

Briefing Note



Aldermary House,
10 - 15 Queen Street,
London, EC4N 1TX

T: 020 3848 2500
W: indigo.planning.com

Ref: bfn.012.25240001
Date: 22 September 2017
Subject: Richmond Local Plan Examination in Public – information relating to Arlington Works

Land at Arlington Works, Arlington Road, Twickenham, TW1 2BB

Introduction

This briefing note relates to Hearing 5, Item 19, scheduled to be heard on Monday 9 October 2017. In specific terms, the Inspector has questioned whether proposed Policy LP 24 is justified by the evidence base, should the SPD be referenced within the policy, has the policy been assessed for its effect upon development viability and is the approach towards Arlington Waste Works justified.

The purpose of this briefing note is to set out the history of representations made on behalf of our client, Sharpes Oil Refinery (Sharpes), and to provide a non-technical summary of the report titled, "*Land at Arlington Works, Arlington Road, Twickenham, TW1 2BB: Site suitability for alternative waste uses*" referred to as the Waterman report. The Waterman report, provided to the Inspector on 08 September 2017, should be referred to in addition to this briefing note. We also reference Policy LP 24 and assess this policy, in relation to its affect on the site.

It has been determined by an expert in the waste industry that Arlington Works should not be safeguarded by Policy LP24 or Policy WLWP 2. The Waterman report concludes that the part of the site that is lawfully permitted to manage waste amount to only 0.05ha out of the 0.23ha (the whole site). As a sustainable waste site, Arlington Works is in the wrong location, the part of the site permitted to manage waste is too small and is not appropriate for other waste uses. In addition, it is noted that the waste use as it functions, does not deal with local waste (either Richmond, WLWP area or even London).

In addition, Arlington Works is located within a residential area and the current waste facility on site is noisy and unneighbourly. Frequent deliveries disrupt neighbours and negatively affect surrounding residential amenity (e.g. on-going noise, odour, dust etc).

Background on representations

Indigo Planning has made representations to the council throughout the consultation process for the emerging Local Plan:

- Pre-publication consultation - representations were submitted as Arlington Works was included in the 'locally important industrial land and business park allocation of 'Twickenham Film Studios and Arlington Works, St Margarets.' The council's response was to amend the proposed site allocation to exclude Arlington Works.
- Publication consultation – representations were submitted as the protection of waste uses, including Arlington Works, is not justified and therefore needs to be amended.

There was a change in the site allocation affecting our client's land following the pre-publication consultation. However, the site remains affected by Policy LP24 which requires the safeguarding of the Arlington Works site, rendering this policy unsound.

Waterman report

Function of Arlington Works

As part of this process, Sharpes appointed Waterman to undertake a detailed analysis of the current function of the site, in terms of the amount of waste the site deals with, where the waste comes from and to demonstrate that the site, as referred to in the WLWP, does not serve the WLWP area or indeed the wider London area. The evidence base underpinning the West London Waste Plan has also been analysed.

In terms of the waste processed at Arlington Works, 83% comes from sources outside of London. The remaining amounts are identified by Waterman (refer to section 3.1.1). It is concluded that the remaining amount of waste that would need to be processed at an alternate location to meet the requirements of Policy WLWP 2 is approximately 1,000 tonnes per annum.

The conclusions of the Waterman report also highlight that the area of the site that actually operates as a waste use is only 0.05ha and according to the assessment criteria of the sites for the safeguarding within the WLWP, this area is too small for waste management uses. It is therefore an incorrect approach for the WLWP to safeguard the total area of the site as a waste site.

Suitability for other waste uses

It has been established that Arlington Works is not a suitable location for alternative waste uses. This is based on national and regional guidance for new or enhanced waste management facilities. It is also due to the nature of the access route and the location of the site within an existing residential area.

It is noted that the evidence base and further policy background for waste sites and notes that the site scored poorly against the WLWP site selection criteria and was consequently ranked 286th out of 309 assessed sites for the WLWP

and 75th out of the 87 existing waste sites.

Refer to section 3.1.1 of the Waterman report for additional detail.

Assessment

Arlington Works is occupied by various uses including an operational waste use. The specific nature of the waste use only amounts to approximately 0.05ha of the site, therefore demonstrating that the safeguarding of the site as a whole is not justified.

The scale of the existing waste use also means that the provision of an alternative waste use on site is not appropriate. Waterman assert that along with the challenges associated with site access and nearby residential dwellings, national waste guidance requires at least 0.15ha for a small scale anaerobic digestion.

It is clear from the above that the continued use of the site as an industrial, commercial and waste site not protected by Policy WLWP 2.

Assessment of Policy LP24

Paragraph 182 of the NPPF. The criteria requires that all policies in the Local Plan are:

- Positively prepared;
- Justified;
- Effective; and
- Consistent with national policy

We consider that Policy LP 24, is unsound. The policy is not positively prepared, justified, effective, or consistent with national policy.

Positively prepared – Policy LP24 is not positively prepared in the case of Arlington Works as it has been justified that the policy, through the West London Waste Plan incorrectly identifies Arlington Works as a 0.23ha site when in fact it is 0.05ha.

The existing waste use currently operating on the site processes 83% of waste material from sources outside of London. The sources lie across east and west Midlands, east, south east, south and southwest England and South Wales.

Justified – The protection of Arlington Works as part of Policy LP24 is not the most appropriate strategy for the protection of waste sites within the borough. Further, the West London Waste Plan Policy WLWP 2 and the corresponding evidence base are unjustified in protecting the entire Arlington Works site (0.23ha) when the waste use is only permitted on 0.05ha of the site. This means that Arlington Works should not be safeguarded under Policy LP24 or WLWP 2.

Effective – Policy LP24 is not effective due to the evidence base underpinning the Local Plan and the West London Waste Plan. It does not positively and proactively respond to strategic priorities.

Consistent with national policy – Policy LP 24 has not been prepared in accordance with National Planning Policy for Waste (2014). This document sets out specific steps that waste planning authorities should follow in preparing their Local Plans as well as criteria against which waste planning authorities should assess the suitability of sites and/or areas for new or enhanced waste management facilities.

Recommended changes to Policy LP24

The council is requested to take a positive approach to development as advocated in the NPPF. A positive approach will ensure that the existing and future needs can be met in the plan period.

In terms of Policy LP 24, we recommend the amendment as set out below:

‘Waste Management

The Council will ensure that waste is managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy, which is to reduce, reuse or recycle waste as close as possible to where it is produced. The Council will require the following:

1. All developments, including conversions and changes of use are required to provide adequate refuse and recycling storage space and facilities, which allows for ease of collection and which residents and occupiers can easily access, in line with the Council's SPD on Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements.
2. All developments need to ensure that the management of waste, including the location and design of refuse and recycling facilities, is sensitively integrated within the overall design of the scheme, in accordance with policies on Local Character and Design.
3. Development proposals, where appropriate, should make use of the rail and the waterway network for the transportation of construction, demolition and other waste. Development proposals in close proximity to the river should utilise the river for the transport of construction materials and waste where practicable.
4. All major developments, and where appropriate developments that are likely to generate large amounts of waste, are required to produce site waste management plans to arrange for the efficient handling of construction, excavation and demolition waste and materials.

Proposals affecting existing waste management sites **(with the**

exception of Arlington Works), as well as proposals for new or additional waste management facilities, will be assessed against the policies of the West London Waste Plan (2015).”

The above change ensures that Arlington Works is not prejudiced by Policy LP 24, the West London Waste Plan and its associated evidence base as:

- It has been demonstrated that the existing waste use on the site is less than the recommended threshold for waste sites to be protected.
- The scale of the existing waste use also means that the provision of an alternative waste use on site is not appropriate. Waterman assert that along with the challenges associated with site access and nearby residential dwellings, national waste guidance requires at least 0.15ha for a small scale anaerobic digestion.