

## LONDON THAMES GATEWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING: 21<sup>st</sup> June 2007

### PLANNING APPLICATION FOR DETERMINATION BY THE LTGDC

#### ADDENDUM REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

<b>UDC CASE NUMBER:</b>	LTGDC-06-046-PP	<b>DATE MADE VALID:</b>	10/04/2006
<b>APPLICATION NUMBER:</b>	06/00674/LTGDC/LBN M	<b>TARGET DATE:</b>	

<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Aggregate Industries Ltd
<b>AGENT:</b>	Scott Wilson
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Development of land for the importation and handling of aggregate, cement and other powdered products, to include: the construction of a jetty and mooring dolphins; the erection of an aggregate processing plant; the erection of a concrete batching plant with 4No associated cement/powdered products silos; erection of s further 4No silos for cement storage bays; office; ancillary facilities; associated parking; creation of new means of access and other works incidental to the development of the site. This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Plaistow and Peruvian Wharf North Woolwich Road Silvertown London

#### 1. SUMMARY

1.1 This provides an update on representations received from local residents objecting to the application and comments from dp9, the agents for the owners of the site. It is not considered that the representations received raise material planning considerations that justify changes to the recommendation and associated conditions and S106 as set out in the report. Dp9 have commented on a discrepancy relating to hours of operation between Condition 22 and text in the report and have also queried the absence of evidence for the level of throughput of the activity.

## **2. DETAILS OF REPRESENTATIONS**

- 2.1 Following preparation of the report a petition has been received from 44 residents of Britannia Village as well as additional letters. Some of the petitioners had already sent in individual letters. The main points concern: lack of consultation with residents; proposals not in keeping with the regeneration of the area; increase in noise, dust and vibration affecting both residents and local primary school; impact of movement of heavy lorries especially as North Woolwich Road is a dangerous rat run for drivers avoiding the A13; do not need any more industrial units in the area. These points duplicate what is set out under "Residents" on page 7 of the report and are responded to within Section 9 (Assessment of Main Issues) at pages 9 and 10 of the report, particularly at 9.9 on page 10. Regeneration of some areas for residential purposes might well seem to be at variance with the 'heavier' types of industries south of North Woolwich Road. However it has to be recognised that this is the result of different land use policies set out in Borough and GLA documents with the industrial aspects of safeguarded wharves being upheld by the Peruvian Wharf public inquiry decision. In these circumstances refusal of permission can not be justified.
- 2.2 The point raised by dp9 in terms of a discrepancy between text and condition relating to the hours of operation is accepted. In paragraph 2.2 of the report under "Description of Proposal" reference is made to the use mainly being between 6am and 5pm, Monday to Saturday, whilst Condition 22 as proposed refers to 6am to 7pm Monday to Friday and 7am to 5pm on Saturdays (with exceptions detailed in Condition 15). Dp9 ask that 6am to 5pm be the timing on the condition for Monday to Friday. Whilst there will be those parts of the year when use will cease by 5pm because of the limited hours of daylight, the longer days may well require a delivery of cement/ aggregate after then and therefore the hours as recommended under Condition 22 are not considered to have a significant impact on local amenity.
- 2.3 Dp9 also query the lack of evidence for the throughput detailed at paragraph 2.2. The applicant has been asked to respond to this point.

## **3. CONCLUSION**

- 3.1 The representations and comments have been considered with regard to the analysis in the report and in particular the relevant planning policies that relate to the site. On this basis, it is not considered that the recommendation and related conditions and s106 should be amended.

**CASE OFFICER:** Peter Minoletti