

## **STATEMENT TO INQUIRY**

**Ref: Appeal by Urbaser Balfour Beatty in respect of land at Javelin Park  
(Gloucester)**

**Appeal Ref: APP/T1600/A/13/2200210**

I am the Member of Parliament for Stroud, and as such the above application which you are now considering on appeal falls within my parliamentary constituency. Since 2010 I have served on the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee and this statement reflects both my and many of my constituents concerns about the proposed development.

I note that many other interested parties have expressed their views about matters relating to health and have also questioned the County Council's Waste Core Strategy and motives, but it has been my view from the outset that the key concerns about this application, and those which the Inspector will have to address, will be planning considerations. This is reflected in the statement submitted by Mrs Swee-Fong Warton who met with me to discuss the application and present to me her petition against the proposal.

In my formal letter of objection to the County Council I made when it considered the planning application (correspondence dated 20<sup>th</sup> April 2012 and 15<sup>th</sup> May 2012) I raised the following relevant planning considerations:

1. The design, visual impact, bulk and massing of the facility on residents living near Javelin Park and the neighbouring Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). For example, proposed design, size and bulk of the building does not take into account the fact it is on the edge of the Cotswolds AONB and is not in keeping with the area. The potential for significant impact on views out of the Cotswolds AONB is clearly a matter of planning consideration. Furthermore, there seems to have been rather inappropriate comparisons made by UBB in terms of visual impact

with the Blooms Garden Centre and other associated existing buildings.

2. Impact of a large volume of heavy goods vehicle movements in the vicinity and the consequential impact on the residential amenity of local residents. Residents have correctly queried the effectiveness of the existing lorry ban on the B4008 and cast doubt that it will control the inevitable increase in lorry movements associated with the proposals.
3. Noise and odour impacts on the local area. This is an issue of particular concern to me as I have previously been involved in helping residents tackle the unacceptable levels of noise and odour impacts at the EMR scrap metal facility and the New Earth Solutions facility respectively in Sharpness. Disputes about acceptable levels should be prevented by clear and agreed thresholds and this also applies to the control of odour.
4. In particular, while noting the most recent proposed design for the complex, I believe the application does not protect or screen adequately to the east in mitigation against the height of the main buildings in response to the interests of nearby residents and to demonstrate respect for the adjacent Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. During consultation organised by UBB I raised specific concerns about the height of the existing plans and requested that they consider reducing them or explore the option of lowering the facility but I do not know whether this was considered any further.

You have requested submission of matters for consideration that could be attached as conditions to your decision if in favour of the appeal. I would draw your attention to the representation of County Councillor Anthony Blackburn who in particular mentions;

1. That the County Council as landowner or UBB acquire particular residential properties adversely impacted for the value, displacement, removal and expenses costs of the individuals in question.
2. That UBB should set up and fund a trust for the benefit of the Haresfield Community (the trustees to include local authority and parish representatives) to monitor the effects of the plant and be in dialogue with the community and able to provide such facilities as a new village

hall, drop in centre etc to benefit Haresfield to balance the loss of amenity caused and any traffic generated through the Village.

These suggested conditions are well made by C/Cllr Blackburn and I endorse them. However, as it stands I am unconvinced how UBB adequately addresses the planning issues of design, visual impact, bulk and massing in the proposal in front of the Inspector and my objection to the application stands on the grounds above.

I am happy to take questions following my statement if the need arises.

I look forward to hearing details of the Inspectors deliberations in due course.

Neil Carmichael