



# HILLINGDON

LONDON

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Major Applications Planning Committee</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>21 June 2016</b>	<b>Time: 6:00pm</b>
<b>Place:</b>	<b>Committee Room 5, Civic Centre, Uxbridge</b>	

## ADDENDUM SHEET

<b>Item: 6 Page: 13</b>	<b>Location:</b>
<p>Add following Paragraph to the beginning of the Recommendation:</p> <p>That should the Mayor not direct the Council under Article 6 to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application, delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning &amp; Enforcement to refuse planning permission (with authority to revise refusal reasons to take into account any further comments from statutory consultees).</p>	For clarity
<p>Amend Refusal reason 1 to read as follows:</p> <p>The application has failed to demonstrate that the development cannot be delivered at any available and suitable existing waste management site within the Borough or OPDC area where the development is proposed and at the sites listed in Tables 5-1 and 5-2 of the West London Waste Plan (July 2015) contrary to Policy WLWP3 of the West London Waste Plan (July 2015) nor has the application demonstrated how the requirements under paragraphs b to d of Policy WLWP3 of the West London Waste Plan (July 2015) shall be met.</p>	For clarity

<p>Delete paragraph in section 7.15 'Sustainable Waste Management' and replace with:</p> <p>The application site is not identified in the West London Waste Plan (WLWP) as being required for waste related development. The WLWP identifies other site which will be able to meet waste requirements for the West London area.</p>	<p>For Clarity</p>
<p>Add the following paragraphs and reason for refusal;</p> <p>With respect to level crossings Network Rail have a legal duty to '<i>assess, manage and control the risk for everyone of level crossings</i>'. In the letter of the 27th May Network Rail indicate that there are two circumstances where they would require an upgrade of the level crossing. A significant increase in vehicular movements (this application includes less vehicle movements than the previous application) and public access to the site through a Civic Amenity Site (this application includes a Civic Amenity Site).</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority and TfL consider there to be a significant increase in movements in the context of the operation of the surrounding highway network (which is a recommended refusal reason), however we do not know how significant an increase in vehicular movements would trigger a requirement for an upgrade of the level crossing. We do know that the proposals include a Civic Amenity site, on this matter it is a simple fact that the conclusion reached by Network Rail in their no objection letter that a level crossing upgrade is not required is flawed (<i>If the applicant had wanted to provide public access to the site, to a domestic waste facility for example, then the crossing would require a major upgrade..... we understand there no plans to introduce public access</i> - extracts from Network Rail letter). These concerns have been brought to Network Rail's attention and they have subsequently issued a '<i>holding objection</i>'. To remove the Civic Amenity site from the planning application would be a fundamental change to the scheme which would alter not only the submitted site layout but the content of key technical reports accompanying the planning application. The Council could wait to receive a third comment from Network</p>	<p>For Clarity</p>

<p>Rail, however it is considered that sufficient clarity has been provided for the Council to take a view on this matter. The planning application includes neither an upgrade of the level crossing or a risk assessment (to understand the most appropriate approach to upgrading the level crossing), this is not a matter which could be simply left to a grampian condition or legal agreement (in part as the Council simply does not know whether a solution is feasible). It is suggested that based on the information before the Council the following refusal reason should be added:</p> <p>It is considered on the basis of information provided by Network Rail concerning circumstances where a level crossing upgrade is required that the proposals would necessitate an upgrade of the existing level crossing. In the absence of a full risk assessment and details of any level crossing upgrade the Council has insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposals would be safe for the public and rail operators, contrary to policies AM7 and AM11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Polices (November 2012), policies 2.6, 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 of the London Plan (FALP March 2016) and paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	
<p>Further Comments received from The Garden City Estate Residents Association:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The first is that the building is exactly the same size as the first which was designed with a capacity of 950,000 tonnes. While 950,000 tonnes were proposed in the previous planning application only 450,000 tonnes are now proposed.</li> <li>2. The EA considers some of the external activities would give rise to levels of odour, noise and dust pollution so great that they should be enclosed on six sides with only small access points for vehicles and pedestrians (page 33).</li> </ol>	<p>Officer Comments:</p> <p>If permission was to be granted a condition could be added to restrict the tonnage of the MRF.</p> <p>The EA comments are the same as with the previous application and the proposals are the same as with the previous application. The MRF building, where the recycling of waste will take place is enclosed. The outside storage bays are for the storage of materials from the construction industry. The materials stored here would be awaiting processing inside the MRF or would be stored there following processing inside the MRF. As the materials will only be stored here and not processed there is no issue. In any</p>

<p>3. It is also proposed that the site be used for the sale and delivery of aggregates and sand to development sites which is a separate builders yard use.</p> <p>4. Concerns with Network rail comments.</p> <p>5. A further concern is that the Environment Agency consider the proposed external operations e.g. Concrete crushing, wood shredding etc should be enclosed on six sides in order to reduce odour, noise and dust pollution (page 33).</p> <p>6. The GLA required further information on the segregation of paths from traffic (page 31) which this proposal has not done nor can it be seen how this can be done in view of the access arrangements. Given this it is surprising that the Access Officer is satisfied that it meets all policy requirements when it clearly doesn't.</p> <p>7. The requirement of the EA is that the site should have adequate water on site for dust suppression and fire fighting (page 33).</p> <p>8. Finally WLWP Policy 1 is stated in the first reason for refusal. Should this not be WLWP Policy 3?</p>	<p>event the storage bays are located to the west of the site away from residential properties.</p> <p>This is not a separate use. The applicant is merely stating they will store such materials on the site relating to the waste transfer facility operation. The issue of traffic etc is covered in reason for refusal 2.</p> <p>Additional reason for refusal added. Network Rail have withdrawn their original comments and provided a holding objection.</p> <p>The external processing and storage areas will operate in association with rail operation and maintenance. This is not for the external processing of any waste materials. The uses mentioned will occur within the MRF.</p> <p>This is exactly the same proposal as the previous application in this regard. The previous application was not refused for this reason. The Access Officer is aware of this. Disabled Access could be conditioned.</p> <p>This could be conditioned.</p> <p>The reason for refusal has been amended to reflect the correct policy.</p>
---	---

<p><b>Item: 9 Page: 87</b></p>	<p><b>Location: St Andrew's Park, Hillingdon Road</b></p>
<p>Amend the wording of Condition No. 3 (Page 90) to:</p> <p>No development shall take place until details of the layout of the shared parking (that is parking not to be occupied solely by users of the office development, but shared with users of other developments within the town centre expansion) in the basement car-park are submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted</p>	<p>To ensure the condition relates only to the Reserved Matters under consideration (in this case Layout)</p>

<p>details shall include (but not limited to):  (i) Details of any designated parking areas;  and  (ii) Details of accessible shared parking spaces.  The basement parking shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed details for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: Car Park Management Plan V5 (September 2012) approved under reference 585/APP/2012/1662 requires shared parking for the town centre-expansion parking, this is essential to ensure both the suitable management of parking within the town centre expansion area and the vitality and viability of other uses within the town centre expansion area, in accordance with policies Pt.1.10, AM14, AM15, AM16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and Policy E5 Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (November 2012).</p>	
<p>Delete Informative Number 5</p>	<p>Informative relates to details that are not connected to the Reserved Matters under consideration</p>