

# South London Waste Plan



## Stage 2a Consultation Report

A summary of the response received to the Stage 2a consultation for the South London Waste Plan: Additional sites held between 8<sup>th</sup> February and 22<sup>nd</sup> March, 2010.

May 2010

## **Purpose**

1. This report sets out how the boroughs of Croydon, Kingston, Merton and Sutton have engaged with the local community and key stakeholders throughout the development of the Waste Development Plan Document we are jointly preparing.
2. The report sets out the findings of the Stage 2a consultation which took place over 6 weeks between 8 February and 22 March 2010.
3. The Stage 2a consultation stage looked at 8 additional sites that were suggested by residents, landowners and waste operators. These sites were assessed by planning officers using the same criteria which was applied to the original list of sites. All of these sites scored relatively poorly as they have numerous constraints which effect their development for waste management. Comments on these additional sites have been sought from residents, local businesses, the waste management industry, site owners and occupiers, statutory and government bodies.
4. This report provides a high level summary of the comments received. All comments and initial officer responses are available as an Appendix A. A similar report was published following the completion of the second consultation stage on potential sites and policies which took place in 20<sup>th</sup> July and 16<sup>th</sup> October 2009. This is available at <http://southlondonwasteplan.limehouse.co.uk>.

## **The requirement to consult**

5. Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (Regulation 25) requires local planning authorities to ensure that development plan documents (DPDs) are genuinely front-loaded by informally involving communities in the development of issues and alternative options. The regulations state that a variety of community involvement measures should be used in order to encourage a meaningful response based upon a genuine choice of options.
6. Boroughs are also required to ensure that consultation arrangements are in accordance with their adopted Statements of Community Involvement (SCI). Each partner borough involved in the development of the Joint Waste DPD has its own adopted SCI. To ensure a common approach across all boroughs, the greatest requirements in any one SCI have been applied to all boroughs.
7. When the South London Waste Plan is submitted, a Statement of Compliance will be prepared. This will explain how the preparation of the DPD has met the Regulation 25 requirements as well as the requirements of the Statements of Community Involvement. This Statement of Compliance will also need to show how all issues raised by stakeholders have been addressed. This report should be read as an 'interim' statement.

## **Background to the South London Waste Plan**

8. The South London Waste Plan will provide a planning framework for the management of all waste produced in the partner boroughs. It will form part of each borough's Local Development Framework (LDF) and will:
  - Contain policies which will be used to assess applications for future waste management facilities within the Plan's area;
  - Allocate land to waste management, to guide the future development of waste management facilities, and;
  - Specify how delivery of the Waste Plan will be monitored annually.
9. When approved, the Waste Plan will replace the saved waste policies within the partner boroughs' Unitary Development Plan's (UDP).

### **How we have consulted on the development of the South London Waste Plan**

10. In preparing the South London Waste Plan, the partner boroughs must ensure they are in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy (in this case the Mayor's London Plan) and National Policy. To this end, regular meetings have taken place, and will continue to take place throughout the Plan's development with the Greater London Authority (GLA) and Government Office for London (GOL).

11. In addition, formal consultation activities have taken place to seek views from local residents, businesses, the waste industry, site owners and occupiers and other stakeholders. The first, known as the 'issues and options consultation' took place over a 6 week period in September and October 2008. The second, known as the 'potential sites and policies consultation' took place over a 13 week period from July to October 2009. The third, known as the 'additional sites consultation' took place over a 6 week period from February to March 2010.

### **The first consultation: 'Issues and Options' September – October 2008**

12. The first consultation stage sought comment on a range of issues and options for dealing with these. In line with each borough's Statement of Community Involvement, the consultation was advertised in the local press and in borough magazines; all boroughs' websites, display of posters, leaflets and consultation materials (questionnaires) in council main receptions and all libraries. All residents, businesses and other parties on each planning department's Local Development Framework database, as well as those who responded to the issues and options consultation were notified by direct mail.

13. An Issues and Options consultation document was prepared containing a questionnaire<sup>1</sup>. A leaflet containing a shortened version of the questionnaire and less technical information was also prepared to appeal to a wider audience<sup>2</sup>. These, together with background technical documents<sup>3</sup> were available electronically via the waste planning pages of each borough's websites.<sup>4</sup> Each webpage directed users to a Joint consultation portal where users could read documents and respond using the online questionnaires.

14. One evening public workshop was held in each borough during September and October 2008. We also encouraged local community groups to invite us to attend their meetings. Meetings of the following groups were attended by Planning Officers to discuss the Waste Plan:

- The Mitcham Society, Merton
- Kingston's Ecofootprint group
- The Hawkes Road Residents Association, Kingston
- The Chessington District Residents Association, Kingston
- The Sutton and Croydon Green Party
- The Mitcham Partnership, Merton

15. Over 100 stakeholders provided written response to the Issues and Options consultation and in addition, 87 people attended the workshops and provided their views in group discussions. These were captured in a full write-up of the workshops which was made available online following the consultation close.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Issues and Options Consultation Document,' September 2008 published jointly by the boroughs of Croydon, Kingston, Merton and Sutton. Available to view via <http://southlondonwasteplan.limehouse.co.uk>

<sup>2</sup> 'Consultation on moving away from landfill,' September 2008 published jointly by the boroughs of Croydon, Kingston, Merton and Sutton. Available to view via <http://southlondonwasteplan.limehouse.co.uk>

<sup>3</sup> The South London Waste Plan Technical Report, The Habitats Directive Assessment, The South London Waste Plan Interim Sustainability Appraisal. Available to view via <http://southlondonwasteplan.limehouse.co.uk>

<sup>4</sup> [www.croydon.gov.uk/wasteplan](http://www.croydon.gov.uk/wasteplan); [www.kingston.gov.uk/wasteplan](http://www.kingston.gov.uk/wasteplan); [www.merton.gov.uk/wasteplan](http://www.merton.gov.uk/wasteplan); [www.sutton.gov.uk/wasteplan](http://www.sutton.gov.uk/wasteplan)

<sup>5</sup> This report is available to view via <http://southlondonwasteplan.limehouse.co.uk>

### **Consultation stage 2: 'Potential sites and Policies' – July to October 2009**

16. The second stage of consultation identified a list of potential sites and a set of draft policies which will be used to assess future applications for waste facilities.

17. The second consultation stage was advertised in the same way as the first; using local press and in borough magazines; all boroughs' websites, display of posters, leaflets and consultation materials (questionnaires) in council main receptions and all libraries. All residents, businesses and other parties on each planning department's Local Development Framework database, as well as those who responded to the issues and options consultation were notified by direct mail.

18. In addition, all boroughs wrote to businesses and residents on and surrounding all potential sites identified in the Stage 2 consultation materials. Unfortunately, the distribution of letters and consultation materials by post was hindered during the consultation period by unplanned strikes by Royal Mail workers which affected most of the country for a number of days. However, residents were able to pick documents up from their local libraries and council main receptions.

19. This second consultation stage received wider coverage in the local press which also helped to ensure residents were aware of the consultation and how they could get involved.

20. Each borough also held an evening drop-in workshop during September 2009 to enable residents to find out more about the development of the Waste Plan, provide feedback about the potential sites and draft policies and ask specific questions. The workshops were well attended, with 214 attendees across the Plan area. A full write-up of these workshops is available as Appendix A to this report.

21. As for the first stage of consultation, all consultation materials and press releases encouraged community groups to invite us to attend their meetings to talk further about the Plan. Planning officers attended all meetings we were invited to.

### **Consultation Stage 2a: 'Additional Sites' – February to March 2010**

22. The Stage 2a consultation identified 8 additional sites put forward by residents, landowners and waste operators.

23. The Stage 2a consultation stage was advertised in the same way as the first and second; using local press and in borough magazines; all boroughs' websites, display of posters, leaflets and consultation materials (questionnaires) in council main receptions and all libraries. All residents, businesses and other parties on each planning department's Local Development Framework database, as well as those who responded to the previous consultation were notified by direct mail.

24. In addition, all boroughs wrote to businesses and residents surrounding 4 of the additional sites identified in the Stage 2a consultation materials, they were sites 1003: Hogsmill Valley, 1004: Beddington Farmlands, 1006: Wandle Valley Trading Estate and 1007: Jessop's Way, Beddington.

25. The Stage 2a consultation stage received wide coverage in the local press which also helped to ensure residents were aware of the consultation and how they could get involved.

26. In total 446 responses were received on the additional sites consultation from a wide range of stakeholders. Some responses were individual's views, whilst some represent much larger organisations such as Chessington Court Residents Association, Spring Grove Residents Association Wimbledon Park Residents Association, Friends of the Grove and local environmental organisations including Surbiton & District Bird Watching Society, Elmbridge Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, Sutton Group Wildlife Trust and Beddington Farm Bird Group. Responses were received from the following schools: Spencer Nursery School & Children's Centre, Hackbridge Primary School, and Culvers House Primary. Responses were also received from government bodies (e.g. the Environment Agency, the Greater London Authority, the Highways Authority, English Heritage, and Government Office for London). Only a few responses were received from waste management companies and site owners. Full details of all respondents and their comments can be found at Appendix A, alongside initial officer comments.

27. It is important to note that organisations and individuals responded to the consultation in different ways. Some filled in all or part of a questionnaire, others wrote letters or e-mails covering some or all of the questions raised.

28. The remainder of this report presents an analysis of the response to the consultation questionnaire. This report contains one accompanying appendix:

- **Appendix A** contains *all* comments received in response to the potential sites and policies consultation, along with initial officer comments. Please note that this is a large document and will be made available online at <http://southlondonwasteplan.limehouse.co.uk>, in local libraries and from the Project Manager.

**Thanks to all of you who responded to the Stage 2a consultation on additional sites for the South London Waste Plan.**

## Comments on Stage 2a additional sites

**Q) Do you think these sites are suitable for waste management facilities?** *This question was asked in a short questionnaire. Views were also provided by letter and Email. Comments received are discussed below*

29. This report summarises the main objections and support received for the 8 additional sites consulted on. All detailed responses to the consultation can be found in Appendix A.

### Feedback from Government

30. The Greater London Authority (GLA) has objected to all but one site on the grounds that they are located within either designated Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) or Green Belt. Therefore the majority of the proposed additional sites are inconsistent with the draft London Plan Policy 7.17 (*Metropolitan Open Land*) which maintains a presumption against inappropriate development of MOL. Objections are also given against these sites because they are designated Sites Of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation and therefore are contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 *Biodiversity and nature conservation* and draft London Plan policy 7.19 *Biodiversity and Access to nature*. Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance. Transport for London (TfL) raises concerns about the impact of additional traffic on the road network and effect on transport network connectivity. TfL advises that policy should aim to minimise the number and volume of waste movements as well as considering the impact of waste transportation on the environment.

31. The Environment Agency (EA) makes objections to sites which are located in flood zones 3, 3a and 3b and groundwater zones. The EA identifies a number of sites which would need a flood risk assessment to demonstrate how flood risk would be addressed e.g. through the use of sustainable drainage systems. The EA advises that the development of sites which are designated Sites of Nature Conservation Importance or greenfield land should not be considered for development and that any proposal should ensure that wildlife should be protected.

32. In developing the South London Waste Plan, it was considered that the redevelopment of these sites could provide opportunities for improvements to surface water drainage and sustainable drainage systems. Further discussion on this issue will be needed with the EA.

33. CgMs Consulting responded on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Authority and objected to sites 1005, 1006 and 1007 because they have the potential to meet strategic and local requirements for a mix of uses including social infrastructure. They ask for the removal of these sites for further consideration.

34. Surrey County Council commented and objected on sites 1000, 1001a, 1001b, and 1002. Comments were concerned with the impact upon the transport network.

**Table 1:** Objections to additional sites from statutory bodies are listed below:

Site	Site description	Borough	Objector	Main reasons for objections
1000	Land west of Hawkhurst road	Croydon	GLA	Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 ( <i>Metropolitan Open Land</i> ) states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development. Designation as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 <i>Biodiversity and nature conservation</i> and draft London Plan policy 7.19 <i>Biodiversity and Access to nature</i> . Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance.
1001a &	Open areas	Kingston	GLA	Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green

1001b	of land adjacent to Chessington Garden Centre			Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 ( <i>Metropolitan Open Land</i> ) states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development. Designation as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 <i>Biodiversity and nature conservation</i> and draft London Plan policy 7.19 <i>Biodiversity and Access to nature</i> . Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance.
1002	Land to the south of Silverglade Business Park	Kingston	GLA	Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 ( <i>Metropolitan Open Land</i> ) states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development.
1003	Land at Hogsmill Valley	Kingston	GLA	Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 ( <i>Metropolitan Open Land</i> ) states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development. Designation as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 <i>Biodiversity and nature conservation</i> and draft London Plan policy 7.19 <i>Biodiversity and Access to nature</i> . Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance.
1004	Former gravel extraction work sites, Beddington farmlands	Sutton	GLA	Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 ( <i>Metropolitan Open Land</i> ) states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development. Designation as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 <i>Biodiversity and nature conservation</i> and draft London Plan policy 7.19 <i>Biodiversity and Access to nature</i> . Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance.
1007	Land to north of Jessop's Way, Beddington	Sutton	GLA	Designation as Metropolitan Open Land or Green Belt. Draft London Plan Policy 7.17 ( <i>Metropolitan Open Land</i> ) states boroughs are to protect MOL from inappropriate development. Designation as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. Contrary to London Plan policy 3D.14 <i>Biodiversity and nature conservation</i> and draft London Plan policy 7.19 <i>Biodiversity and Access to nature</i> . Both of these policies require local authorities to protect Sites of Metropolitan Importance.
1005	Wimbledon Greyhound Stadium	Merton	GLA	This site is not within a strategic Industrial or Employment Area and is at risk from flooding. Contrary to London Plan policy 4A.23 and draft London Plan policy 5.17 requires sites located in industrial locations, employment areas or existing waste management locations to be selected.

1000	Land west of Hawkhurst road	Croydon	EA	Sensitive zone for groundwater and located in a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.
1001a	Open areas of land adjacent to Chessington Garden Centre	Kingston	EA	Located in Greenfield land.
1001b	Open areas of land adjacent to Chessington Garden Centre	Kingston	EA	Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and contains important nature habitats.
1003	Land at Hogsmill Valley	Kingston	EA	Located in flood zone 3a and contains important nature habitats.
1004	Former gravel extraction work sites, Beddington farmlands	Sutton	EA	Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and location of watercourses on site and to the south of the site.
1005	Wimbledon Greyhound Stadium	Merton	EA	Located in functional floodplain zone 3b.
1006	Wandle Trading Estate	Sutton	EA	Located in flood zone 3.
1007	Land to north of Jessop's Way, Beddington	Sutton	EA	Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.
1000	Land west of Hawkhurst road	Croydon	Surrey County Council	Green Belt, nature conservation and local access constraints.
1001a & 1001b	Open areas of land adjacent to Chessington Garden Centre	Kingston	Surrey County Council	Green Belt constraints and visual impact. They are located on or near the busy A243 Leatherhead Road close to the county boundary with Surrey. It forms part of the primary route network linking Kingston and the M25. Potential Impact of waste traffic on Epsom town centre if lorries travel via the B280.
1002	Land to the south of Silverglade Business Park	Kingston	Surrey County Council	Green Belt constraints and visual impact. They are located on or near the busy A243 Leatherhead Road close to the county boundary with Surrey. It forms part of the primary route network linking Kingston and the M25. Potential Impact of waste traffic on Epsom town centre if lorries travel via the B280.

1005	Wimbledon Greyhound Stadium	Merton	CgMs Consulting on behalf of Metropolitan Policy Authority	This site has the potential to meet the strategic and local requirements for a mix of uses including social infrastructure. London Plan Policy 3B.4 (Industrial locations) allows for potential alternative uses for surplus industrial land where appropriate. The removal of this site would provide greater flexibility.
1006	Wandle Trading Estate	Sutton	CgMs Consulting on behalf of Metropolitan Policy Authority	This site has the potential to meet the strategic and local requirements for a mix of uses including social infrastructure. London Plan Policy 3B.4 (Industrial locations) allows for potential alternative uses for surplus industrial land where appropriate. The removal of this site would provide greater flexibility.
1007	Land to north of Jessop's Way, Beddington		CgMs Consulting on behalf of Metropolitan Policy Authority	This site has the potential to meet the strategic and local requirements for a mix of uses including social infrastructure. London Plan Policy 3B.4 (Industrial locations) allows for potential alternative uses for surplus industrial land where appropriate. The removal of this site would provide greater flexibility.

35. The Highways Agency did not provide any site-specific comments in their consultation response on the additional proposed sites, but in general seek to promote strategies and land allocations which support alternatives to the private car. English Heritage did not provide a formal response on these additional sites but are keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. The NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit do not provide site specific comments but emphasised the importance of waste facilities not having a detrimental impact on physical, social or mental health. In addition, The Government Office for London, National Grid and CABE did not provide any site specific comments.

36. On a regional level, comments were received from the RSPB South East Region who objected to sites 1004 and 1007 because of their location within a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation. In particular site 1004 is of high conservation concern and contains London's only breeding colony of tree sparrows. The BioRegional Development Group, an entrepreneurial charity, objects to sites 1006, 1007 and 1004. Comments raised against these sites are made on the grounds that this area already contains a land fill site and sewage works and is a residential area. In addition the location of site 1004 is within MOL and within the centre of the proposed Wandle Valley Regional Park and Beddington Farmlands Urban Nature Reserve.

37. **Table 2:** Support for additional sites from statutory bodies are listed below:

Site	Site description	Borough	Supporter	Main reasons for support
1006	Wandle Valley Trading Estate, Hackbridge	Sutton	GLA	Supports site due to its designation as a Preferred Location for Industry. However flood risk would need to be mitigated.

38. GLA supported site 1006 Wandle Valley Trading Estate Hackbridge as it is a designated preferred location for Industry although the risk of flooding would have to be addressed.

#### Feedback from residents

39. Local stakeholders objected to and supported a number of sites (though with greater numbers objecting to sites than supporting them). These are summarised in Tables 3 and 4, found at the end of this section on sites comments. All comments received can be viewed in Appendix A.

40. Similar to the responses received during the last consultation, residents and local stakeholders cited similar reasons for objection on these additional sites proposed. The key concerns raised by local residents in objection to sites were:

- Additional traffic on already congested roads
- Traffic impact on residential amenity
- Traffic impact on air quality
- Traffic impact on road safety (particularly where schools, playing fields, residential areas are located close by)
- Close proximity to residential properties
- Fear of air pollution from any facility
- Fear of water pollution from any facility (e.g. on the Wandle River and Hogsmill Rivers) and increase in flood risk
- Fear of increased noise from any facility
- Fear of smells from any facility
- Fear of visual intrusion and a general reduction in residential amenity
- Fear of health impacts (particularly for those who suffer from respiratory problems e.g. asthma)
- Protection of the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
- Loss of biodiversity

41. A small number of residents did indicate support for the additional sites proposed. The key reasons given by local stakeholders in support of the consideration of sites for waste management facilities are:

- The site is already industrial
- The site is not too close to residents and would therefore have less impact on residential amenity
- The site has good accessibility
- The site is closer to other boroughs and would have less of an impact of their borough.

42. As Table 2 shows (found at the end of this section on potential sites comments), much of the support for particular sites comes from residents in other boroughs. This 'Not In My Backyard' (NIMBY) attitude is common when planning new development sites and is played out at a neighbourhood level as well as a borough level.

43. Most residents felt that the development of waste facilities should be away from residential areas, schools and the Green Belt. For those residents which supported sites, they generally provided the same reason, *"In my opinion the obvious choice for a Waste Management Facility is the old Cemex site in Beddington Lane as it is already industrialized and with few residents."* Another resident commented, *"the visual and residential impact would be less great than for sites in more built up areas. Again this resident said "because it is already in an area that is already industrial so would have little impact on any residents."*

44. Similar responses from the previous consultation were found in this third stage of consultation. Most residents do not recognise any beneficial impact that a waste facility will have on them individually, or on their local community. A Kingston resident commented that, *"Another waste management facility in close proximity will have a huge negative impact on local residents and central Kingston in general."* Again some residents raised concerns about the perceived negative impact on property values if a waste facility is to be built in close proximity to their homes.

### Feedback from the industry

45. The industry and some site owners responded in support of a number of sites:

Site	Site description	Borough	Supporter	Main reasons for support
1007	Land to north of Jessop's Way, Beddington	Sutton	LRS Consultancy on behalf of Cappagh Ltd (site owner)	The owner is willing to undertake mitigation measure to compensate any impact on MOL. The proposed facility would be able to treat waste wood and other materials from construction and demolition activities. A gasification facility would produce decentralised, renewable energy. The site is of sufficient size, the access road serves an industrial area and is located away from residential property. Surface drainage can be addressed plus the site has no significant wildlife or archaeological value.
1004	Former gravel extraction work sites, Beddington farmlands	Sutton	Viridor	The road network is of already industrial and thus will have no impact on residential areas. It has the potential to be connected to the rail network. It used to be a landfill site and therefore unlikely to have archaeological value. There is potential to provide some sort of a wildlife habitat. The London Plan (February 2008) and The London Plan Consultation Draft Replacement Plan (October 2009), support the co-location of waste facilities. Potential to deliver a Combined Heat and Power. This would be in accordance with the Mayor's aspirations. The site's designation of MOL should be taken into consideration along with wider environmental and economic benefits, this approach is supported by Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management.
1000	Land west of Hawkhurst Road	Croydon	Land owner	Proposes support for development of an underground water reservoir and overground nature park as a part of an exchange proposal for a part of the site 1003.
1003	Land at the Hogsmill Valley	Kingston	Thames Water	Supports this site as suitable for waste management development.

### Main areas of conflict and consensus

46. There is little consensus on the suitability of these sites at this stage of the Plan's development. The majority of respondents objected to the use of these additional proposed sites.

47. The waste management industry desire flexibility and believes that the most appropriate place to discuss the detail of proposals is at the planning application stage. This is an issue which needs further consideration.

48. Support was given for a number of sites; GLA supports site 1006, Thames Water supports suitability of site 1003, LRS Consultancy/Cappagh supports site 1007, Viridor supports site 1004 and the land owner supports site 1000. However in contrast, residents who responded gave support on a range of sites proposed during this consultation round.

**Table 3: Summary of objections to additional proposed sites.** *Note: All responses can be viewed in Appendix A, which will be made available on <http://southlondonwasteplan.limehouse.co.uk> and in libraries*

Site	Site description	Borough	Nos. of objections at time of publication*	Main reasons for objections
1000	Land West of Hawkhurst Road	Croydon	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt designation</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Destruction of woodland</li> <li>• Greenfield site</li> <li>• Impact upon traffic</li> <li>• Poor accessibility</li> <li>• Loss of biodiversity</li> <li>• Located in source protection zone 1</li> </ul>
1001a & 1001	Open areas of land adjacent to Chessington Garden Centre	Kingston	51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt designation</li> <li>• Intrusion of the Green Belt</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Poor access</li> <li>• Loss of biodiversity</li> <li>• Loss of visual amenity</li> <li>• Impact upon traffic- already busy during peak periods due to Chessington World of Adventures</li> </ul>
1002	Land to the south of Silverglade Business Park	Kingston	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green belt designation</li> <li>• Loss of biodiversity</li> <li>• Poor access</li> <li>• Loss of visual amenity</li> <li>• Impact upon traffic- already busy during peak periods due to Chessington World of Adventures</li> <li>• Inadequate size</li> <li>• Odour</li> </ul>

1003	Land at Hogsmill Valley	Kingston	52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollution</li> <li>• Poor accessibility</li> <li>• Already suffering from Thames Water Sewage Works</li> <li>• Residential area</li> <li>• Flood risk</li> <li>• Impact upon health</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Too close to local schools</li> <li>• Already suffering from existing waste facility</li> <li>• Located in flood zone 3a</li> </ul>
1005	Wimbledon Greyhound Stadium	Merton	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood risk</li> <li>• Pollution</li> <li>• Impact upon traffic</li> <li>• Poor accessibility</li> <li>• Existing use for local community</li> <li>• Opportunity for nature reserve</li> <li>• Residential area</li> <li>• Opportunity for social infrastructure</li> <li>• Located next to Wandle Valley Park</li> <li>• Located in flood zone 3b</li> </ul>

1004	Former gravel extraction works, Beddington Farmlands	Sutton	100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact upon traffic</li> <li>• Pollution</li> <li>• Loss of biodiversity</li> <li>• Existing odour problems from waste facility in local area</li> <li>• Located in the centre of the proposed Wandle Regional Park</li> <li>• Proposals for a bird nature reserve – RSPB – an area of special importance</li> <li>• Metropolitan Open Land</li> <li>• Impact upon health</li> <li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li> </ul>
1006	Wandle Valley Trading Estate	Sutton	58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollution</li> <li>• Greenfield site</li> <li>• Inconsistent with Sutton’s plan for a sustainable Hackbridge</li> <li>• Loss of residential amenity</li> <li>• Odour</li> <li>• Pollution</li> <li>• Nearby residential area</li> <li>• Located close to Wandle path which is used by local residents</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Loss of biodiversity</li> <li>• Already suffering from existing waste facilities and land fill</li> <li>• Effect on property values</li> <li>• Located in flood zone 3</li> </ul>

1007	Land to the north of Jessop's Way, Beddington	Sutton	53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic</li><li>• Inconsistent with Sutton's plan for a sustainable Hackbridge</li><li>• Already suffering from existing waste facilities and land fill</li><li>• Metropolitan Open Land/ Green Belt</li><li>• Loss of biodiversity</li><li>• Visual impact</li><li>• Site of Importance for Nature Conservation</li><li>• Metropolitan Open Land</li><li>• Odour</li><li>• Located in the centre of the proposed Wandle Regional Park &amp; Beddington Farmlands Nature Reserve</li><li>• Croydon rifle and pistol club uses the recreational facilities of Wandle Park</li></ul>
------	---	--------	----	--

**Table 4: Summary of support for additional proposed sites.** *Note: All responses can be viewed in Appendix A, which will be made available on <http://southlondonwasteplan.limehouse.co.uk> and in libraries*

Site	Site description	Borough	Nos. of objections at time of publication*	Main reasons for support
1000	Land West of Hawkhurst Road	Croydon	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only suitable if compensation is paid to local residents</li> <li>• Land owner support</li> </ul>
1001a & 1001	Open areas of land adjacent to Chessington Garden Centre	Kingston	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the waste plant is properly screened</li> <li>• If good access is provided</li> <li>• Access to road network and opportunity to manage traffic to and from the site via m25</li> </ul>
1002	Land to the south of Silverglade Business Park	Kingston	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good size</li> <li>• Reasonable access</li> </ul>
1003	Land at Hogsmill Valley	Kingston	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would be an improvement</li> <li>• If full screening is provided</li> <li>• Adequate access</li> <li>• Adequate size</li> <li>• Existing use is similar to the proposed use</li> </ul>
1005	Wimbledon Greyhound Stadium	Merton	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area is in need of regeneration</li> <li>• Good location to serve all Boroughs</li> <li>• Located away from residential areas</li> <li>• Development would be an improvement for the area</li> <li>• No visual impact</li> </ul>

1004	Former gravel extraction works, Beddington Farmlands	Sutton	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already used to traffic</li> <li>• Existing industrial use</li> <li>• Located away from residential areas</li> <li>• Good access</li> <li>• Nearer to other boroughs so will have less of an impact upon Kingston</li> <li>• Minimum changes needed</li> <li>• Good size</li> </ul>
1006	Wandle Valley Trading Estate	Sutton	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preferred location for industry</li> <li>• Flood risk can be mitigated</li> <li>• Located away from residential areas</li> </ul>
1007	Land to the north of Jessop's Way, Beddington	Sutton	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to treat waste wood and other materials from construction and demolition activities. A gasification facility would</li> <li>• Potential for decentralised energy</li> <li>• Adequate size</li> <li>• access road serves an industrial area</li> <li>• If accessibility is addressed properly</li> </ul>