

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING PANEL
HELD ON THURSDAY, 23 JULY 2009**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Alan Barker (Chairman), Lee Chamberlain, Peter Fallart,
Donald McGowan and Toby Simon

OFFICERS: Steve Jaggard (Traffic and Transportation), Carol Collins
(Environmental Health), David Warden (Principal Planning
Officer), Aled Richards (Development Services), Nicky Fiedler
(Waste Services), Sav Michael (Democratic Services) and
Felicity Parker (Democratic Services)

Also Attending: Applicant / Agent Representatives:
David Sargent (LondonWaste Ltd)
Russ Morgan (LondonWaste Ltd)
Kevin Goodwin (LondonWaste Ltd)
Peter Mayer (LondonWaste Ltd)
Stephen Barnett (LondonWaste Ltd)
Deanna Donaldson (LondonWaste Ltd)
Matt McGeehan (LondonWaste Ltd)
Wendy Lord (LondonWaste Ltd)
Roz Ruben (LondonWaste Ltd)

Ward Councillors:
Councillor Kris Brown
Councillor George Savva
Councillor Geoff Robinson
Councillor Andrew Stafford

And approximately 11 members of the public.

**211
OPENING**

The Chairman welcomed all attendees to the Planning Panel meeting. He explained that the purpose of this meeting was a fact-finding exercise for the Planning Committee, five representatives of which were here tonight. The Panel Members, the applicant and agents, and the officers from the Council's Planning Department introduced themselves.

Apologies for absence were received from Andy Love MP.

**212
OFFICER'S SUMMARY OF THE PLANNING ISSUES**

David Warden, Principal Planning Officer, clarified that the purpose of a Planning Panel meeting was not to determine the application. A decision on

PLANNING PANEL - 23.7.2009

the application would be made by the full Planning Committee at a later date. This Planning Panel would give local residents and interested parties the opportunity to raise questions directly with the applicant and agents.

The planning proposal was to build a recycling facility which would receive 100,000 tonnes of dry recyclables per annum.

The key issues were outlined as follows:

- Principle of the intensification
- Design and visual impact
- Traffic generation
- Nature conservation

213

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT / AGENT

David Sargent – Managing Director, London Waste Ltd – outlined the main details of the proposal, as follows:

1. The proposal was to build a recycling building with facilities to sort 100,000 tonnes per annum of dry recyclables, which would be sorted and segregated into grades for specialist processing. The building would be approximately 80 metres long, 40 metres wide and 20 metres high.
2. The recycling facility would be accessed using existing access off Advent Way from the slip road to the A406 or via the Eley Estate. Trials to run commercial waterways transport were successful, however this was not an option at the present time.
3. Along with the recycling building there would also be a separate office and visitors centre, with parking facilities. The proposed building would be approximately 12 metres wide, 50 metres long and 7.5 metres high. The roof of the office block would be 'green' to encourage wildlife.
4. The visual impact of the buildings on the area had been considered and 'before and after' pictures were displayed.
5. The recycling building would:
 - Be fully enclosed
 - Have the potential for separation machinery
 - Provide enhanced recyclate storage capacity
 - Have sustainable drainage and rainwater systems
 - Integrate sustainable energy systems.

214

QUESTIONS BY PANEL MEMBERS

1. Councillor Barker asked:

PLANNING PANEL - 23.7.2009

- 1.1 Whether the regeneration of sustainable energy would include the installation of solar panels.

Kevin Goodwin advised that it would be unlikely that solar panels would be used to meet the policies set out by the Greater London Authority (GLA) in the Greater London Plan.

- 1.2 How much noise would be generated by the facility, including traffic.

Kevin Goodwin replied that the vehicles would approach the north end of the building and enter through fast operating double doors. All tipping and processing would take place within the building.

There would be 24 HGV lorries entering the site per day – some of which already visited the site. The amount of traffic on the A406 would only increase by 0.04%.

- 1.3 What the predicted life span of the facility would be.

Kevin Goodwin advised that the life span of the facility would be around 50 years.

2. Councillor Simon asked about the economic context to the Council and how the new facility related to the existing bulk waste facility behind the energy centre.

David Sargent advised that the current waste contract with the Council would run until 2014. However London Waste Ltd was a commercial waste management company with a wide range of companies and not exclusive to municipal waste. Waste management systems were changing and were moving away from dumping at landfill sites (for which the Local Authority were charged).

There were no immediate plans to transfer the bulk waste facility into the new building, however this could always be a possibility in the future.

3. Councillor Chamberlain asked:

- 3.1 Whether the size of the 24 vehicles accessing the site be larger than the current vehicles.

Kevin Goodwin replied that the size of the vehicles would be no bigger than those used already.

- 3.2 How it was estimated that 24 vehicles would be accessing the site each day.

Kevin Goodwin informed the group that the estimated 24 vehicles was based on the tonnage each vehicle could hold and the turnaround time of the lorries at the facility.

- 3.3 How many vehicles could access the building at any one time.

Kevin Goodwin replied that the number of vehicles accessing the building depended on a number of factors – the amount of waste or how quickly the material was processed (i.e. whether there was a manual picking line or a machinery to sort the waste). The waste from previous loads would need to be processed before more lorries could empty their loads.

4. Councillor McGowan enquired about the types of waste which would be recycled at the facility.

David Sargent informed the group that the types of waste recycled at the facility would be dry materials – no food or hazardous materials – only items which would normally be recycled.

5. Councillor McGowan also asked whether this expansion would take the place of the search for another site.

David Sargent replied that this was nothing to do with London Waste Ltd – as the North London Waste Plan, the authority was looking for sites that boroughs might need in the future.

6. Councillor Fallart asked whether there were any plans to use the River Lea for transport in the future.

David Sargent confirmed that it was possible – a company called Smart Barge Ltd currently moved material from site to site – and it would be beneficial. However, this method was expensive and the facility would have to have a viable need to investigate this method further.

7. Councillor Simon asked for the views of the Council officers regarding additional traffic generation which may arise.

Steve Jaggard said he felt that in numerical terms the net additional traffic was not an issue. However there was perhaps a concern over the proportion of heavy traffic accessing the site through Eley Estate.

215

QUESTIONS BY WARD COUNCILLORS AND MPS

1. Councillor Brown voiced his concerns over the potential increase in traffic levels on that particular area of the A406. He asked whether this meeting was the only form of consultation to be carried out with regards to the application.

David Warden informed him that this was the only meeting, however there was a statutory consultation period of 21 days.

2. Councillor Stafford asked:

- 2.1 Whether the 100,000 tonnes of waste was new waste and how much of the waste would come from outside of the borough.

David Sargent informed him that not all of the waste would be new waste and 100,000 tonnes was probably an optimistic figure at present. Some of the waste was already there but it was expected that recycling figures would increase in the future.

The Council would not be using the facility so on 'day 1' all of the waste would be from outside boroughs, with the exception of commercial waste from within the borough.

- 2.2 Why this application was allowed to go ahead when it seemed that other applications within Edmonton could not, due to the Place Shaping plans.

Aled Richards replied that the plans/vision of the Place Shaping strategy were taken into account when considering planning applications and they had not expressed any objections to the application.

216

OPEN SESSION - QUESTIONS AND VIEWS FROM THE FLOOR

1. A resident asked where the funding would come from for the facility and referred to a meeting held in 2002 between London Waste Ltd and the GLA.

David Sargent responded that the 2002 meeting did not refer to the same project.

The funding for the project would be raised from corporate sources and internal monies. The North London Waste Authority (50% shareholder) would not be investing any money.

2. A resident raised the issues of potential conflicts of interest in the application process – the Council were effectively being called upon to approve their own application.

David Sargent explained that London Waste Ltd had two shareholders, one of which was the North London Waste Authority – Enfield Council was one of the boroughs who made up the authority, therefore there was only an indirect link with London Waste Ltd.

Aled Richards also explained that any planning application made by the Council would always be determined before the Planning Committee, where members had the authority to refuse the application based on evidence heard. There was no conflict of interest.

3. A resident enquired whether there would be an opportunity to have 'eco-businesses' within the Ecopark.

PLANNING PANEL - 23.7.2009

David Sargent replied that it was not part of the current proposal to share the site with local 'eco-businesses'.

4. A resident asked how the sorting of waste would be monitored to ensure efficiency.

David Sargent said that the sorting would be of a high standard and the facility would work to standards formed by the ECA.

217

CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman thanked everyone for their comments and questions: these would be fed back into the application process. It was likely that the application would be determined at the Planning Committee meeting scheduled for 26 August 2009, 7.30 pm at Enfield Civic Centre.