which of the following categories does your representation fall regarding the preferred waste area (Appendix C) - CUTBUSH LANE BUSINESS AREA, WOKINGHAM (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

REP 49

Name Rachel Stockton

Question	Answer
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
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

Question

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

Answer

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

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 Naylor's 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. In addition, considering the flood risks in the area and the recent review of the waterways to enable protection of the towns along the Thames River route pushing flooding back to more rural areas. When there is high rain levels, Swallowfield already has very high water levels surrounding the Nursery. This will put the recently more developed areas of Swallowfield at a higher risk of flooding, this does not make sense to a logical thinking person. Residents home insurance will become unaffordable if this continues and the water levels rises even more. If you put a pebble in a glass the water spills, how do you prevent that where a high water table already exists. I struggled to see where the SFRA specifically covered the Nursery area, surrounding areas further a field but not the Nursery, road and opposite Blackwater River that constantly bursts its bank when heavy rain comes that flows into the Blackwater River -> Loddon -> Kennet -> Thames. Why has this project not been made widely known to the residents and those that currently own, have a business and home on the site. Why does the Government "Secretary of State" think that they have such overriding powers to do whatever they want in rural areas. The population in this country is too big, why don't you

REP 49

Name Rachel Stockton

Question

Answer

start looking more at controlling the population in the country, all these additional facilities will not be required and what we have will be adequate or even better some sites can be returned to countryside and open space. Villages and rural areas will soon become lakes that cannot be populated at all and the beautiful English countryside, which is our heritage, will be lost.

Q310 Are you seeking a change to the policy? Yes OR No

Yes

Q311x:1 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 - LANDSCAPE

Landscape

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:5 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 - FLOODING

Flooding

REP 49

Name Rachel Stockton

Question	Answer
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)
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 and any other surrounding area in this beautiful rural village, hasn't enough damage to this area already been done!
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.

REP 49

Name Rachel Stockton

Question

Q518

If you have any further comments about the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Proposed Submission Plan document for Central and Eastern Berkshire, please include them here

Answer

The documentation to trawl through and even this process of objection is extremely painful. Do you rely on this to try and put off the public objecting, what happened to Town Hall discussions, articles in the local news papers etc ... and we are expected to trust those running this country, even local Councillor's no nothing of what is being proposed here! It is very sad that the people the country vote for to give power to making decisions on behalf of this beautiful, fortunate country cannot be trusted. Apparently in consultation since 2017, and 2-3 weeks before the end of this phase we only get to hear about it via word and mouth within the community! One positive, the back button worked and did not delete my previous responses!
