

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE

Reference No: HGY/2006/1298

Ward: Hornsey

Date received: 27/06/2006

Last amended date:

Drawing number of plans : Report: Planning Application Supporting Statement:

Site Plan. 9PWD/A1/5051/EX A;9PWD/A1/5053/EX A : 9PWD/A1/5056/EX A; 9PWD/A1/5052/EX A; 9PWD/A1/5054/EX A. A9PWD/A1/5081/EX A. 9PWD/A1/5080/EX A. 9PWD/A1/05061/EX A. 9PWD/A1/05060/EX A. 9PWD/A1/05059/EX A 9PWD/A1/05058/EX A 9PWD/A1/05057/EX AM, 9PWD-A1-02001-IN D: 9PWD-A1-02000-IN D: C1117-SK063 Rev 1 & Photomontages.

Address: Hornsey Treatment Works, High StreetN8

Proposal: Erection of pre-treatment and bromate removal facility comprising four new buildings:-i) pre-treatment building.ii) chemical storage and dosing building iii) catalytic GAC building/structure and iv) washwater recovery building/structure: Associated plant and machinery and new access arrangements to the site including constructions of temporary crossings of New River for construction traffic and extension of estates road from within New river Village (New River Avenue N8) for delivery vehicles only

Existing Use: Treatment works Proposed Use: Treatment Works

Applicant: C/O Thames Water Property Thames Water Utilities Limited

Ownership: Thames Water

PLANNING DESIGNATIONS

Conservation Area
ROAD - BOROUGH
Ecological Corridor
EVS - Borough Grade 1
EVS - Metropolitan
Green Chain - Proposed
Metropolitan Open Land
Area of Archaeological Importance
Historic Park
Green Chains
Metropolitan Open Land

Officer Contact: Frixos Kyriacou

RECOMMENDATION

To grant planning permission subject to a section 106 and agreement and planning conditions and subject to referral to the Greater London Authority who have 14 days in which to decide whether or not to direct refusal.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site is located adjacent to the south slopes of Alexandra Palace and Park and is bounded by the Park to the west and the railway line and New River to the east. To the south is Newland Road, which provides the existing access road, and further to the south are the residential properties of the Campsbourne Estate.

The application site consists of a reservoir to the north and six individual slow sand filter beds to the south. There are also a number of operational buildings and associated structures that are used in conjunction with the works. A distributor road runs around the site, which enables commercial vehicles to service the premises.

The site is considered to be a very sensitive site as it is located within Metropolitan Open Land and part of the site to the north including the reservoir is designated as an area of Ecological Borough Grade 1 status. The site is also located within the Hornsey Water Works and Filter Beds Conservation Area and on the boundary with the Alexandra Palace and Park Conservation Area, which is also designated as a Historic Park.

The site holds a prominent position and is visible from many public positions and viewpoints. The adjoining area has recently undergone extensive redevelopment in the form of the New River Village.

The proposed access road for construction would utilise the existing facility used in the construction of the New River Village and then a temporary access across the New River. The access for deliveries to the new treatment works(once completed) would be through New River Village

PLANNING HISTORY

The main planning history relates to the redevelopment of the Hornsey Water Works where currently 626 new residential units are being developed.

In 1998- planning application HGY/1997/1980 was approved for the erection of new treatment plant and pumping station.

Condition 05 stated that all delivery, servicing and maintenance shall be from Newlands Road entrance and the south gate shall be used for maintenance access to the New River Water course.

In 2005 A similar application, but of a different design and access was refused for the following reasons:

Adverse Impact on MOL, Conservation Areas, Alexandra Palace MOL and Historic Gardens. Poor Design.

Insufficient very special circumstances to outweigh the harm identified above and lack of information on Phase II.

No Section 106 Agreement.

No information on how the development will meet any objectives of sustainable

development and energy efficiency contrary to Revised UDP plan policy UD1A and The London Plan policy 2A.1

In March 2006, a further similar application was refused for the following reasons:

The site is located in a sensitive area designated as a Conservation Area and as Metropolitan Open Land in the Adopted Unitary Development Plan 1998 and the Revised UDP of September 2004. (Draft Deposit) and adjacent to the Alexandra Palace Historic Park. The site commands wide views from Alexandra Palace to the north-west and from the New River Open Space and footpath to the east. The proposed development, by reason of its height, substantial footprint and bulk, would be detrimental to the appearance of the Metropolitan Open Land and would not enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Areas. The adverse impact would be exacerbated by the design of the building, notwithstanding amendments made in this submission, would still appear as an intrusive industrial style of construction in a very open setting. Further the Council is not convinced that there are no suitable alternative locations for such a scheme elsewhere within Hornsey Waterworks filter/beds complex. The very special circumstances put forward are insufficient to outweigh the harm identified above. The scheme is thus contrary to Policies OP3.2 Metropolitan Open Land, Alexandra Palace and Park: OP 3.5 Historic Parks, Gardens and Landscapes: DES 2.2 Preservation and Enhancement of Conservation Areas of the Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policies UD2 General Principles, OS1A Metropolitan Open Land, OS3 Alexandra Park and Palace and CSV1A Development in Conservation Areas of the Revised UDP September 2004.

No section 106 agreement exists for the securing funding for a landscape screen planting at the boundaries with Alexandra Palace for improvements to Penstock Path and improvements to Campsbourne Play Centre to mitigate against the adverse visual impacts of the proposed buildings, contrary to Policy UD10 Planning Obligations of the Haringey UDP 2004.

Both of these applications are now at appeal.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Background (from applicant's statement)

The new water treatment facilities at Hornsey are being developed in response to bromate contamination of the aquifer in the Upper Leal Valley and to the undertakings Thames water have made to the Drinking water Inspectorate.

The majority of the raw water to be treated in the new water treatment facilities will come from the Hornsey Reservoir, which is supplied from the New River. The water suffers from algal blooms during which the overall output from Hornsey Water works can drop dramatically.

A robust form of pre-treatment is required that can remove algae and maintain water quality at a maximum flow using surface water from the New River throughout the year without the need to operate the contaminated boreholes. It is proposed to provide an advanced pre-treatment process to treat the water prior to further treatment. This facility will consist of Dissolved Air Flotation followed by Rapid Gravity Filtration.

Phase 1 works would comprise flocculation and clarification treatment upstream of the existing slow sand filters at Hornsey WTW with the purpose of improving the robustness of the process against algae growth in Hornsey Reservoir. This is necessary to mitigate against bromate contamination given that Upper Lea Valley water has historically been used to provide dilution during algal bloom events.

Phase 2 works are required to ensure Hornsey WTW is capable of treating bromate contaminated water so that the Upper Lea Valley sources may be utilised to its maximum extent.

The Buildings

Three buildings are proposed one to carry out the main filtration system and one to store the chemicals.

1. The Main Process Building.

The maximum dimensions of the building would be 55.4m in length, 44.3m in width and 15.8m in height. This building would be sited on the central northern filter bed around 80m from the boundary with Alexandra Park. The building would vary in height due to the height of the eaves and the design of the building with the curved roof profile.

This building would house the flotation area of the Dissolved Air Filtration plant, the air saturation equipment, sampling and monitoring equipment and MCC Panels. In this building the algae and suspended solids would be removed.

2. The Chemical Storage and Dosing Building.

This building would measure 43.3m in length, 9.25m in width and a maximum of 10.85m in height. The building would house chemical storage tank and dosing equipment. This building would be centrally located within the site, 65m from the play centre and 60m to the main entrance.

A number of commonly used chemicals in the water industry would be stored here, Sulphuric acid (delivered as a liquid and used to lower the pH value of the raw water. Polyaluminium chloride delivered as a liquid to promote the coagulation and flocculation of suspended particles.

Sodium Hydroxide (caustic Soda) to make the water more alkaline and Sodium Chloride (salt) delivered as a powder and used to regenerate water softeners.

3. Catalytic GAC (Granular Activated Carbon) Building/Structure.

This building would be located to the east of the main treatment building and would have the following measurements. 43.3m in length, 9.25m in width and 9.85m in height. The building would house the GAC adsorption process. Again due to the curved roof profile the GAC building would vary significantly in height from approximately 6.5m to 12.7m.

Water from building 1 would be pumped into this building. This building would be used to treat bromate-laden water. This will be done through a bed of catalytic Granular Activated Carbon which will remove bromate and pesticides by adsorption. Finally, treated water will be passed to the existing disinfection facilities before it is pumped into the supply.

4. Wastewater recovery Building/Structure.

This building would be located on the eastern boundary of the site and would have the following dimensions. 52.25m in length, 14.7m in width and 14.7m in height. This building will house the facilities to allow the dirty wash water from the RGFs and the catalytic GAC processes to be recycled. This will include settlement plant, dosing equipment for polyelectrolyte, pumps and a MCC.

Access.

Access to the site for construction would be from the access currently used for the construction of New River Village. However it is likely that this access will not be available for the whole construction process and therefore it is proposed to have a new temporary access created along New River. Once construction is completed this access would be removed.

It is envisaged that all chemical deliveries would be through New River Village and along the estate road which would have to be extended.

CONSULTATION.

This is the third application on the site and there has been extensive consultation as part of this and past applications on the site.

A Development Control Forum took place on the 13th July 2006:

The following consultation has taken place:
Local Residents:

Campsbourne Community Residents' Association
42-86 (c) Newland Road
1-8 (c) Honeymead
1-21 (c) Campsfield
1-17 Myddleton Road
1-33 (c) Newland House, Newland Road
1-19 (c) Goodwin Court
7-24 (c) Koblenz House
25- 79 (o) Boyton Road
Rhein House 1-16 (c) Boyton Road
1-4 Newland Road
161-175 (o) Nightingale Road
1-76 (c) Amazon Building
1-90 (c) Blake Building
1-49 (c) Danube Building
1-30 (c) Emerson Building

Environment Agency
GLA
Drinking Water Inspectorate
Conservation Officer
Building Control
Conservation Officers
Local councillors
Garden History Society
Hornsey CAAC

Mayor's Office
Alexandra Palace Manager
Alexandra Palace and Park Statutory Advisory Committee

Campsbourne Playscheme
Campsbourne Junior and Infant School

Site Notices & Newspaper Advert

RESPONSES

St.James Group developers of the New River Village:

Confirm awareness of the proposals and recognises the strategic importance of supplying the catchment area with clean drinking water to address a potential public health issue.

We are now confident that through detailed and sensitive design, an access strategy through the development can be achieved which will result in a minimal impact on the landscaping but more importantly on the residents of New River Village.

St.James group have no objections and fully support planning application.

The following responses have been received:

Campsbourne Community Residents Association

1. Welcome new route away from Nightingale Lane/ Newland Road. New route through New River village far from ideal.
2. Issue with Campsbourne Play scheme has been addressed.
3. Chemicals to be delivered in accordance with Health and safety legislation.
4. The massing of the building has not been addressed. If size of the building cannot be addressed the detailing of the building should look at the Hornsey Pump Station 1903 and other structures on the site.
5. Petition signed by a large number of residents in relation to issue 4 on the previous application should be taken into account.
6. Hours of working condition needs to be applied. Residents currently disturbed by existing early working.

Alexandra Park and Palace Conservation Area Advisory Committee:

1. Modification to MOL should not be taken as justification for such high and intrusive buildings as are proposed by TW. Development on other operational land should not be used to sidestep MOL status. Any proposals should enhance the setting of the conservation area and not detract.
2. Such an exposed and important site demands a building which is both as unobtrusive as possible and of real architectural merit. Company should re-invest funds received from redevelopment by putting a greater part of its building under ground. The part sunken pumping station approved in 1998 shows what can be achieved.
3. TW has allowed the residential to proceed despite knowing some of this land maybe required for plant and access.
4. Screening would be ineffectual in screening this development from Alexandra Palace promenade which provides spectacular views of London and beyond.

5. TW has not safeguarded adequate access arrangements to ensure the filter beds could be serviced in the future.
6. Loss of Green Path only community benefit of housing development. Possible legal challenge to extension of residential estate road for the delivery of vehicles. A permanent roadway on the east side of the New River is not acceptable.

Friends of Alexandra Park:

The view from the Park eastwards across the reservoir and filter beds to the railway embankment is an integral part of the beauty of the park, uninterrupted by buildings. Any development here would detract from this view and destroy the character of the MOL. This would be particularly harmful in the present case where the building is not only devoid of architectural merit but is so large as to dominate the view.

We would like to be assured that the Council is satisfied that there is no less sensitive site which Thames water could use for its development.

Hornsey Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Extremely concerned about this development of Metropolitan Open Land. It is hard to believe that the need for this for this plant was not envisaged when the adjacent land was sold for redevelopment.

Drinking Water Inspectorate: (DWI)

It confirms acceptance by the Secretary Of State to Thames Water undertaking to achieve compliance with the Bromate Parameter in water supplied by Hornsey Water Treatment Works as laid down in the Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2000.

' Where a Company encounters difficulties in meeting the conditions of an undertaking, or considers it should modify its proposed work, there is provision,..., for it to submit a new undertaking, if accepted by the Secretary of State... '

The letter states that such variations or new undertakings may be because of events not reasonably within its control.

Highways- No objection subject to a section 106 agreement and planning conditions.

Conservation Officer: No objection

Nature Conservation Officer: (taken from previous application)

I am concerned that the proposed route of the circa 3m wide access track, to the east of the New River, which is now proposed to be permanent, would destroy valuable habitat. This area of scrub and brambles supports mammals and birds and there have been records of the scarce and declining lesser whitethroat in this area.

Any work must by law be carried out outside the bird nesting season (March to August). A survey of protected species should also be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecological consultant before works are undertaken – for example reptiles such as slow worms might be present here.

I would much prefer to see the route of the access track go along the west of the New River where there is already a roadway (new houses are being constructed along here). Is this really not possible? What volumes of traffic and times of the day for usage are envisaged once the initial works are completed?

If there is no option but impacting on the area of scrub, then I would prefer to see the access track located as close to the New River as possible, to minimise habitat loss in this area.

We should seek planning conditions such as planting with appropriate native trees and shrubs such as hawthorn in relevant areas. Bird and bat boxes could be placed on trees and buildings. Work on the filter bed will need to avoid any adverse impacts on the adjoining Alexandra Park and Wood Green Reservoir Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation.

Alexandra Palace Management:(taken from previous application)

As you are already aware Alexandra Charitable Trust are in the process of carrying out Heritage Lottery Funded Landscape restoration project to improve the Palace surrounds and wider park. As part of this area we are improving the conservation area including new paths, improved habitat management and the construction of observation platform to enable park users to watch migrant waterfowl on the neighbouring reservoir/water treatment site.

Having considered the proposed construction of a pre-treatment building on a disused filter bed I would have to request that the new structure is screened by planting along the boundary with the park. At present there is some scrub and few small trees established along this section of boundary and there is space available for additional trees.

It would be preferable to make sure that there is sufficient space on the Water works side of the boundary for the tree planting as I would want to ensure that we negate any root damage claims related claims that may arise in the future.

I also notice from the application that there is specific mention of a chemical storage facility of some description. I would wish that this be located as far from the boundary as possible, preferably out of sight.

New River Village Residents Association:

Design / materials look low cost and are unsympathetic to the parkland environment situated close by, not in keeping with the Victorian Pump House and the brick building crossing top the New River.

Visually Intrusive from Alexandra Palace

Buildings should be redesigned/ materials upgraded

Work hours should be restricted to weekdays: no late evenings, night shift or shift work hours.

Remain worried about the new application proposes delivery through New River Avenue. We ask that it be made a condition of planning that Thames Water enters in to a legal agreement in order to secure the upkeep of the road. That the covenant includes a limit on the number of tanker deliveries permitted each day (max 3). And that the hours be restricted 0930-3.30 weekdays. To minimise impact /conflict with occupiers (children) of NRV.

New River Path landscaping should result in an enhancement once temporary construction is completed.

Chemical spillage.

Noise pollution.

Objections raised in individual letters:

1. Transit of dangerous chemicals
2. Recompense for the use of the road and use of the private road. Damage to road
3. Chance for consideration as part of a master plan for the whole area has been lost. Unsatisfactory gap from the New River Village Development
4. Architectural character does not relate to any of the surrounding buildings, curved roofs add to height and volume. Ugly modern factory buildings. Visually Intrusive.
5. Drawings misleading elevations are not brick but concrete blocks.
6. Materials make no reference to the buildings in the vicinity apart from the worst buildings.
7. Montages should be verified.
8. All other sites should be investigated.
9. Impact on MOL, visual.
- 10 Heavy vehicles accessing NRV
11. Hours of Work and delivery
- New River Village not complete
13. Proposed landscaping for NRV would be destroyed.
- 14 Impact on lay out of New River Village

The Environment Agency has raised no objection but has requested the following conditions:

Development shall not commence until an assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of this proposed development upon the structural integrity of the Moselle Brook which crosses from east to west beneath the proposed road crossing. For these proposals to be acceptable, it shall be demonstrated that the culvert is of a good enough condition to support a new road and passage of vehicles, also that the crossing has been designed so that no additional load shall be placed upon the culvert's wall.

Condition relating to contamination

Condition relating to surface and foul water drainage system

No soakaways shall be constructed in contaminated land

A buffer zone of 5m to be established alongside the reservoir

Landscape management plan

Planting

No light spillage

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

Haringey Unitary Development Plan

UD2 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

UD3 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

UD4 QUALITY DESIGN

UD8 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

UD 11 LOCATIONS FOR TALL BUILDINGS

ENV4 ENHANCING AND PROTECTING THE WATER ENVIRONMENT

ENV5 WORKS AFFECTING WATER COURSES

ENV 6 NOISE POLLUTION

ENV9 ENERGY EFFICIENCY

ENV 10 RENEWABLE ENERGY

ENV12 DEVELOPMENT AT OR NEAR PREMISES INVOLVING USE OR STORAGE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

OS2 METROPOLITAN OPEN LAND

OS4 ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE
OS5 DEVELOPMENT ADJACENT TO OPEN SPACES
OS6 ECOLOGICALLY VALUABLE SITES AND THEIR CORRIDORS
OS7 HISTORIC PARKS, GARDENS, AND LANDSCAPES
OS10 OTHER OPEN SPACE
OS 16 GREEN CHAINS
OS17 TREE PROTECTION, TREE MASSES AND SPINES
CSVI DEVELOPMENT IN CONSERVATION AREAS
CSC2 LISRE BUILDINGS

London Plan -

Policy 3D.9 METROPOLITAN OPEN LAND
Policy 3D.12 BIODIVERSITY, HABITAT, AND NATURE CONSERVATION.
Policy 4A.11 WATER SUPPLIES
Policy 4A .12 WATER QUALITY
Policy 4A.14 REDUCING NOISE

ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

Background.

This application has been submitted to attempt to deal with the reasons for refusal expressed in the previous application HGY/2005/2060 (now subject to appeal). The new aspects to this application are:

1. Full details of Phase 1 and Phase 2- this essentially shows two additional buildings required for the water treatment process. The development will now be built in one phase.
2. Re-location of Main Treatment Building 60m from the boundary with Alexandra Palace.
3. New Access Arrangements for construction and deliveries to the treatment plant.

The main issues to be covered in this report are as follows:

In relation to the buildings:

Inappropriate Development in the Metropolitan Open Land and whether there are any very special circumstances which should allow this development. (The needs of the water industry)

The impact on the two conservation areas: Hornsey Filter Beds and Alexandra Palace and Park. In terms of appearance, mass bulk and scale.

Impact on the Historic Park.

Impact on the amenity of local residents: (1) visual (2) noise (3) smell

Impact on the Nursery

Impact of Site of Ecological Interest

In relation to the Access Road and Construction Road:

- 1 Impact on amenities of residents of New River Village
- 2 Impacts on the Site of Nature Conservation
3. Impact on New River and Footpaths
4. Highway and Pedestrian Safety

In addition the possibility of using other sites and accesses will be examined.

METROPOLITAN OPEN LAND. (MOL)

The London Plan section 3.249 states ' MOL will be protected as a permanent feature and afforded the same protection as the Green Belt. Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 on Green Belts provides the tests for development in the Green Belt.

The first issue is whether the development is appropriate or inappropriate development in the Green Belt. PPG2- section 3.4 states that new buildings inside a Green Belt is inappropriate unless it is for the following purposes.

λ Essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries ***and other uses which preserve the openness of the Green Belt.***

It is considered the current reservoir and Thames Water site falls within this category. It is a predominantly open site with ancillary buildings.

Section 3.5 of PPG2 gives examples of the essential facilities, such as **small** changing facilities or **small** stables.

The proposed main treatment building would have dimensions of 44m in length and 55m in width. The building would have a maximum height of 15.8m, but this would vary significantly with some of the building being only 6m to the eaves and at other points 13.45m to the eaves. The main chemical building would be 9.2 m in width and 43m in length 5.69m to the eaves and 10m to the ridge. The other two buildings are of considerable size as well.

Taking into account the size of the building, it is considered such proposals would amount to inappropriate development in the Metropolitan Open Land for which Very Special Circumstances must be demonstrated in order to justify inappropriate development.

Very Special Circumstances.

It is now necessary to examine the very special circumstances put forward by the applicants.

Need for Water Treatment Plant

Water does have to be treated either at source or at some point in its distribution network. If the treatment works were in Hertfordshire this area is predominantly Green Belt and similar inappropriate development issues would arise.

The source of the bromate contamination has been traced by the Environment Agency and Three Valleys Water to a chemical factory at Sandridge, to the north of St.Albans. The responsibility for the contamination is uncertain and the legal responsibility has not been clearly defined. It is understood remedial measures at source will take many years and it is clear that more immediate actions are needed to manage the bromate concentrations in water sources and supplies.

Thames Water has implemented a system to manage abstractions in order to control bromate concentrations at Hornsey. To date bromate has not been detected in the North London Artificial Recharge (NLARs) boreholes, located upstream of Hornsey.

In the short term the company is planning to use the NLARs sources as a means of reducing abstraction from the contaminated wells and providing additional dilution.

Thames Water argues that this is not a complete or sustainable solution. In order to sustain the output from Hornsey the larger, more highly contaminated, sources must be used when the use of River Lea water is restricted due to high algal loading.

Contamination of raw waters with bromate is highly unusual. Other options have been considered, however the proposals are considered the only practical method of dealing with the contamination.

Thames Water have now re-located the buildings, with the pre-treatment building in slow sand filter bed no.2 and the catalytic GAC and wash water building in slow sand filter bed no.3. The chemical building would remain in the same position located centrally within the site. Thames Water state to site the pre-treatment building in slow sand filter bed 2 is not ideal from an engineering or business perspective. This will potentially impact Thames Water's statutory obligation to meet the water demands of its local customers during periods of high demand. Thames Water also state that sand filters 1 and 2 remain their preferred option, if this application were not approved they would seek approval for the use of filter beds 1 and 2.

Most of the pipe work required for the slow sand filters is buried below the roads on the site. If the pre-treatment building was constructed on another slow sand filter bed many of the existing connections would need to be replaced and the disused filter would have to be refurbished. This option was rejected by Thames Water because it would lead to the closure of the existing Water Treatment Works and because of excessive costs.

The Drinking Water Inspectorate on the 19th July 2005 confirmed the Secretary of State's acceptance of Thames Water's undertaking to achieve compliance with the Bromate parameter in water supplied by Hornsey Water Treatment Works.

It therefore appears that the water treatment plant would be essential to ensure that clean water is maintained for this part of London. There does appear to be very special circumstances why these buildings should take place in order to maintain an adequate and safe water supply.

The Greater London Authority has confirmed that in their view very special circumstances justify development on Metropolitan Open Land. However this was in relation to the previous application which did not give full details of phase 2. The Inspector into the UDP when responding to an objection to the role of statutory undertakers reasoned the plan should be modified as follows:
"When assessing development proposals on MOL, the operational needs of utility companies should be taken into account. In particular cases, the essential need for new infrastructure **may** override the need to protect the open character of the MOL." This sentence duly appears in the UDP section 8.10.

The introduction of this facility within the MOL would be inappropriate but the very special circumstances of the Water Industry should carry significant weight. Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 advises that very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. It is therefore necessary to consider other considerations and assess whether the very special circumstances are sufficient to outweigh any other harm identified.

URBAN DESIGN

The Mayor's Office has given some strong guidance on this issue. Reference is made to the London Plan chapter 4B-'Designs on London' states that good design is central to all the objectives of the plan. The Mayor also cites PPS1 and a key principle of that document states that "Design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of area should not be accepted"

In relation to the design of the buildings which is similar to the design of the second application, the GLA original comments were that the "The proposal is a vast improvement over the previous design. The layout of the building is broadly the same, as this is dictated by the equipment it houses. However, the applicant has introduced new materials for the façade (red ceramic tiles, yellow eternit cladding, blue and grey metal cladding and cream brickwork around the base) and replaced the single flat/pitched flat roof with three curved standing seam metal roofs. These design changes give the building a uniqueness and distinctiveness appropriate to its location in MOL and opposite the listed building at Alexandra Palace." It must be noted these comments were made in relation to the previous application which had two buildings rather than 4 as now proposed.

The Planning Applications Sub- Committee refused the previous application because of the design, height substantial footprint and bulk and its impact on the Metropolitan Open Land, New River, Conservation Areas and the setting of Alexandra Park. The design of the buildings has not changed indeed there are now two additional buildings which has moved the development closer to the New River.

Considerable objection and concern has been received regarding the height of the buildings. Thames Water has offered this explanation. "The size of the buildings is determined by the size and nature of plant and machinery to be located within them. Currently, water flows under gravity from the reservoir to the slow and sand filters. It is not possible to maintain this arrangement if a new process is introduced. It is proposed to pump water to the DAF and then allow the water flow under gravity through pre-treatment .An inter stage pumping station will then lift the filtered water to the GAC adsorption before it gravitates to disinfection facilities.This provides a good balance between the number of pumping stages and keeping the height of the building to a minimum".

Many comments have sought to have the building lowered by excavation, Thames Water state this would result in additional spoil having to be removed and a risk from flooding due to the high local water table.

The only other material difference is that the main treatment building has now been set away from Alexandra Park by some 60m.While this deal with immediate impact, their would still be wider views of the building from Alexandra Palace.

IMPACT ON THE CONSERVATION AREAS.

The site lies within the **Hornsey Filter Beds Conservation Area** and adjoins the Alexandra Park and Palace Conservation Area.

In relation to the Filter Beds, the main issue is the introduction of the four buildings which are of considerable size. The introduction of such buildings would have a significant visual impact on the character of the conservation area which is predominantly open and void of any significant buildings.

The site is within operational land, the development of the water filter beds is difficult to resist. It is considered the design of the buildings are of sufficient quality however the loss in part of the open character is regrettable and would not preserve the character and appearance of this conservation area.

In relation to the **Alexandra Palace and Park Conservation Area** the main treatment building would now be located 60m from the boundary with the Conservation Area. This building and the other buildings would be seen from the Park though there is some screening along the boundary. The buildings would also be seen from wider views on the upper slopes and from the Palace itself. It is therefore considered necessary to enter into a section 106 agreements requiring a contribution towards a landscape strategy for screening the building. Alexandra Palace and Thames Water have reached agreement on a landscape strategy for the boundary with Alexandra Palace. The Palace and Park is also listed as a **Historic Park** and the Filter beds have formed part of the wider setting it is therefore considered essential that a landscape strategy within the Park is closely considered.

On balance it is considered the character and appearance of this conservation area and the setting of the Park would be preserved would be preserved.

IMPACT ON ADJOINING RESIDENTIAL OCCUPIERS BUILDING:

Visual Impact

The building in parts would be 15m in height, it would be more than 100m from the nearest residential property. Some views would be gained from the public footpath which surround the site to the south and from the upper floors of houses and flats further to the south and from New River Village.

On balance the visual impact of the proposals would not be unduly dominating when viewed from the adjoining residential properties. Indeed the relocation would give improved of the Palace from some of the properties in the New River Village.

Noise

In order to ensure that the noise levels from the proposed operations do not exceed existing background levels a planning condition has been included in the recommendation in the event that the Committee are minded to approve the Planning application.

Visits to similar facilities in Chingford revealed the noise levels outside the building were not significant.

Smells:

No significant odours were identified at the similar facility at Chingford.

The Nursery/Playscheme

The main treatment building would now be sited some 70m from the nursery and therefore there would be little impact on this facility.

The chemical building is located over 23m from the nursery; the storage of chemicals is generally governed by other agencies and not directly by the planning system. However the applicants have provided details of the safety measures.

Impact on Adjoining Ecological Areas:

The application site lies outside but is situated in close proximity to the Wood Green Reservoirs which is a Grade 1 Site of Borough Importance and Alexandra Park is Grade II.

The development itself would be located on two operational filter beds; in addition another filter bed would be used for construction purposes. There would be no loss of natural habitat however subject to suitable noise insulation and a management plan to cover the construction phase.

CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC AND ACCESS ROAD THROUGH NEW RIVER VILLAGE.

In terms of construction traffic an agreement has been reached with St.James who are developing New River Village, to use the existing haulage road from November 2006 until June 2007. During this time Thames Water plan to construct a temporary access for construction purposes across the New River with access from the High Street this will be required until June 2009.

IMPACT ON THE AMENITIES OF NEW RIVER VILLAGE.

Visual Impact:

Temporary Construction Route (until June 2009)

The visual impact of the temporary access road which would be sited some 19m from the first residential block of flats would be significant, a new bridge would be provided together with a new hard surfaced road along the embankment. The plans for the New River Village envisaged the embankment being a landscaped route. Indeed objections have been received from residents who purchase their properties because of the views of the landscaped River.

The introduction of the bridge and road would reduce the amount of landscaping for this route, but only for a temporary period.

There is no doubt the introduction of the road instead of the proposed grass verges and tree planting would reduce the attractiveness of the visual amenity to residents in New River Village. In addition the site of large vehicles moving along the Green chain is a significant disadvantage of the proposals. However as these proposals are temporary and to assist in the construction of the facilities until June 2009 when the land would be re-instated.

Permanent Access from New River Village. (Delivery only)

The extended estate road in terms on the visual impact would largely affect blocks J and k of the New River Village. In the area between the two blocks it was proposed to have trees and landscaping. Therefore there would be some loss of visual amenity, this is regrettable but there would still be some space for planting either side of the access road. A permanent access on the east side of the New River would be clearly more undesirable

Noise and Disturbance:

Temporary Construction Route:

The proposed construction route subject to appropriate controls such as the arrival and departure times bearing in mind its distance from the nearest residential properties is unlikely to cause any significant noise problems.

Permanent Delivery Access:

There will be no more than 3 deliveries per day and these deliveries will take place on Mondays to Fridays. In these circumstances apart from the brief period of delivery and departure it is unlikely a case could be against the access on grounds of noise and disturbance. It must be borne in mind that the New River Village development as a whole has underground parking spaces for 400 cars, which represents a significant source of traffic generation far exceeding that from 3 lorries.

Proposed Green Chain/Ecological Area: (see comments from Nature Conservation Officer)

The introduction of the access road cannot be seen to comply with the policies relating the Green Chains and Ecology.

The Nature Conservation Officer would prefer the access to be on the western side of the New River. However this would have implications for future residents of the New River Village and disrupt further the proposed broadwalk down the New River. The Nature Conservation Officer has also outlined a number of ecological concerns which would partly be dealt with by planning condition.

The impact on the nature conservation aspects of the Green Chain would be negative aspect of the proposals. Currently from site visits it is clear that walkers use the existing New River walk and the introduction of the access road would make this path less attractive to walkers.

The applicants have produced an ecological study the conclusions are outlined below

The new access route within the corridor may include the removal of potential reptile and breeding bird habitat along the section of land which follows the eastern bank of the New River. This may potentially fragment the reptile population and have an adverse impact on the sustainability of any reptile population present. In order to ensure continuity of the green corridor and the associated reptile habitats, we have recommended that the final design and positioning of the access route allow for the retention of a linear strip of semi-natural scrub and rank grassland habitat to the east of the access track. A minimum one metre width of habitat should be retained; however the maximum amount of habitat should be retained, whilst permitting the safe construction and use of the track.

In order to avoid potentially disturbing breeding birds and damaging active nests, all scrub clearance work should be undertaken between September and February (inclusive), when birds are generally not breeding. Where this is not possible, the habitat should be surveyed prior to clearance to ensure no nesting birds are present.

If nests are found, works will have to be suspended until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer active.

In order to avoid potentially harming slow worms and grass snakes which may utilise the rank grassland and scrub habitats, the habitat should be cleared by experienced ecologists outside the hibernation period (to avoid potentially disturbing hibernating animals). To avoid nesting birds and hibernating reptiles, vegetation clearance is likely to be carried out in early September. Potential hibernacula should be removed in spring/summer and replaced in suitable habitats which are unaffected by the proposed access track. All hibernacula and terrestrial habitats should be removed by hand by experienced ecologists/herpetologists to avoid potentially killing or injuring reptiles during the habitat clearance.

Walkers.

There would be some disruption to the use of the Green Chains by pedestrians during the construction phase, however as this would be temporary it is considered this would be acceptable. Once the road is installed it should be possible to maintain pedestrian access particularly at weekends.

Other Issues.

Access difficulties and Damage to walls

The neighbour nearest to the original proposed access had complained of damage to the wall in Newlands Road bounding the garden to the property which has been hit by vehicles entering and leaving the site.

The applicants have amended their plans to set back the access and gate to allow more turning area into the site. The plans have been amended accordingly.

As the access point has been changed this has now become less of an issue but the applicants have agreed to carry out the works.

Delivery of Chemicals:

Chemicals will be delivered to the site by dedicated road tankers with trained drivers. These tankers are operated by specialist chemical distribution companies with strict compliance with health and safety legislation.

Thames water have agreed to plan and co-ordinate chemical deliveries between Thames water and the distribution company to take account of local issues such as schools opening times and closing times. One chemical will be delivered at a time. There will be one delivery per day to supply the pre-treatment facility with the necessary Chemicals. Times for delivery will be after 10.00 am but would extend to 5.00 pm.

There will be no weekend deliveries.

On site Operations:

The site will be generally unmanned but will be visited daily by a Thames Water operator. The site will be continuously monitored at one of Thames Water's control centres.

Automatic alarms will be sounded if any problems are detected or if any plant automatically shuts down. An operator will then be called out to the site to investigate and take any action required.

The Council consider it preferably to have the premises manned on a 24 basis.

Other Access Arrangements:

Rail:

Thames Water has indicated that rail would require the purchase of land, and the creation of sidings which would be expensive and outside their control.

Also due to the change in levels this would require a significant engineering operation. The main problem is that the quantity of chemicals is so low that the delivery by rail cannot be justified in operational terms.

Existing Access.

The existing access is through Nightingale Lane, this road is heavily parked on both sides. Nightingale Lane also has a significant number of residential properties and schools.

The original application proposed to use this access point.

Bedford Road Access.

This access is also not ideal, Bedford Road is heavily parked and there are buses entering and leaving Alexandra Palace. Congestion also occurs across the bridge when large vehicles also turn onto the bridge.

This access is also not fully in the control of the Water Company and would require the purchase of land from other landowners.

Alternative sites:

The gas works to the east has been cited as a possible alternative location however this would have implications for the redevelopment of that part of the Heartlands. In addition Thames Water argues that acquiring this site could be lengthy and by no means certain. The site is likely to be contaminated. Further the degree of additional pumping would be significant and require additional energy consumption.

It is noted that the Mayor's office when dealing with the question of alternative sites states "Thames water has not provided any evidence of the absence of alternative sites. However, as the plants will be part of the wider treatment process at Hornsey and needs to be close to the New River it is accepted this is the only suitable site".

Section 106

Thames Water have offered to give over some land to widen the Penstock footpath in accordance with the request if the Transportation Section and to contribute to the lighting and maintenance of the footpath.

In addition agreement has been reached with Alexandra Palace to a landscape strategy for the boundary with the Palace.

A contribution has also been made to the Playscheme.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The proposals are inappropriate development within the Metropolitan Open Land (Policies OS2 Metropolitan Open Land, OS4 Alexandra Palace and Park) and some harm would be caused to the open character of the land and the Hornsey Filter Beds Conservation Areas. and Alexandra Park Conservation Area (Policy CSV1 Development in Conservation Areas) In addition the proposed access road through New River Village and temporary construction road would have some implications for residential amenity (UD3- General Principles))and the Green Chain and Nature Conservation Site. (OS6 Ecologically Valuable Sites)Through appropriate design and conditions the access road impact could be ameliorated to an acceptable level and reinstated to its former condition once the construction is completed.

The Council is unaware of any alternative sites for this development, within the Waterworks or at other sites where this development could take place. However alternative access arrangements do exist through Newlands Road.

It is considered the harm caused by inappropriateness and other harm identified above is clearly outweighed by the benefits to the public interest of ensuring an effective and efficient Water Industry. (London Plan Policies Policy 4A.11 Water Supplies and Policy 4A .12 Water Quality)

Further there is section 106 agreement to ensure effective planting and landscape within Alexandra Palace and Park and improvements to footpaths where the access road would cross.

RECOMMENDATION 1

(1) That planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application reference HG/2005/2060 subject to a pre-condition that Thames water shall have first entered in to an agreement with the Council under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning act 1990 (as Amended) and Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As amended) and section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 in order to secure:

To provide a sum of £2,000 to secure screening for the boundary with Alexandra Palace.

To provide land adjacent to the Penstock Footpath to provide improved pedestrian and cycle facilities.

£40,000 towards associated works and improved lighting, for the Penstock Footpath

£7,500 to the Playscheme.

Administrative /Recovery Costs- £2,500.

Recommendation (2)

Grant Permission

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

3. Any noise by virtue of this development shall not cause an increase in the pre-existing background noise level or more than 5db (A) when measured and corrected in accordance with BS 4142:1967 as amended titled Method of Rating Industrial Noise affecting Mixed Residential and Industrial areas'. In this context, the background level is construed as measuring the level of noise which is exceeded for 90% of the time.

Reason; In order to protect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers.

4. Notwithstanding the details of landscaping referred to in the application, a scheme for the landscaping and treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development to include detailed drawings of:

- a. those existing trees to be retained.
- b. those existing trees to be removed.
- c. those existing trees which will require thinning, pruning, pollarding or lopping as a result of this consent. All such work to be agreed with the Council's Arboriculturalist.
- d. Those new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Such an approved scheme of planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of development (whichever is sooner). Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, become damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be maintained and retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
- e. Details of any artificial lighting shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the installation of any lighting.

Reason: In order for the Local Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

5. That details of all levels on the site in relation to the surrounding area be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that any works in conjunction with the permission hereby granted respects the height of adjacent properties through suitable levels on the site.

6. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0730 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties and in view of the importance of the works to the supply of water.

7. The authorised development shall not begin until drainage works have been carried out in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory provision for drainage on site and ensure suitable drainage provision for the authorised development.

8. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no development shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

9. No development shall take place until site investigation detailing previous and existing land uses, potential land contamination, risk estimation and remediation work if required have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to ensure the site is contamination free.

10. Details of the siting of the new temporary access road across the New River, lighting, materials design and construction methods including the crossing details and construction time table shall be agreed with the local planning authority prior to the implementation of that part of the development.

Reason: To ensure the impact on the area of nature conservation and the amenities of adjoining residents are minimised.

11. Details of the measures to provide pedestrian access along the new temporary access road and safety measures for crossing footpaths for this and the permanent access shall be agreed prior to the use of the road commencing.

Reason: To ensure pedestrian safety and access to the site.

12. Development shall not commence until an assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the proposed development upon the structural integrity of the Moseele Brook which crosses from East to West beneath the proposed road crossing. It shall be demonstrated that the culvert is of good enough condition to support a new road and the passage of vehicles, also that the crossing has been designed so that no additional load shall be placed on the culverts wall.

Reason: To ensure that the culverts structural integrity is not compromised.

13. Deliveries of chemicals in association with this development by road tanker shall only take place from the New River Village. The deliveries shall only take place between 1000 and 1600 hours on Mondays and Fridays. No deliveries shall take place on Saturdays and Sundays.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining residents and reduce conflicts with pedestrian traffic.

14. A detailed ecological programme and mitigation measures shall be submitted and approved prior to the works of the access road taking place.

Reason: To ensure the nature conservation issues are taken into account.

15. The proposed temporary access road for construction shall be removed, in conjunction with details submitted by the end of 2007. The access road shall be removed by June 2009 or before that period if work finishes earlier. The road shall only be used for construction purposes.

Reason: To ensure the long term planning of the locality is not prejudiced.

16. Before the works are brought into use a Section 72 Agreement shall have been entered into, dedicating the land adjoining the Penstock Footpath for Highway purposes.

Reason: To ensure improved access around the site



**PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL SERVICE
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL DIVISION**

MINUTES

Meeting : **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL FORUM**- Hornsey Water Treatment Works, N8

Date : 13th July 2006

Place : Baptist Church, The Campbourne, Hornsey High Street, N8

Present : Paul Tomkins, Tay Makoon, Applicants, Local Residents (40 approx) Ward Councillors

Minutes by : Tay Makoon

Distribution :

Item		Action
1.	<p>Paul Tomkins welcomed everyone to the meeting, introduced officers, applicants' representatives and explained the purpose of the meeting and the agenda.</p> <p>The Proposal Erection of pre-treatment and bromate removal facility comprising four new buildings i) Pre-treatment building, ii) Chemical storage and dosing building, iii) catalytic GAC building/structure; and iv) wash water recovery building/structure; associated plant and machinery and new access arrangements to the site including construction of temporary crossings of New River Village (New River Avenue, N8) for delivery only.</p> <p>Main Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The need for the facility – water requirements• Impact on Metropolitan Open Land (Alexandra Palace)• Access arrangements for construction and delivery• Impact on amenities of neighbours <p>Presentation from Thames Water representatives – Duncan Stewart – Project Manager</p>	

Item		Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentation covered the history of provision of water – growth and resources to meet future demand. • Improvement – bromate additional to meet standards to continue • Phase 1 – Pre-treatment plant September 2008 • Phase 2 – Bromate treatment facility September 2008 <p>What is bromate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemical used in industrial area, product used in hair perm solution and flour/beer. • Problem – to protect public health drinking water containing bromate is a health risk. • In 2000 we became aware there was an issue of bromate source at the St Albans. At the time it was thought to be more localised. Northern New River Wells fed into new river. <p>What's new?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appealed – against refusals in October/March 06 • Resubmitted third application for both phases with a revised location, new operational access route. All the comments taken from the last DC Forum. <p>Question from the floor</p> <p>PT offered to take questions from the floor in the order listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for the facility – water requirements • Impact on Metropolitan Open Land(Alexandra Palace) • Access arrangements for construction and delivery • Impact on amenities of neighbours <p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What stage is it possible to prosecute the company regarding the bromide? 2. Statement – Local residents need to kept inform so we can be aware of what is going on? 3. Is it possible to put a compensation claim in? 4. Is this going to be a temporary building? 5. Why not build the facility closer to the problem and why does it need to be Hornsey? 6. What about using the Hertfordshire Area as an alternative site? Statement – Cllr reported that Lynn Featherstone sends her apologies not attending this is due to a prior engagement. 7. Will you expect to need more facilities as you treat the bromate? 8. What changes are you offering local residents? 9. How this application relates to the ones you are appealing on? 	

Item		Action
	<p>10. Why did you sell the site to St James knowing you had this problem?</p> <p>11. Access arrangements for construction and delivery, what other routes have you considered?</p> <p>12. Which way are the lorries going into the site?</p> <p>13. How big are the trucks?</p> <p>14. In a worse case scenario – how would you deal with a chemical spillage in a resident area?</p> <p>15. In the previous planning application there was discussion about enhancing the penstock path and cycle route, are you still going to do that?</p> <p>16. Can you not design a better building? It will ruin the view from Alexandra Palace looking down.</p> <p>17. Newlyn resident can't sell their properties. How do we cope with the disruption?</p> <p>18. What are the operational hours?</p> <p>19. What will you do with the redundant bed filter – will you reuse it in the future?</p> <p>Statement: The current application is an improvement on the last application. Removal of the bridge is good improvement, approach of Masterplan , an opportunity missed as it does not relate to the new river village. There is a GAP in between. Materials do not relate. Have not seen any suggestions for a pedestrian route.</p> <p>Answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is an issue for the Environment Agency to deal with, to identify the polluter and serve notice on them. There is an appeal against the notice. The hearing is in November and it may take years to get a decision. 2. Duncan Stewart said he would be happy to have regular monthly liaison meetings with local residents to look at progress of work and discuss other related issues. 3. The Environmental Agency will look into it. 4. This will be a new building to deal with the bromate, as we are currently struggling to meet drinking water quality. 5. Hornsey is the only river servicing this area. St Albans stop servicing this area some 20/30 years ago. 6. The new treatment plant is to serve Hornsey not Hertfordshire. 7. No we do not expect to need more facilities in the future. 8. We are increasing our budget from 30 million to 45 million. The 15 million increase is going towards meeting local concerns. 9. The application has been modified to take on board the comments raised at the DC forum. The two applications has now become phase 1 and phase 2 as one application. If Planning permission is granted we will 	

Item		Action
	<p>withdraw the appeals.</p> <p>10. Thames Water only realised this was an issue in 2002 by which time the land had already been sold to St James in late 1990.</p> <p>11. The intention is to use the St James access route or as long as possible.</p> <p>12. The trucks will come down Muswell Hill and through Nightingale Lane onto the site.</p> <p>13. The trucks will be standard size of no more than 2.5 metres</p> <p>14. We don't envisage of any chemical spillage as all the odourless chemicals arrive separately in seal containers and we will be advised by the appropriate bodies as to how best to carry out this procedure.</p> <p>15. This will be met through the s106 monies</p> <p>16. The application will be referred to the GLA for further comment at stage 1 the GLA found the building to be acceptable. At stage 2 the report will be sent to the GLA for a final say.</p> <p>17. This application should not influence the sale of your house in anyway. Surveys show that it will not cause more disruption as the movement of the lorries will be at such time as when most people will be at work.</p> <p>18. The hours of operation can be covered by planning conditions to operate from 7am to 6pm.</p> <p>19. No the filter bed will be redundant and will not be used in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PT reminded everyone to forward their objections in writing to the Planning Department and further representation can be made at the Planning Application Sub-Committee when the application goes to committee. He thanked everyone for attending and participating the meeting. <p>End of meeting</p>	