

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING: 21 April 2010**

**PLANNING APPLICATION FOR DETERMINATION BY THE LTGDC  
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING**

<b>UDC CASE NUMBER:</b>	LTGDC-09-109-FUL	<b>DATE MADE VALID:</b>	21/01/2010
<b>APPLICATION NUMBER:</b>	10/00092/LTGDC	<b>TARGET DATE:</b>	07/04/2010

<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Blue-NG
<b>AGENT:</b>	Environmental Perspectives
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Variation of Condition no.2 attached to planning permission number 08/00460/LTGDC dated 21/01/2010 for the construction of a combined cycle biofuel generation plant to generate renewable electrical energy. This amendment seeks to enable design amendments to the approved scheme relating to the design of the CHiP Plant building; the CHiP Plant exhaust stack; fuel tanks; the Turbo Expander building; plant housing; the sub-station/pump-house and the incorporation of ancillary infrastructure.
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Beckton Gas Pressure Reduction Station And Adjoining Land Armada Way Gallions Reach Beckton London E6 7FB

## **1. SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The application before Members proposes a variation of condition 2 attached to planning permission number 08/00460/LTGDC dated 12<sup>th</sup> January 2009 for the construction of a combined cycle biofuel generation plant to generate renewable electrical energy. This amendment seeks to enable design amendments to the approved scheme relating to the design of the CHiP Plant building; the CHiP Plant exhaust stack; fuel tanks; the Turbo Expander building; plant housing; the sub-station/pump-house and the incorporation of ancillary infrastructure.
- 1.2 The proposed changes to the design of the building would retain a contemporary appearance with visual interest. The loss of the curved character of the originally approved building does not in itself warrant a refusal of planning permission when assessed in relation to the resulting impacts on this industrial area. Overall the design and visual impacts are acceptable.
- 1.3 The change to a single engine would improve efficiency and would also improve noise and air quality impacts in comparison the previously approved scheme. Transportation impacts are unchanged and would not be significant. The principle of the development remains acceptable. In accordance with the approved scheme

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

conditions and S106 clauses are necessary to mitigate the impacts, including air quality, noise, contamination, fuel procurement and transportation.

1.4 Overall the application is acceptable with regard to the relevant UDP and London Plan Policies set out in this report. It is therefore recommended that the Committee approve the variation to condition 2, subject to a Deed of Variation to the original Section 106 updating the approved plans and decision notice.

## **2. SITE AND PROPOSAL**

### Site Context

- 2.1 The application is the Beckton Gas Pressure Reduction Station located on the southern side of Armada Way and approximately 75metres west of the northern junction with Royal Dock Road (A1020). The site is 1.87 hectares and is split into the northern operational Gas Pressure Reduction Station (1.47ha) and a small area of non-operational and vacant land to the south (0.4ha). The division of the north and south elements is defined by a private service road, by which the site gains access from Armada Way.
- 2.2 The surrounding uses are predominately industrial and commercial. The Beckton Gas Holder Station is located directly to the east and the Beckton Depot for the Docklands Light Railway to the south east. Located to the north is the retail development of Gallions Reach Shopping Park. The nearest residential development is located 200 metres to the south east, to the west of Royal Docks Road.
- 2.3 The existing Gas Pressure Reduction Station is positioned on the northern side of the east-west service road and is comprised of exposed pipe work, an associated turbine house 6.9 metres in height to the north and a control building adjacent to the service road 4.5 metres in height. A telecommunications mast is located next to the control building to the south west and is 17.25 metres in height. Two high level pipes cross the access road from the site to the Gas Holder Station to the east. These have a minimum clearance height above this road of 7.65 metres.
- 2.4 The southern side of the service road is vacant and degraded industrial land. The land to the east is derelict and allocated for the expansion of the Dockland Light Railway maintenance facilities. There is a wide strip of dense vegetation immediately to the west which separates the PRS from the A1020 road. This area has been designated as the potential route for the Thames Gateway Bridge project to connect to the A1020.
- 2.5 Planning permission was granted by the Development Corporation in January of 2009 (08/00460/LTGDC) for a combined cycle electricity generation plant that uses biofuel as part of the generation process. The decision notice and original committee report are attached in Appendix 1 of this report. The biofuel aspect of the scheme created a significant number of objections from groups opposed to the use of biofuel as a means of electricity generation. The scheme was approved subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement to secure off site air quality monitoring,, off site noise monitoring, a fuel sourcing statement and a research and development statement.

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

## Proposal

2.6 The application is lodged on behalf of Blue NG and seeks minor changes to the design of the previously consented application. These changes relate to the design of the CHiP Plant building; the CHiP Plant exhaust stack; fuel tanks; the Turbo Expander building; plant housing; the sub-station/pump-house and the incorporation of ancillary infrastructure.

2.7 The mechanism by which changes are intended to occur is through a variation of condition 2 of the extant planning permission by way of Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Condition 2 in its entirety states:

*“All works shall be completed in accordance with drawing numbers:*

*1426 P-100 Site Plan*

*1426 P-110 Site Elevations North and South*

*1426 P-111 Site Elevations East and West*

*1426 P-120 CHP Building Plans and Isometric*

*1426 P-121 CHP Building Elevations*

*1426 P-122 CHP Building Perspectives*

*TE001/BE/03/01/0908/012 rev B Turbo Expander Building*

*TE001/BE/03/01/0908/014 rev B Customer Sub-Station/Pump House*

*TE001/BE/03/01/0908/022 rev A General Arrangement of Existing PRS*

*Reason: To ensure that the development is implemented in accordance with the approved details”*

2.8 The applicant now wishes to revert to a single-engine operation for the CHiP Plant instead of the twin-engines originally intended as part of this approved scheme. The applicant has advised that the reasons for changing the engine specification of the scheme are essentially threefold.

2.9 First and most fundamentally, it would improve the overall efficiency and reliability of the electricity generating process, resulting in lower absolute particulate emissions and an improvement of the air quality impact accepted under the approved scheme.

2.10 Secondly, the electrical output of the single engine generally is better and thirdly, the maintenance requirements of the engine are less. The applicant has also identified construction difficulties associated with the roof curvature of the approved building.

2.11 Although the engine specification of this development is not a material planning matter, the proposed single engine is larger than the twin-engines it is intended to replace and as a consequence, some design adjustments are needed to the approved scheme.

2.12 These design changes are mainly confined to the CHiP Plant building itself, which has now been reconfigured to take a different form to the approved scheme. Some additional, ancillary infrastructure is also proposed outside this building and within the main operational area of the development. This includes the engine cooling fans, which would be housed externally of the building.

2.13 The overall site layout arrangement (including vehicular means of access)

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

nevertheless remains the same, as does the electrical output of the development (up to 19MWe).

2.14 In summary, the changes comprise:

- A reconfigured building design for the CHiP Plant, which would have a more angular form to the approved scheme design, rising to a maximum building height of 25m (compared to 22m under the current planning permission) and having a larger, overall footprint of 1,844 m<sup>2</sup> (compared to 1,645 m<sup>2</sup> under the current planning permission).
- A 0.5m increase in the height of the CHiP Plant exhaust stack from 27.5m to 28m overall.
- Provision of 4 x 100,000 litres fuel tanks (instead of the 3 x 75,000 litres approved under planning permission), each of which would be 2.5m lower in height.
- Increasing the maximum height of the associated Turbo Expander building from 8.5m to 10.3m.
- Housing the engine and other related cooling fans externally of the CHiP Plant and within the main operational area of the development.
- Incorporating other ancillary infrastructure within the main operational area of the development, including 3 additional storage tanks (for diesel, urea and sludge) and a firewater tank.
- Providing a smaller sub-station/pump-house.

2.15 Members will note that planning permission is sought for these design changes only. The principle of development was established by virtue of the existing planning permission.

### **3. MAIN ISSUES**

- Principle of Development
- Design and Visual Impact
- Air Quality and Odour
- Noise
- Contamination
- Traffic/Transportation
- Fuel Procurement

### **4. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

4.1 Planning permission (ref: 08/00460/LTGDC) was granted by the Corporation on 12<sup>th</sup> of January 2009 for the construction of a combined cycle biofuel generation plant to generate renewable electrical energy.

4.2 The site has been occupied by a gas Pressure Reduction Station (PRS) and associated gas distribution structures since the 1950's. Historically prior to the earliest occupation of the site in 1896, the site was undeveloped marshland, with development between 1896 and 1951 being the east west railway yards, the original Beckton train station and Beckton Gas works. The first appearance of the existing gas infrastructure was in 1951, which in turn led to the disappearance of the railway by 1970.

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

## **5. CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

### The London Borough of Newham

5.1 At the time of writing, the application had not been before Newham's Planning Committee. However, it is understood that the recommendation to Newham's Committee will be to not raise any objection to the proposal.

5.2 More specific comments have been received from the Borough and can be summarised as follows:

#### *Environmental Health*

5.3 In terms of noise, some inconsistencies were noticed however the noise report was broadly acceptable, subject to validation of the noise figures upon commissioning of the plant.

5.4 Environmental Health Officers are satisfied with the air quality report.

#### *Transportation*

5.5 Highways officers have confirmed that the changes to the scheme will have no material impact in highways terms and raise no objection.

#### *Urban Design*

5.6 Although the changes to the design will make the building bulkier than approved, it is considered that this won't have a visual impact for the area due to the site location.

### Environment Agency

5.7 Confirmed no further comments from previous application, which confirmed no objection subject to conditions regarding: 1) storage of oils, fuels and chemicals; 2) piling and foundations designs; 3) surface water drainage; and 4) contamination risk assessment. Advice is also provided regarding waste and contamination.

### London City Airport:

5.8 No objection to the proposal subject to a condition seeking details of any crane or scaffolding required during construction and an obstacle light fitted atop the exhaust stack. Additional conditions to be attached.

### English Heritage GLAAS

5.9 The site is located in an area of high archaeological potential. A condition is proposed requiring implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation. The condition attached to the extant permission is considered to be acceptable without change.

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

Transport for London:

5.10 No comments received at the time of writing. Members will be updated.

London Development Agency:

5.11 No comments received at the time of writing. Members will be updated.

Thames Water

5.12 Advice provided regarding surface water drainage. No objection regarding impacts on sewerage or water infrastructure.

Natural England

5.13 Confirmation has been received that significant effects on the natural environment are unlikely. As such, Natural England has no further comments to make.

Health and Safety Executive:

5.14 The HSE does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

**6. APPLICATION PUBLICITY**

6.1 Press Notice: 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2010

6.2 Neighbour Notification: 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010

**7. REPRESENTATIONS**

7.1 The application was advertised in the Newham Recorder on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2010. Consultation letters were sent to 452 adjoining occupiers on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2010. Consultation emails were also sent on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2010 to all third parties who made representations via email regarding the previous application ref: 08/00460/LTGDC.

7.2 One letter of objection was received that is jointly signed by representatives from the groups Biofuelwatch and Food Not Fuel. The focus of the objection is centred on concerns that the burning of biofuel will result in significant air quality implications for the local area and the environment overall. Members will appreciate that the application deals with changes to the design of the building that houses the biofuel generators and that the land use principle has been established with the grant planning permission in January of 2009. Be this as it may, the applicant has provided an analysis of the air quality implications of the scheme which indicate an air quality improvement over the already acceptable air quality impact of the permitted scheme. Air quality discussed in greater detail later in this report.

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

## **8. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

### 8.1 The London Plan, consolidated with alterations since 2004 (2008)

- 2A.1 Sustainability criteria
- 2A.10 Strategic Industrial Locations
- 3B.4 Industrial Location – Annexe 2 – Preferred Industrial Locations – Beckton Riverside
- 3C.1 Integrating transport and development
- 3C.2 Matching development to transport capacity
- 3C.3 Sustainable transport
- 3D.14 Biodiversity and nature conservation
- 4A.1 Tackling Climate Change
- 4A.2 Mitigating Climate Change
- 4A.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 4A.4 Energy assessment
- 4A.5 Provision of heating and cooling networks
- 4A.6 Decentralised Energy – Heating, cooling and Power
- 4A.7 Energy efficiency and renewable energy
- 4A.8 Energy assessment
- 4A.9 Providing for renewable energy
- 4A.10 Supporting the provision of renewable energy
- 4A.14 Sustainable drainage
- 4A.16 Water supplies and resources
- 4A.19 Improving Air Quality
- 4A.20 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
- 4B.15 Archaeology

### 8.2 London Borough of Newham Unitary Development Plan (Adopted June 2001, Saved from 27 September 2007 in accordance with the direction from the Secretary of State)

- S4 Sustainable Development
- S9 Environmental Quality: Design Issues
- S10 Environmental Quality: Neglected, Derelict and Vacant Land
- S15 Environmental Quality – Control of Environmental Hazards and Nuisances
- S16 Environmental Quality – Thames Policy Area
- EQ18 Promoting Urban Quality
- EQ25 Access
- EQ26 Safety
- EQ44 Vacant Land: Environmental Improvements
- EQ45 Pollution
- EQ46 Air Quality Management
- EQ47 Noise Impact Assessment
- EQ48 Noise - Sensitive Development
- EQ49 Contaminated Land
- EQ63 Surface Water Disposal
- T1 Environmental Impact of Traffic
- T3 Capacity of Highway Network
- T4 Major Highway/Public Transport Contribution
- T10 Road Hierarchy

## **9. ASSESSMENT OF MAIN ISSUES**

### Principle of Development:

- 9.1 The principle of development is established under the current, extant planning permission (08/00460/LTGDC/LBNM), whereby the proposed development was found to be acceptable in planning terms, subject to conditions and a Section 106 legal agreement.
- 9.2 The design changes proposed in this application do not alter the previous conclusions regarding the principle of the development in land use terms. The proposed use of the site is consistent with the London Plan site designation as a 'Preferred Industrial Location' (Beckton Riverside) and the proposal is appropriate to the site context.

### Design and Visual Impact:

- 9.3 The applicant has submitted an amended Design and Access Statement which explains the proposed amendments. The proposed building design differs from the original planning permission principally in its form, primarily as a result of the change to a single larger engine from the original proposal of two smaller engines, but also due to construction difficulties associated with the roof curvature proposed by the architects.
- 9.4 The applicant has advised that the reason for the change from two engines to a single larger engine was that the recent economic crisis has meant that orders for the larger engines were not being honoured, and therefore more of the larger engine types are now available on the market. However, the increased size of the engine coupled with construction issues associated with the original design of the roof structure has resulted in a requirement for an alternate building design. The applicant has advised that in recognition of the design aesthetic embedded in the original proposal and the desired iconic status of the building, the scheme has been revised to present a very similar and striking form.
- 9.5 The building forms a diamond shape in plan view. The north elevation emulates the twist of the original building with a split roofline with each side falling into a common valley at the north point of the diamond. The building is three metres taller at its peak than the original design, and has a slightly larger overall building footprint of 1,844m<sup>2</sup> (compared to 1,645m<sup>2</sup> under planning permission) due to its shape. The view from the south has a less pronounced valley but uses louvres to provide texture and form.
- 9.6 In terms of the visual impact of the amended design itself, it is considered that the main generator building will not have a discernable impact above the surrounding industrial context and certainly not above that of the consented design. It should also be noted that the nearest residential receptors are located approximately 225m to the west and 230m to the south west and beyond the A1020.
- 9.7 Newham's Design Officer has advised that the amendments will make the proposed building bulkier than previous scheme, but that overall this will not have a significant visual impact for the area due to its site location. Officers agree with this conclusion and consider that the reconfigured building would retain a contemporary

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

appearance with visual interest. Furthermore, the loss of the consented curved roof shape does not in itself warrant a refusal of planning permission when assessed in relation to the resulting impacts on this industrial area.

9.8 The details of the material type and finish for the CHiP Plant and stack will continue to be secured by planning condition in order to ensure a high-quality design.

9.9 Subject to the proposed conditions the design and visual impacts are considered to be acceptable.

#### Air Quality and Odour

9.10 The applicant has submitted an Air Quality Impact Assessment which updated the impact assessment carried out on the original scheme. The update provided a generic assessment of the potential impacts during the construction phase. This shows that during this phase of the proposed development releases of dust and PM<sub>10</sub> are likely to occur during site activities. However, through good site practice and the implementation of suitable mitigation measures, the impact of dust and PM<sub>10</sub> releases will be reduced and excessive releases prevented. It is therefore considered this impact can be regarded as *'insignificant'*.

9.11 An assessment of the cumulative impacts from both the proposed installation and emissions associated with road traffic has been undertaken at relevant receptors. The maximum contribution of annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> from the proposed installation at a sensitive receptor where there is relevant public exposure is predicted to be 1.7ug/m<sub>3</sub>. This is substantially lower than the 4.5 ug/m<sub>3</sub> process contribution determined from the approved scheme. The impacts on annual mean NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations are considered as *'slight adverse'* in the areas of highest impact where there is relevant public exposure compared with the previous impact significance of *'moderate adverse'*. No exceedences of either the short or long-term objectives are predicted once the site is operational in 2010 or later. It should also be noted that the assessment has assumed a 100% engine load. In reality, therefore, the impacts will be lower than that now determined.

9.12 The maximum predicted contribution of annual mean PM<sub>10</sub> from the proposed installation is 0.9 ug/m<sup>3</sup> at the sensitive receptors, where there is relevant public exposure. This is lower than the 1.5 ug/m<sup>3</sup> process contribution determined with the approved scheme.

9.13 The Air Quality Impact Assessment includes an assessment of the cumulative impacts from both the proposed installation and emissions associated with road traffic at relevant receptors. The impacts from the proposed installation on PM<sub>10</sub> are considered *'negligible'* where there is relevant public exposure, compared with the impact significance of *'slight adverse'* determined with the approved scheme, as follows:

9.14 The maximum contribution of PM<sub>2.5</sub> is 0.09 ug/m<sup>3</sup> at a sensitive receptor and the maximum predicted concentration including background is 14.5 ug/m<sup>3</sup>, which is considerably below the objective for this pollutant.

9.15 The maximum contribution of CO from the proposed installation is predicted to be 0.02 mg/m<sup>3</sup>. This is considered *'negligible'* and exceedence of the objective is highly unlikely for this pollutant. This impact is unchanged from the approved

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

scheme.

- 9.16 The odour impact of the development remains unchanged from that accepted under planning permission, as the scope of the application is confined to the proposed design changes only and not the nature/source of the proposed fuel, which will continue to be controlled through the existing Section 106 Agreement.
- 9.17 Although some sources of odour may be released from the venting of the storage tanks, these impacts are not considered significant enough to cause any harmful effect on the nearest residential receptor some 240m to the west of the site.
- 9.18 The Air Quality Impact Assessment concludes that having regard to the above findings, the overall air quality impact of the amended scheme is materially improved in terms of NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations. The odour impact remains unchanged.
- 9.19 Members are also advised that the proposed installation will now require an Environmental Permit to operate as the generation capacity of the single engine falls under Process Guidance Note PG1/5(95). Although the overall capacity is no greater than the approved scheme, PG1/5(95) does not consider aggregation of sources and therefore the previous twin-engine did not fall under this legislation. Accordingly, the facility would now also be regulated by Newham's Environmental Health Services under such a Permit.
- 9.20 The Council's Environmental Health officers have assessed the submission and agree that the amended design would improve air quality impacts when assessed in relation to the approved scheme and that odour impacts would be as previously approved.
- 9.21 The air quality and odour impacts of the proposed development are acceptable, subject to the inclusion of the previous S106 clauses regarding the Air Quality and Odour Management Strategy.

#### Noise

- 9.22 The applicant has submitted a Noise Assessment Report which examines the noise impact of the scheme on the three nearest sensitive receptor sites previously assessed under the approved scheme, being:
- 16, Winsor Terrace;
  - Gallions Primary School; and
  - Beckton Riverside (proposed residential development)
- 9.23 In summary the assessment has identified the following impacts in comparison to the approved scheme.

<b>Sensitive Receptor</b>	<b>Predicted Noise Level – dB(A) Approved Scheme</b>	<b>Predicted Noise Level – dB(A) Amended Scheme</b>
16, Winsor Terrace	37	35
Gallions Primary School	42	36
Beckton Riverside (Proposed)	31-37	27-31

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

9.24 The noise impacts of the amended design are improved in comparison with the approved scheme. The noise impacts are consequently acceptable in terms of impacts on amenity, subject to the inclusion of the S106 Noise Mitigation Strategy and conditions attached to the previous permission.

#### Contamination

9.25 The design changes proposed do not alter the findings of the Phase 1 Environmental Assessment undertaken with the previous application. The Phase 1 assessment identified potentially significant sources of contamination associated with the historic and current operations at the site. In accordance with the approved planning permission conditions are proposed requiring a further phase of investigatory work to identify the risk and a remediation strategy to be agreed based on the results of the risk assessment and site investigation. Subject to the original conditions the application is acceptable.

#### Traffic and Transportation

9.26 The Newham's Transportation officer has advised that the overall traffic and highway impact of the scheme shall remain unchanged as a result of the proposed design changes. The development shall be served by the two to three fuel deliveries anticipated every day, which is considered a modest amount of deliveries that can be timed to non-peak periods. This timing was secured by condition when planning permission was granted for the original scheme. The overall site layout arrangement (including vehicular means of access) remaining largely unchanged.

9.27 Traffic movements during the construction period will continue to be on average 25 two-way trips per day, increasing to a maximum 40 two-way trips per day. In any event, the applicant is already required under planning condition to obtain approval of a Traffic Management Plan.

9.28 Given that the proposal shall not have any material impact in highway terms, other than those already accepted and consented, the application is considered to be acceptable in terms of traffic and transportation impacts subject to the inclusion of the relevant conditions attached to the previous permission.

#### Fuel Procurement

9.29 A key issue associated with the proposed development is the fuel procurement strategy. The sourcing of the biofuels raises potential issues relating to land take; loss of agricultural land to the use of biofuel production and the resultant reduction of food availability and increased food prices. These issues were assessed under the approved scheme and planning permission was granted subject to S106 clauses regarding a fuel sourcing strategy and research and development commitments.

9.30 The design amendments do not impact in any way on the proposed biofuel sourcing strategy as set out in the S106 pursuant to the approved scheme and the applicant has confirmed that they remain committed to sourcing the fuel from fully traceable supply chains that are independently audited and meet strict sustainability criteria. The previous Section 106 Agreement requires the applicant to obtain the Corporation's written approval of a Bioliquid Procurement Report, which must

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

include information on the nature and source (including country of origin) of the proposed fuel.

9.31 On this basis the proposed fuel procurement impacts are acceptable subject to a S106 deed of variation requiring the applicant to comply with the previously agreed clauses.

## **10. CONCLUSION**

10.1 The proposed changes to the design of the building would retain a contemporary appearance with visual interest. The loss of the curved character of the originally building approved does not in itself warrant a refusal of planning permission when assessed in relation to the resulting impacts on this industrial area. Overall the design and visual impacts are acceptable.

10.2 The change to a single engine would improve efficiency and would also improve noise and air quality impacts in comparison the previously approved scheme. Transportation impacts are unchanged and would not be significant. The principle of the development remains acceptable. In accordance with the approved scheme conditions and S106 clauses are necessary to mitigate the impacts, including air quality, noise, contamination, fuel procurement and transportation.

10.3 Overall the application is acceptable with regard to the relevant UDP and London Plan Policies set out in this report and it is recommended that the application be approved, subject to the applicant entering into a Deed of Variation to allow the approved drawings and new decision notice to be consistent with the original Section 106.

## **11. RECOMMENDATION**

11.1 It is recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to the changes to condition 2 and the additional two conditions set out in the following section and the satisfactory completion of a Deed of Variation to the original Section 106 agreement delegated to the Director of Planning.

## **12. CONDITIONS AND REASONS**

12.1 Condition 2 shall be amended to read as follows:

*“All works shall be completed in accordance with drawing numbers:  
1426 P-100 Site Plan  
08/169B/30003 P3 Site Elevations North and South  
08/169B/30004 P3 Site Elevations East and West  
08/169B/30014 P2 CHP Building Plans and Isometric  
08/169B/30015 P1 CHP Building Plans and Isometric  
08/169B/30013 P2 CHP Building Elevations  
08/169B/30005 P1 Turbo Expander Building  
08/169B/30008 P2 Sub-Station/Pump House  
TE001/BE/03/01/0908/022 rev A General Arrangement of Existing PRS*

*Reason: To ensure that the development is implemented in accordance with the approved details”*

Meeting: 21 April 2010  
Agenda Item: 4  
Report No: LTGDC/10/PC19

11.1 Two additional conditions shall be added to the new consent and shall read as follows:

1. *"In the event that during construction, cranes or scaffolding is required at a higher elevation than that of the planning development, then their use must be subject to separate consultation to London City Airport.*

*"Reason: In the interest of aviation safety"*

2. *"The exhaust stack shall be fitted at its highest point with an obstacle light to be steady red of medium intensity at a minimum of 1000 Candelas and visible from all angles*

*"Reason: In the interests of aviation safety"*

**CASE OFFICER:** Stephen Allen

**Appendix 1:** Original Planning Permission and Committee Report

**Appendix 2:** Site Plans

**Appendix 3:** Elevations

**Appendix 4:** Perspective View

**Appendix 5:** Consented and Proposed Scheme.