

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK PANEL MINUTES

8 DECEMBER 2011

Chairman: * Councillor Keith Ferry

Councillors: * Stephen Greek * Anthony Seymour
* Thaya Idaikkadar * Krishna Suresh (2)
* Bill Phillips * Simon Williams

In attendance: Councillor Joyce Nickolay Minutes 52, 53, 54, 55
(Councillors)

* Denotes Member present
(2) Denote category of Reserve Members

RECOMMENDED ITEM

53. **West London Waste Plan: Pre-submission consultation Document**

Consideration was given to a report which presented the results of the consultation held in February and March 2011 on the West London Waste Plan Proposed Sites and Policies Consultation Document and introduced the next version of the Plan, the Pre-Submission document, which was proposed for publication for public consultation in February 2012. It was noted that agreement from all six boroughs in membership of WLWA was required

The officers reported that the land needed to meet west London's target was 22.4 hectares. The Pre-Submission document included existing waste transfer sites totalling 19.39 hectares and three new sites totalling 9.15, of which the Council Depot at Forward Drive in Harrow was one. Other WLW boroughs did not place importance on prioritising sites and felt all sites should be treated

equally. Officers suggested that waste transfer stations should be converted to waste treatment centres and prioritised before new sites.

The wording of the policy on the location of waste development had been amended in order to strengthen the requirement to ensure that there was no loss in existing capacity at existing or allocated waste sites. It was therefore important to prioritise reserve sites because otherwise contingency sites could not be used for any other purpose and the Council wanted to continue to use the Council Depot for its present use.

In response to questions by Members it was noted that:

- the consultation document referred to domestic or business use and not hazardous or medical waste;
- even if prioritised as a contingency site, and therefore may not be required, the plan still sought to safeguard land at the Central Depot for waste development;
- it was possible the HS2 (high speed train proposals) could require land in Hillingdon and therefore one of the 8 sites could be ruled out;
- the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise had been involved as it was a Plan. The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety was responsible for the waste management function.

The Panel was informed that the contents of the Pre-submission consultation document were not what Harrow had signed up to. In view of the information received the Panel was unable to support the draft West London Waste Plan: Pre-submission document in its present form.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet)

The LDF Panel recommends that Cabinet seek the following amendments to the draft West London Waste Plan: Pre-submission consultation document prior to its publication:

1. That WLWP Policy 1 is split into two policies, with the intention that the first policy address the safeguarding of existing waste sites (identified in Appendix 4 Table 4-1), and the second policy address the allocation of new sites (identified in Appendix 5 Table 5-1) for development for waste management facilities by providing (as below) for their continued contribution as contingency waste sites to be set alongside their appropriate and continued existing use.

2. That WLWP Policy 2 is amended to direct proposals for waste facilities to existing waste sites in the first instance before consideration is given to provision on identified new sites.

Reasons for the recommendation:

It is appropriate that land accommodating existing waste management uses should be safeguarded, and proposals to intensify the treatment of waste on existing sites or to turn transfer sites into facilities should be supported and prioritised.

The three new sites, comprising 9.15ha, are identified as being suitable for development for waste management facilities and should be allocated for such potential use, and any change of use, other than to waste management, should be resisted. However, it is not considered appropriate or necessary to safeguard new sites for waste management because:

- a) Of the 9.15ha provided by the new sites, only 3.01ha of this is required to provide the capacity necessary to manage west London's waste apportionment;
- b) In effect, two of the new sites identified will not be needed but are included as a contingency;
- c) The level of contingency proposed in the draft Plan gives rise to uncertainty as to whether a new site may or may not be developed for waste management over the life of the Plan;
- d) However, the effect of safeguarding the new sites means they cannot be developed for non-waste uses, even despite the fact that they might not be needed for waste management use;
- e) Unlike the existing waste sites, the new sites identified are currently occupied by existing non-waste uses, typically industrial uses;
- f) As currently written, by safeguarding these new sites for waste management, the policy would prevent redevelopment of these sites to provide for the appropriate continuation of their existing use, which given the points above, is unacceptable.

If the above amendments are not considered acceptable to the other five west London boroughs, then the Council should require that the level of contingency to be provided by the draft Plan, currently at 30% land area, be reduced so as not to undermine the robustness of the safeguarding policy or the public's confidence in the Plan.