



Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 13 December 2005

Site visit made on 13 and 14 February 2006

by **John Woolcock** BNatRes(Hons) MURP DipLaw
MPIA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for
Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/09 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date

- 2 JUN 2006

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/A/05/1189822

The Ferme Park Depot, Cranford Way, Hornsey, London N8 9DG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by London Concrete Ltd against the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application Ref.HGY/2005/0007, is dated 2 December 2004.
- The development proposed is the erection of a concrete batching plant, with associated hoppers, conveyors and ancillary facilities.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted subject to conditions set out below in the Formal Decision.

Preliminary Matters

1. The Inquiry opened on 13 December 2005 and continued on 14, 15 and 16 December, 10 and 11 January, 15, 16 and 17 February and 20 March 2006. Evening sessions were undertaken on 14 December 2005 and 15 February 2006. The accompanied site inspection included visits to London Concrete's Battersea and Wembley facilities and to the Tolworth site.¹ I also undertook unaccompanied visits to Cranford Way and the locality on 16 and 19 March 2006.
2. A revised scheme from that originally submitted with the application was submitted on 27 June 2005. The revised scheme rotated the plant away from Chettle Court, added an acoustic screen, reduced the height of the plant and conveyor, and fully enclosed the point at which conveyors discharged into the storage bins and plant. It is the scheme (shown on Drawing Nos.2416/10D and 2416/20C) that I have used in my consideration of the appeal. I have had regard to artist's impressions of the plant and storage bins as illustrative material not forming part of the application.
3. The Council failed to make a decision on the planning application in the required amount of time. However, had it been able to do so, the Council would have refused the application because it considered the proposal to be contrary to UDP Policies in respect of amenity (DES 1.9), pollution (RIM 3.2) and employment (EMP 3.1 and 3.5).
4. The First Secretary of State directed by letter dated 18 November 2005 that the development is not EIA development for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations.

¹ Extant permission granted on appeal Ref:APP/Z5630/A/03/1136175.

5. A unilateral planning obligation dated 20 March 2006 by Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd and London Concrete Ltd provides for a construction management plan, dust management scheme, ecological management plan and noise management scheme.

Main Issues

6. I consider the main issues in this appeal to be the effects of the proposed development on:
 - (a) The living conditions of nearby residents, with particular reference to noise, disturbance, vibration, dust and air pollution.
 - (b) Other uses in the locality, employment provision and the local economy.

Planning Policy

7. The development plan for the area includes the Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, The London Plan (TLP), which was adopted in 2004. It also includes the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP), which was adopted in 1998. The majority of the appeal site lies within a Defined Employment Area (DEA) (Policy EMP 1.3), with the remainder undesignated. It adjoins an ecological corridor and local ecologically valuable site (Policy OP 4.1). The UDP is being revised and the emerging plan (eUDP) has reached an advanced stage. Policies most relevant to the main issues in this appeal are included in the Annex to this decision. I have had regard to relevant national guidance.

Reasons

Local context

8. The appeal site was previously part of Hornsey Goods Yard, as was the adjoining Cranford Way Industrial Estate. It comprises operational railway land to the south-west of Ferme Park down sidings, which extend along the western side of the East Coast Main Line between Hornsey and Haringay Stations. The appeal site also includes a part of Cranford Way over which Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd has a legal right of way. Cranford Way is located off a gyratory system that comprises a one-way section of Tottenham Lane (A103), Church Lane (A103), which is also one-way, and part of Hornsey High Street (A504).
9. To the east of the rail corridor there are dwellings facing Wightman Road (180 metres from the proposed plant). The terraced houses in Uplands Road are about 118 metres west of the proposed batching plant. Chettle Court lies some 132 metres to the south. This is a 7/8 storey 'L' shaped block with some 93 apartments facing towards the appeal site and 54 facing the rail corridor. The land rises to the south of the appeal site so that the ground level of Chettle Court is about 22 metres above that of the appeal site.

Proposal

10. The scheme proposes a modern concrete batching plant with aggregate (including sand) transported by rail. Rail wagons would unload into a Bottom Discharge Hopper (BDH). Aggregate would be transported from the BDH by conveyor to a 2,000 tonne capacity enclosed overhead storage bin. When required, aggregate would be transferred by a further conveyor to the batching plant, which would include 400 tonne capacity overhead aggregate storage. The plant would be fully enclosed in steel cladding. Cement and other cementitious materials would be discharged into integral silos direct from road tankers via a sealed system using compressed air. Two loading points would provide a pan mixer for collect loads and a half wet loading point for truck mixers.

11. There is concern about the capacity of the proposed facility and considerable time was taken at the Inquiry about the likely number of fills per mixer per day, and the resultant traffic generation. However, the Appellant would accept a number of conditions that would limit the overall capacity of the plant. Train deliveries of aggregate would be restricted to an average of four, and a maximum of 4,050 tonnes of aggregate, per week. The delivery of cement by road would be restricted to no more than an average of three per day, with a maximum of four in any one day (Monday-Friday) and a maximum of two on Saturday. Other proposed constraints are as follows:
 - (a) A maximum of five operational mixer trucks to be based at or operate from the plant on any one day.
 - (b) No more than an average of 50 operational mixer truck movements per day (25 in and 25 out) with a maximum of 60 such movements in any one day on Monday-Friday, with no more than 30 such movements (15 in and 15 out) on Saturday.²
 - (c) No more than an average of six private concrete vehicle movements per day (3 in and 3 out) with a maximum of 10 such movements (5 in and 5 out) in any one day on Monday-Saturday.
12. Such conditions would effectively limit the overall capacity of the proposed plant and the traffic it would generate on any one day. However, it would not restrict periods of concentrated activity during a day, which I consider below. Given the local context, I consider that it would be reasonable, in the event that planning permission were to be granted, to restrict the capacity of the proposed facility along the lines outlined above. I have, therefore, dealt with the appeal on the basis that reasonable planning conditions could effectively restrict the operational capacity of the proposed concrete batching plant.

Traffic generation

13. If the conditions in paragraph 11 above were to be imposed the average HGV movements would be 62 per day. The worst case traffic generation for HGVs from the proposed plant would comprise 8 cement delivery movements, 60 operational mixer truck movements, and 10 private concrete vehicle movements, giving a total of 78 movements per day. In addition, provision for 20 car movements per day for employees driving to work would be a reasonable estimate. On this basis, increased traffic levels resulting from the proposal on Tottenham Lane and Church Lane would be less than 1% of the flows recorded in 2005.³
14. I have had regard to the other traffic surveys adduced. With respect to HGV movements Green N8 considers that the increase in large vehicles (32 tonne 4 axle HGVs) resulting from the proposal should be compared with the number of such large vehicles currently using the local road network. However, it seems to me that large vehicles associated with the proposed plant would be seen within the context of other HGVs of various sizes and shapes using local roads, and that it is appropriate to assess the impact of the proposed development on the basis of the broader definition of HGVs normally used in traffic assessments.

² The Appellant considers that this suggested condition should include some flexibility to allow the Council to permit additional movements in circumstances where this was sustainable. I consider this later.

³ The 2005 12-hour survey on Tottenham Lane east of Cranford Way recorded an existing flow of 7,001 vehicles (of which 378 were HGVs and buses) for Church Lane 5,520 (of which 194 were HGVs and buses), for Tottenham Lane south of Church Lane 11,760 (of which 546 were HGVs and buses).

15. The worst case 78 HGV movements per day cited above would result in an additional 39 HGVs using the one-way section of Tottenham Lane, which would be about a 10% increase in the number of HGVs/buses using this route. Additional flows on Church Lane (one-way north) and Tottenham Lane south of Church Lane (two-way) would depend upon destinations and routes followed. On the assumption that vehicles would return along the outbound route, then irrespective of the proportion of the 39 HGVs that turned right into Church Lane or carried on along Tottenham Lane, all 39 HGVs would use Church Lane either leaving or returning to the site, resulting in about a 20% increase in the number of HGVs/buses using Church Lane. HGVs represent some 3.5% of existing flow on Church Lane, and on the basis of the above additional traffic, this would rise to about 4.2%. If all the HGVs carried on along Tottenham Lane this would result in about a 14% increase in the number of HGVs/buses using Tottenham Lane south of Church Lane.⁴
16. A survey in 2005 recorded that the total flow on Cranford Way was 939 vehicles, with 122 HGVs and buses.⁵ If the proposed development resulted in 78 HGV movements along Cranford Way and 20 car movements, this would represent an overall increase of about 10% in vehicle flow, and about a 64% increase in the number of HGVs/buses using this private industrial estate road.
17. The Institute of Environmental Assessment (IEA) has published guidelines to help an assessor to decide if a predicted increase in traffic is worthy of detailed assessment or can be 'screened out'. Whilst these guidelines have no policy status, I have had regard to them as a useful indicator in assessing the possible effects of additional traffic. The guidelines suggest two broad rules-of-thumb to delimit the scale and extent of assessment. The first provides for assessment where traffic flows would increase by more than 30% (or the number of HGVs would increase by more than 30%), and the second adds that other specifically sensitive areas where traffic flows would increase by 10% or more should be assessed.⁶ I accept that the appeal site lies within a sensitive area for the purposes of the IEA guidelines by reason of the number of dwellings and community uses, and people walking and cycling, along roads likely to be used by traffic from the proposed plant. However, I do not consider that the IEA guidelines should be read as indicating a need for assessment where HGV flows would increase by 10% or more.

Living conditions

Noise, disturbance and vibration

18. The proposal would not add significantly to the hundreds of trains that use this major rail corridor each weekday.⁷ I acknowledge that freight trains have different noise characteristics from passenger trains and that traction noise and vibration components tend to be more pronounced. However, freight trains already use the rail corridor and aggregate trains would use an existing siding that currently holds rolling stock and has in the past been used for holding freight trains. I consider that noise from additional freight trains would not

⁴ See footnote 3.

⁵ A survey in 2003 recorded 996 total flow with 264 HGVs and buses. During the intervening period TNT, a parcel distribution operator, vacated one of the largest units on the estate.

⁶ Guidance Notes No.1 *Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic*, Institute of Environmental Assessment.

⁷ The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) refers to 240 trains passing the site daily. This appears to be based on correspondence from English Welsh & Scottish Railways Ltd (EWS), but a later statement by EWS says that according to the latest timetable 640 passenger and freight trains pass between Alexandra Palace and Hornsey on the East Coast Main Line in both directions over a 24 hour weekday.

significantly add to existing noise levels along this busy rail corridor. The Appellant would have no control over the arrival and departure times of trains.⁸ However, unloading of railway wagons, which would take two to three hours, would occur within the operating hours of the plant.⁹ Planning Policy Guidance Note 24: *Planning and Noise* (PPG24) advises that local noise from such operations should be treated in the same way as noise from industrial sources. Survey data from the Wembley BDH estimates noise levels of 36 dB and 31 dB ($L_{Aeq, T}$ where T is the duration of the discharge activity) at dwellings in Wightman Road (180 metres from the proposed BDH) and Chettle Court (300 metres). These levels, which do not include an effect from any screening or enclosure, are some 10 dB below the level calculated in relation to other activity on site (which I consider later), and so would not materially increase the higher noise emission levels. It was evident at my site inspection that aggregate size affects the noise level, and I have noted concern about the possible use of air hoses and hammers to dislodge aggregate from the sides and from beneath the wagons. Nonetheless, the discharge of aggregate would take place inside a building, albeit one that was open at both ends, where physical and administrative measures could be taken to control noise from the BDH.

19. The Appellant's noise assessment identifies the main sources of noise from the proposed development as vehicle movements and concrete fill operations. The latter is noisier because vehicle engines operate at fast idle to power the rotating mixing barrel. Based on measurements from the Wembley plant, the Appellant calculates a combined noise emission level of 41 dB at Chettle Court (including a screening attenuation of 13 dB from a five metre high acoustic screen adjacent to the loading bay¹⁰) and 47 dB at Wightman Road properties. These levels would be within the World Health Organisation (WHO) guideline values of 50-55 dB.¹¹ The guideline values are applicable over a 16 hour time-base, but given the proposed operating times the Appellant employed the index $L_{Aeq, 12hr}$ for assessment purposes. The proposed plant would be a non-anonymous varying noise source, whereas the WHO guidelines refer to a steady continuous noise. Even if a broader view should be taken about the type of noise source to which the WHO guidelines apply, PPG24 advises that the likelihood of complaints about noise from industrial development can be assessed, where the standard is appropriate, using the guidance in BS 4142.¹² I do not, therefore, consider that the WHO guidelines/BS 8332 should necessarily be decisive here, even if the Appellant's noise expert is correct that the use of the L_{Aeq} index penalises varying noise sources in a BS 4142 assessment.

⁸ The SoCG states that EWS has advised that likely path times would result in expected arrival of trains at 0640 and departure at 1015, but that these would be at the discretion of Network Rail.

⁹ The Appellant would accept a condition that the use would not operate outside of the hours of 0700 to 1900 Monday-Friday and 0700 to 1300 on Saturday, nor at any time on Sunday, Bank or Public Holidays.

¹⁰ The Council considers this to be an over estimate of likely performance of the barrier, but I am satisfied that an acoustic screen could be designed to achieve this attenuation.

¹¹ PPG24 refers to BS 8332 *Sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings*, which states that in gardens and balconies it is desirable that the steady noise level does not exceed 50 $L_{Aeq, T}$ and 55 dB should be regarded as the upper limit. Minerals Policy Statement 2: *Controlling and Mitigating the Environmental Effects of Minerals Extraction in England* (MPS2) Annex 2: Noise cites the WHO *Guidelines for Community Noise* (1999) that "to protect the majority of people from being seriously annoyed during the daytime, the outdoor sound level from steady continuous noise should not exceed 55dB L_{Aeq} on balconies, terraces, and outdoor living areas. To protect the majority of people from being moderately annoyed during the daytime, the outdoor sound level should not exceed 50dB L_{Aeq} ."

¹² BS 4142:1997 *Method for Rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas*. This provides that a difference between rating and background levels of around +10 dB or more indicates that complaints are likely. A difference of around +5 dB is of marginal significance. A difference of - 10 dB is a positive indication that complaints are unlikely.

20. The weighing and mixing of raw materials for concrete is an industrial activity, although partly undertaken within a mixer mounted on a truck. I accept that vehicles moving around the site would mean that some noise sources would be mobile, which could affect predictions and attenuation possibilities. However, the batching/loading bay and BDH, would be fixed installations, and I consider that the plant would give rise to a noise source of an industrial nature in commercial premises, to which BS 4142 would apply. I also consider that the noise would be irregular enough to attract attention and so a 5 dB correction, as indicated in BS 4142, would be appropriate. An assessment on this basis, using the Appellant's figures, results in the rating level exceeding the background noise level by +4 dB at Chettle Court and +3 dB at Wightman Road, which would be of marginal significance.
21. The Council considers, on the basis that the noisier filling operation would be intense for short periods, that a five minute reference time interval should be adopted. A statutory nuisance case concerning the operation of a transonic wind tunnel for the aerodynamic testing of aircraft models was cited in support of this view.¹³ However, there is nothing to indicate that the pattern of noise emission in that case would be directly comparable with the pattern of emissions likely from the proposed concrete batching plant. A one hour measuring period might allow for some averaging down of the noise level, but I do not consider that the nature of noise events likely from the proposed plant would indicate that a five minute period would be more characteristic of the degree of disturbance. I do not consider that a convincing case has been made to depart from the one hour reference time interval, which BS 4142 advises is appropriate during the day.
22. The noise experts concur on a background level at the rear of Chettle Court ($L_{A90} = 42$ dB). I have no reason to disagree.¹⁴ However, the survey, to the rear of properties along Wightman Road, which determined a background level of 49 dB, is challenged by the Council. I share the Council's reservations, especially as the site surveyed is some distance from those properties in Wightman Road that would be closest to the proposed batching plant.¹⁵ Whilst I do not consider the survey to be sufficiently robust, there is anecdotal evidence that noise from the railway corridor adversely affects the residential amenity of occupiers of dwellings in Wightman Road. I consider below whether a condition could address the deficiencies in the background survey.
23. The Appellant's assessment is based on an even distribution of fills throughout the day, i.e. about 2.1 fills per hour. In my experience periods of concentrated activity are characteristic of the building industry.¹⁶ With corrections made at the Inquiry, the Council's noise expert predicted that at Chettle Court the difference between the rating level noise from the loading of five concrete trucks per hour and the background would be 4.3 dBA at 1.5 metres above the ground level and 5.2 dBA at 1.5 metres below roof level. Again, these would be of marginal significance. However, applying the formula relied upon by the Appellant to five fills in one hour, the combined rating level for fills and vehicle movements would

¹³ *R. (on the application of Aircraft Research Association Ltd) v Bedford Borough Council*, Environmental Law Reports, 2001 Vol 9 p700.

¹⁴ This figure was derived from surveys on different days and by different noise consultants.

¹⁵ The survey was undertaken near to New River for a limited period on one day. BS 4142 notes that more than one assessment may be appropriate.

¹⁶ Furthermore, observations made at ready mix concrete plants indicate that some five lorries can be filled in one hour. *Noise Assessment Proposed Ready Mix Concrete Plant Ferme Park, Hornsey*, RPS Planning, Transport & Environment, October 2005, which was commissioned by the Council but submitted to the Inquiry by the Appellant.

exceed background levels by 8 dB, which would be approaching the noise level at which complaints would be likely. I acknowledge that the Appellant's assumption of even distribution underestimates noise during periods when more activity could occur, such as at the start of the working day or following a spell of bad weather which halted building operations. However, the duration of such peaks in activity would be limited. In addition, I am not convinced that physical and administrative measures to limit noise at peak times have been exhaustively assessed. I do not, therefore, consider that periods of concentrated activity would be sufficient, by itself, to dismiss the appeal on noise grounds.

24. The 13 dB barrier effect applied above would only be effective when mixer trucks were directly behind the proposed 8.5 metre long acoustic screen. However, it was apparent from my site inspection that vehicle engines operate at fast idle whilst manoeuvring within the yard at times. In fact they would need to do so at the end of the day, or when mixers were taken out of service, and utilised the washout trough. Other possible sources of intrusive noise and disturbance could include the use of hammers or drills to dislodge encrusted concrete from the inside of mixing barrels, vehicle reversing sounders, compressors for discharging cement, and conveyors where these were not fully enclosed. I accept that some of these would be of limited duration, and I consider below whether they could be reasonably controlled by condition.
25. Part of Cranford Way has a one-way western loop that passes close to, and in some places above, the rear gardens of dwellings in Uplands Road. This is not part of the appeal site and vehicles visiting the proposed plant would have no right to use it. I acknowledge that a significant increase in the number of HGVs using the western loop could result in noise and disturbance for those living nearby. However, the use of the western loop by HGVs visiting the proposed plant could be restricted by measures such as signing and the design of the access to the plant. I consider that such measures would be effective and so the proposal would not result in undue noise and disturbance for those living near to the western loop.
26. On the wider road network the increases in traffic levels from the proposed plant would fall far short of that necessary to generate noise disbenefits.¹⁷ Even allowing for noise from mixer drums and for HGVs negotiating local hills, I do not consider that the additional traffic would have a significant effect on the noise levels experienced by those using and living near to local roads. I have had regard to local representations about land stability and the effects of vibration from HGVs. However, there is no compelling evidence to suggest that the proposal would result in ground-borne vibrations likely to result in subsidence or to significantly affect buildings or occupiers. Given the likely effects of traffic noise, it is unlikely that airborne vibration would be significant.
27. There is no technical evidence to support local suggestions that the topography creates an amphitheatre effect. However, noise reflected from Chettle Court could exaggerate any impact upon the garden, children's play area and court, which lie between Chettle Court and the proposed plant. This facility is an important community resource, and I have had regard to the advice in PPG24 that most residents expect a reasonable degree of peaceful enjoyment of their gardens and amenity areas. I have also taken into account that the scheme would be a change to the noise environment, which would be evident to many of those living nearby. This would influence the subjective response to any noise from the

¹⁷ *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges* Vol 11 Section 3 Part 7 Traffic Noise and Vibration, notes that disbenefits may arise from noise changes as small as 1dB(A), but that this is equivalent to an increase in traffic flow of 25%.

plant.¹⁸ A judgement has also to be made about likely community response to non-acoustic factors such as fear of the noise source, or heightened awareness or perception of non-noise problems.

28. Nonetheless, I believe that the nature of the proposal, along with the size and location of the appeal site, would provide scope for physical and/or administrative measures to control noise from the BDH, conveyors, compressors, reversing sounders, along with the cleaning and maintaining of mixers. Taking into account all the evidence before me about noise, I consider that emissions could be minimised at source, thereby controlling noise to acceptable levels. PPG24 advises that a noise limit condition would allow the developer to achieve the required noise level in whatever way was considered most cost-effective. This would also apply to measures devised to limit noise at times of concentrated activity. I do not consider that the imposition of conditions to achieve acceptable noise levels would prevent the plant from operating in the manner intended.
29. *The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy* refers to gradual upward creep in background noise levels and states that avoiding creep could require new sources to be 10 dB below the background.¹⁹ I acknowledge that repeated application of BS 4142 could, in some circumstances, result in 'creeping ambient', but it seems to me that a strategy to deal with this by means of setting rating levels at or below background levels would need to be promoted as a specific local policy initiative to deal with the possible cumulative effects of development. I do not consider that TLP Policy 4A.14 provides such a policy basis. I was not referred to any such specific policy, and have had regard to that part of the *Strategy* which adds that judgement needs to be exercised in relation to local circumstances and that sustainable development requires a pragmatic approach. In this case, I consider that a condition limiting noise to marginal significance i.e. a rating level not exceeding background noise levels by more than 5 dB, would restrict noise to an acceptable level.²⁰
30. I consider that background levels at Wightman Road could be determined as part of a compliance noise monitoring condition that would also require prior approval of how, where, and when noise would be measured, who would be responsible, and how results would be assessed and used.²¹ The positions determined for measurement could have regard to the effects on amenity areas at Chettle Court, and the rear gardens of the nearest dwellings in Uplands Road and Wightman Road.²² A scheme to be submitted for prior approval could be required to demonstrate that the noise limit could be achieved.²³
31. Subject to appropriate conditions I do not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the living conditions of those living nearby by reason of noise, disturbance or vibration.

¹⁸ The Forward to BS 4142 notes that response to noise is subjective and affected by many factors, not only the margin by which it exceeds background levels, but also its absolute level, time of day, the change in noise environment, as well as local attitudes to the premises and the nature of the neighbourhood.

¹⁹ *Souder City The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy*, Greater London Authority, March 2004.

²⁰ Based on BS 4142:1997 and PPG24 Model condition 17.

²¹ The planning obligation does not adequately address these matters. However, it does provide for regular reviews of the effectiveness of the noise management scheme.

²² PPG24 notes that a disadvantage of such conditions is that in order to ensure compliance, noise emissions must be monitored, but adds that whilst this may be costly and time-consuming this should not be regarded as sufficient reason for not using such conditions where they are appropriate.

²³ Based on PPG24 Model condition 13.

Dust and air pollution

32. Local residents expressed strong opposition to the proposal on air pollution grounds, but the Council limits its case on dust to track-out and perception or 'the fear factor'. The Appellant acknowledges that there is little effective screening from the effects of dust between the site and the closest potentially sensitive receptors, but considers that dust and air quality assessments conclude that the operation of the plant would be unlikely to have any harmful impact.
33. Haringey has declared the Borough an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and has drafted an air quality action plan, which includes action to reduce emissions from vehicles and to reduce traffic volumes. No detailed base-line dust deposition monitoring or survey of inhalable particles has been undertaken for the appeal site. However, it seems to me that these could be required, if necessary, as part of monitoring undertaken for Local Air Pollution Prevention and Control (LAPPC), to which the proposal would be subject.
34. Dust and inhalable particles from construction could be controlled in accordance with an approved construction management plan. Rail wagons would be uncovered, but there is no evidence that this would generate unacceptable dust emissions locally. It is likely that any fugitive dust would be released in transit prior to arrival at Ferme Park down sidings. Some evidence of dust emissions from the BDH at Wembley was apparent at my site inspection. However, no dust suppression measures of the type proposed in the appeal scheme appeared to be in use. The dust management scheme would provide, if aggregates were dry and potentially dusty, that rail wagons would be conditioned with water prior to discharge, and that further water would be applied, as necessary, during discharge to control any visible dust. Given that discharge would take place in a building, I am satisfied that measures could be taken to control dust. This is a matter that could be addressed by a planning condition.
35. Notwithstanding the detail shown on the application plans it is proposed that conveyors would be fully covered and fully enclosed at points of discharge. Although the conveyors would extend for some 140 metres and would rise about 15 metres above the ground, I am satisfied that they could be designed with appropriate wind-guards and dust arrestment features so as to provide adequate protection against wind-whipping and dust dispersal.
36. The batching plant and cement silos would be fully enclosed and of a modern design, incorporating features such as extraction ducts, alarms and filters to minimise pollution. The dust management scheme would limit dry batching.
37. The manoeuvring of vehicles in the yard and the clearing of settlement pits could result in wind blown dust. There is a slight risk of adverse impact to properties in Wightman Road due to the high frequency of winds from the south-west and west, but I believe that planning conditions and the measures proposed in the dust management scheme would reduce this risk to an acceptable level. The dust deposition rates at an older batching plant (with fewer dust control measures than is proposed for the appeal scheme) indicate that dust emissions from the appeal scheme would be unlikely to have an unacceptable effect on the amenity of the area.
38. The body and wheels of vehicles would be a possible source of dust.²⁴ The evidence before

²⁴ Process Guidance Note 3/1 (04) *Secretary of State's Guidance for Blending, Packing, Loading, Unloading and Use of Bulk Cement*, 2004.

me is that it would not be possible to eliminate the track-out of residue on trucks. Furthermore, it would not be appropriate, because of possible harmful effects on adjoining businesses, to rely on any residue falling off vehicles along Cranford Way before they reached the public highway. However, the use of wash-down and wheel-cleaning facilities could minimise track-out. Subject to the installation and use of appropriate cleaning facilities, I believe that track-out could be reduced to an acceptable level. Private collections could pose an additional risk of track-out because of greater drop heights, dryer material and use of open/uncovered trucks, but drop heights/types of chutes would be a matter for the design of the plant, and a condition could require loads to be covered. With respect to Cranford Way, the dust management scheme would provide for it to be wet-swept twice weekly, which would be beneficial given the observed dust deposits.²⁵ I do not consider that the additional HGVs using local roads would significantly increase the extent to which traffic raised dust from these roads.

39. Concrete spillage on roads is unsightly, a hazard to road users and a source of dust. Photographs submitted at the Inquiry highlighted this problem, but there is no evidence about the particular circumstances in which these spillages occurred, i.e. whether they resulted from over-fill, leakage, or inadequate maintenance. Furthermore, such deposits onto the carriageway are the subject of other legislation. Enforcement might be problematic. However, denying permission for a batching plant in order to control concrete spillage would, in the circumstances that apply here, be disproportionate and unreasonable given the existence of other controls.
40. A written statement by a toxicologist states that the main health issue from the proposed plant relates to dust levels, including respirable crystalline silica, but concludes that no adverse health effect would be likely to be suffered by workers or neighbouring receptors because the design of the plant would minimise dust generation and release.²⁶ I was referred to the high incidence of respiratory illness in the area, and note the grave concerns expressed by local residents about the health implications of the proposal. In particular health workers and local residents are concerned about the cumulative effects of PM₁₀ emissions from construction of the proposed plant, its operation and from vehicles associated with it. However, I consider that the emission of PM₁₀ particles at the construction stage is a matter that could be considered in the proposed construction management plan. PM₁₀ concentrations due to fugitive emission from the plant have not been assessed, but the Council's advisors note that emission factors are unreliable for the concrete batching process making predictions for PM₁₀ concentrations impossible to quantify.²⁷ The traffic figures used in the modelling for PM₁₀ and NO₂ emissions were less than the worst case scenario outlined in paragraph 11 above, but I do not consider that the small difference in vehicle numbers would appreciably affect this assessment. The modelling estimated that incremental PM₁₀ concentrations would be very low, and the predicted increase in NO₂ concentration would be unlikely to be discernible in the context of the existing air quality and daily variation. Local concern was expressed about PM_{2.5} emissions, but this fraction of PM₁₀ emissions would be included in the modelling referred

²⁵ A site visit in 2003 noted loose, potentially dusty deposits on the roads and pavements throughout the industrial area (*Airborne Dust Assessment*, Smith Grant LLP, November 2003). Casella Stanger's *Peer Review*, dated September 2005, also observed dust deposits on Cranford Way and considered the likely source to be re-suspension and entrainment of dust deposited from vehicles entering and leaving the industrial estate.

²⁶ *Evaluation of Health Issues*, Dr AJ Ingram November 2005, submitted by the Appellant. As a written representation this was not subject to cross-examination.

²⁷ Casella Stanger's *Peer Review*, dated September 2005.

to above.²⁸

41. I have taken into account all the material adduced about the use of cement and concrete, but find nothing that amounts to compelling evidence that the emission of inhalable particles from the proposed development would justify dismissing the appeal on health grounds. Health practitioners consider that permission should not be granted without a specific health impact assessment. I do not accept that insufficient information is available to determine the planning application, and note that the proposed plant would also be subject to pollution controls. The pollution control system complements the planning system and ensures that ambient air and water quality meet standards that guard against impacts to the environment and human health.²⁹ These would involve regular inspection and review of conditions. I do not consider that there is compelling evidence here of any residual pollution impact that would amount to a material planning consideration which by itself would justify dismissing the appeal.
42. I acknowledge that catastrophic failure of the plant or its pollution control devices resulting in the release of cement could have land use implications for residential and commercial premises in the vicinity. However, there is no evidence that the technology and equipment widely utilised in other concrete batching plants and in handling cement in accordance with Process Guidance Note 3/1 has proved to be unreliable. I consider that this limits the weight that can be given to actual or perceived risks from the proposed plant in determining this appeal. Subject to appropriate conditions, I do not consider that the proposal would, by reason of dust and air pollution, have an unacceptable adverse effect on the amenity or health of those living and working nearby or using local roads.
43. On the first main issue, I do not consider that the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the living conditions of nearby residents, by reason of undue noise, disturbance, vibration, dust or air pollution. I find no conflict with the underlying aims of TLP Policies 4A.6 and 4A.14. I do not consider that the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of UDP Policies RIM 3 or RIM 3.2, and so it would accord with the objectives of Policies DES 1 and DES 1.9 insofar as the amenity of neighbours is concerned.

Other uses in the locality, employment provision and the local economy

44. The proposal would provide 12 additional jobs, but the Council considers that it would result in an overall net reduction of employment in the DEA because it would discourage businesses from locating in Cranford Way and may lead to some occupiers moving out of their existing premises.
45. The proposed plant, which would lie at the end of the estate road, would substantially increase the number of HGVs using Cranford Way. However, this is a private industrial estate road where a significant proportion of HGVs could reasonably be expected. In addition, there is evidence that Cranford Way has accommodated higher levels of HGV use in the past. I do not, therefore, consider that the number of HGVs would, by itself, unduly affect other users of the estate. Some existing operators might need to modify current practice with respect to parking, loading and open storage along Cranford Way so as to maintain a through route at all times, but I do not consider that any such changes would significantly affect these businesses.

²⁸ PM₁₀ is a measure of particles with diameter of less than 10 micrometres.

²⁹ Planning Policy Statement 23: *Planning and Pollution Control* (PPS23).

46. Existing enterprises which might be sensitive to dust have operated on the estate in the past, notwithstanding the level of dust on Cranford Way observed by the dust experts and apparent at my site visits. I am satisfied that the appeal scheme would not, given the dust control measures proposed, make the situation any worse. It would be unlikely, therefore, that existing businesses would vacate the estate because of the effects of dust from the proposed concrete batching plant.
47. The available evidence does not demonstrate that the number of vacancies on the estate, or the time taken to fill them, has been detrimentally affected by the market's fear or apprehension about an application for a concrete batching plant. The recent vacancies and turnover of premises are not so exceptional that they could not be reasonably explained by other commercial considerations. It seems to me that the changes within the estate described at the Inquiry are well within that which might be expected from the day-to-day operation of the property market, irrespective of any proposal for a concrete batching plant on the estate.
48. Cranford Way DEA currently comprises predominately light industry and Class B8 uses, but there is no policy presumption against appropriate B2 uses. Existing occupiers could not, therefore, reasonably rely on the existing mix of uses in the DEA always remaining so. Action for Kids occupies the corner site at the entrance to the estate, but its main access is via Tottenham Lane and I do not believe that additional HGVs using Cranford Way as a result of the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on these premises.
49. Shops and commercial properties along the main thoroughfares are a feature of the local centres in the wider area. Many of these have goods, including food, on open display in front of shops. However, in view of the existing traffic levels along these routes, I find it unlikely that additional vehicles from the appeal scheme would have an appreciable effect on local shops or businesses in the wider area.
50. On the second main issue, I do not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect upon other uses in the locality, or would unduly affect employment provision or the local economy. I find no conflict with the aims of UDP Policies EMP 1, EMP 2 or EMP 3. The proposed development would accord with the underlying objective of Policy EMP 1.3, and would not conflict with the aims of Policy EMP 3.1.

Other matters

Transport and highway safety

51. There is no evidence that the additional traffic from the proposed plant would affect the capacity of junctions near to the appeal site. I accept that the traffic gyratory at Tottenham Lane, Church Lane and High Street is congested at times, but the extra traffic generated by the proposal would be within the day-to-day variation of traffic flows that could be expected on such busy streets. The likely increase in HGVs on local roads, particularly Church Lane, might be apparent because of the distinctive mixer trucks that would operate from the proposed plant, but I do not consider that the increase would be significant in terms of traffic impact. St Mary's School occupies the corner site at the junction of Church Lane and Hornsey High Street, but given the boundary treatment and position of buildings, play areas and access, I do not consider that additional HGVs associated with the proposed plant on roads adjoining the school would have a significant effect on the school itself or those travelling to it. There is on-street parking in the vicinity of the appeal site, but it appeared from my site visits that the carriageway is wide enough to enable mixer trucks to

use these routes without causing undue obstruction. I do not consider that additional vehicles from the proposed plant would have a material effect on the Harringay Club, which has an access onto Ribblesdale Road.

52. Green N8's video also highlighted congestion at times on the wider network. I have had regard to the advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 *Transport* (PPG13), which promotes opportunities for freight generating development to be served by rail. It also advises that, where possible, developments generating substantial freight movements, particularly bulk goods, should be located away from congested central areas and residential areas, and ensure adequate access to trunk roads. However, the gyratory system that provides access to Cranford Way is designated as a 'London Distribution Route' in the road hierarchy proposed in the eUDP. This links into a network of other routes similarly designated in the hierarchy. It seems to me that these roads are intended to accommodate the type of local service trips that would be generated by the proposed development, especially as the text supporting eUDP Policy UD7 states that this hierarchy is consistent with the objectives of traffic restraint, with priority given to essential users, environmental improvements and road safety.
53. Much concern was expressed about the impact of the proposal on the 'ladder roads' between Green Lanes (A105) and Wightman Road. However, these are restricted routes, and I consider that any breach of highway controls would be readily apparent and that restrictions would be enforced and effective. I do not believe that a distinction should be drawn, insofar as respect for highway restrictions is concerned, between drivers employed by the operator of the proposed plant and self-employed drivers.
54. The Appellant argues that the overall effect of the proposal would be to reduce very significantly the overall number of lorry movements associated with development both within the local highway framework and generally. However, any reduction in HGV trips/mileage that would result from the rail transport of aggregate would need to be balanced against any increase in HGVs on the local network. Without detailed information about all such trips it is not possible to quantify this balance in numerical terms. Clearly there is advantage in using rail for transporting aggregate long distances, and the proposal would allow for cement to be delivered by rail in future should commercial considerations change in the future. I note that the supporting text in the UDP seeks the provision of additional rail freight facilities provided these do not give rise to undue local environmental disturbance. In addition, changes to the local pattern of HGV movements would need to take into account that mixer trucks from existing concrete batching plants located outside Haringey, but meeting local demand for concrete, would already be on the local network. Taking all these factors into account, I consider that the proposal gains substantial support from national and strategic policies for the sustainable transport of bulk materials.
55. There is no particular pattern of accidents on the local road network that would be exacerbated by traffic from the appeal scheme. I am not satisfied that the statistical evidence adduced about the proportion of accidents involving HGVs is sensitive enough to draw reliable conclusions about the relationship between HGVs and pedestrian/cyclists accidents. Taking account of all the representations about highway safety, I do not believe that the additional traffic movements generated by the proposed development would be likely to result in an unacceptable increase in risk to those using the highway. As a result, I do not consider that much weight can be given to submissions that the proposal would discourage pedestrians, cyclists, and children walking to school.

56. I have had regard to the many representations about traffic generation and genuine concern for highway safety. However, I am satisfied that traffic from the proposed plant could be effectively limited by condition. On this basis, I do not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the road network or the safety of highway users. I find that the proposal would accord with the aims of TLP Policy 3C.24 and UDP Policy TSP 1. I find no conflict with UDP Policies TSP 1.1 or TSP 6.5, and consider that the proposal would accord with the guidance in PPG13.

Character and appearance

57. The appeal site lies within an area that is characterised by a large industrial estate bounded by residential development, both of which adjoin a major rail corridor. The wider area comprises Victorian and Edwardian suburban development with a mix of residential areas, commercial areas and community facilities, including many schools, nurseries and playgroups.
58. The proposed batching plant and hoppers would be substantial structures, but a sufficient distance from residential properties so as not to have an overbearing impact or to dominate the outlook from nearby dwellings. Furthermore, the structures would not be out of keeping with the local context, which includes other large buildings on the estate and utilitarian plant and equipment associated with the rail corridor, including tall silos or tanks near to the appeal site. The site is some distance from Alexandra Palace and I consider that the proposed facility would, to a considerable degree, blend into the backcloth of buildings apparent in distant views from this elevated vantage point.
59. The Council's submission that the environmental capacity of the area has already been exceeded does not square with its allocations for additional development in both the UDP and eUDP. Furthermore, I do not consider that allowing this appeal would set a precedent for heavy industry in the area, nor lead to the inexorable expansion of such uses within the DEA. Adequate planning controls exist to deal appropriately with any such future development proposals on their own merits. For these reasons, I do not consider that the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. I find no conflict with the aims of UDP Policy DES 5.

Nature conservation

60. I am satisfied that the ecological management plan would reasonably safeguard the limited wildlife interest, as indicated by surveys, of the appeal site. The site adjoins an area of nature conservation interest, but it seems to me that the dust and drainage controls proposed would minimise any effect on the trees and wildlife in Stroud Green Bank. For similar reasons, the proposal would not have a significant effect on open spaces further afield, such as New River, Stationers Park, Hornsey memorial gardens and churchyard, and Finsbury Park. I do not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the adjoining ecological corridor and valuable site, or open space in the wider area. I find no conflict with TLP Policy 3D.12 or UDP Policies OP 4, OP 4.1 and OP 4.3. Neither do I consider that the proposal would conflict with relevant policies in eUDP or the guidance in Planning Policy Statement 9: *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation* (PPS9).

Need

61. The Council accepts that applications for concrete batching plants do not have to prove need and that demand for concrete, and therefore, the viability of the proposed plant, is not

a planning consideration.³⁰ However, local residents question the need for the facility given the proximity of other plants. They also dispute the demand for concrete on the basis of the limited development opportunities in the locality and the possibility of a revised housing allocation.

62. PPS23 Annex 1 provides that applicants do not normally have to prove the need for their proposed development, or discuss the merits of alternative sites. However, it refers to particular circumstances where these might be material to a planning decision. Given the nature of the proposal, its potential to pollute, along with its local context, all of which I consider in more detail above, I am satisfied that the circumstances which might determine that need is a material consideration do not arise here. I find, therefore, no requirement for proof of need or an assessment of other sites.

Fear

63. I have had regard to the petition against the proposal, the hundreds of written objections and the many thoughtful statements opposing the scheme by those who appeared at the Inquiry. These include passionate and honestly held opinion that the proposal, by reason of its environmental and health impact, would be harmful and socially disruptive. There is widespread and genuine fear about the effects of the proposed development, including that it would undermine local urban regeneration initiatives. However, as outlined above, the facility would be regulated by pollution controls. I consider, therefore, that these submissions fall short of the positive evidence that would be necessary to support public fear as an overriding consideration.
64. Furthermore, I do not consider that the level of scientific uncertainty about the consequences of the proposed plant is such that the best available scientific advice could not assess health risk with sufficient confidence to inform decision-making. Consequently, I do not believe that there is any justification here to invoke the precautionary principle.

Other considerations

65. I have had regard to submissions about the effects of other concrete batching plants. However, I am not satisfied that these are directly comparable, in terms of the plant and operation or local context, to the proposal before me. There is local concern that Ferme Park has little in common with other areas which the Appellant occupies in London. I do not believe that much weight can be given to such comparisons, and I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
66. I have taken into account all the other matters raised in the evidence, including local concern about the effect on house prices. However, this is not a consideration which can be given much weight having regard to the planning merits of the proposal. Neither these, nor any of the other matters raised, are sufficient to outweigh my conclusions on the main issues, which have led to my decision on this appeal.

Conditions

67. The Council has suggested conditions if the appeal were to be allowed, many of which the Appellant would accept. I have indicated the numbers of these draft conditions in [] below. Third parties dispute some of the conditions that were agreed by the main parties, and consider that additional conditions would be necessary. I have considered the need for

³⁰ SoCG paragraph 5.4.

conditions and their wording in the light of the advice contained in Circular 11/95 *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions*.

68. Given the nature of the proposed development it would need to be carried out in strict accordance with approved details [2]. I agree, for the reasons given above, that it would be necessary to restrict the operational capacity of the proposed concrete batching plant [3, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30]. The Appellant considers that the suggested condition to limit the number of HGV movements should include some flexibility to allow the Council to permit additional movements were this to be sustainable. However, I consider that this would be a matter about which other parties might reasonably wish to comment, and so agree with the Council that any such amendment would most appropriately be dealt with by means of an application to carry out development without complying with such a condition.
69. Restrictions on the commencement of concrete batching would be necessary in the interests of the amenity, character and appearance of the area [4, 5, 6, 7 and 37, 8]. The Council suggested a trial period to assess whether a wheel washing facility would be required [8(i)]. I consider that cleaning facilities would be necessary for the reasons given above. Preventing the breaking out of hardened concrete from mixers would be necessary on noise grounds [8(ii)]. Boundary treatment, landscaping and details of levels would be necessary in the interests of the appearance of the area [9, 10, 11, 12]. Noise conditions, as outlined above, would be necessary to safeguard the residential amenity of those living nearby [13, 14]. White noise sounders and alarms, the acoustic wall, and a restriction on amplifying equipment would be necessary for similar reasons [15, 16, 17, 18].
70. Dust control measures would be necessary in the interests of health and amenity [19, 20]. Loads would need to be covered to prevent dust and spillage [21]. Conditions concerning the transport of material and use of roads would be necessary in the interests of safety and amenity [23, 24, 26, 31]. Restrictions on aggregate crushing, concrete recycling and open storage would also be necessary on these grounds [32, 33]. The scheme relates to a particular modern plant and so would need to be conditioned as such, with other external plant and lighting requiring approval, and office and mess room accommodation restricted to ancillary use [34, 35, 36, 38]. Drainage would need to be controlled to safeguard the local environment [41, 42, 43].
71. The operating times of the proposed plant, along with times for construction, would need to be restricted to safeguard the amenity of those living nearby [39, 40]. Green N8 opposes both the unloading of aggregate and a start time of 0800 hours on Saturdays, and considers that construction work would need to end at 1700 hours. However, I do not consider that the noise evidence before me would justify these restrictions.
72. Where necessary the suggested conditions would need to be altered in accordance with the advice in Circular 11/95.
73. I do not consider that a condition concerning dry batching [22] would be necessary, as this would be addressed by the obligation. Measures to deal with any contaminated land during construction could be included in a construction management plan approved by the Council in accordance with the obligation. Green N8 suggested removing permitted development rights, but I do not consider that there are any exceptional circumstances here that would justify doing so.

Conclusions

74. Subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions I am satisfied that the proposal would not, by reason of noise or pollution, have an unacceptable adverse effect on those living nearby. It would have no significant indirect impact on those living, working or visiting community facilities further afield. Concern has been expressed about possible future applications to amend restricting planning conditions. However, any such applications would be determined having regard to the particular policies and circumstances that applied at that time.
75. The site is partly located within a DEA and I consider, for the reasons given above, that this is an appropriate location for the proposed development, which would accord with relevant employment policies.
76. I have found that the proposal would accord with relevant development plan policies and national guidance. It would also be consistent with the aims of policies in the eUDP. In my judgement, the widespread and genuine anxiety about the health and amenity impact of the proposal is not a consideration which indicates that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
77. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Formal Decision

78. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the erection of a concrete batching plant, with associated hoppers, conveyors and ancillary facilities at The Ferme Park Depot, Cranford Way, Hornsey, London N8 9DG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref.HGY/2005/0007, dated 2 December 2004, and the plans submitted therewith, as amended, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of five years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed in all respects in accordance with the proposals contained in the application and any plan or drawing submitted with the application or subsequently submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority in compliance with any of the following conditions before the use hereby permitted commences.
 - 3) Vehicles transporting concrete from the batching plant shall be either operational mixer trucks or private concrete vehicles, and no other type of vehicles. Other than in the types of emergency situations which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a maximum of five operational mixer trucks shall be based at or operate from the site on any one day. Details of the five mixer trucks operating from the site (including vehicle registration numbers) shall be provided in writing to the local planning authority prior to commencement of concrete batching, and any subsequent changes in these details shall be notified in writing to the local planning authority within 14 days.
 - 4) Concrete batching shall not commence until the rail unloading building, the storage hoppers and conveyors, and the settlement pits, washout trough and drying bay have been constructed in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in

writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter these facilities shall be retained and operated in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications and the requirements of any other operative condition of this permission.

- 5) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of the unloading facilities for materials from railway wagons (including measures to control noise and dust) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall take place in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of concrete batching and shall thereafter be retained.
- 6) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted full details of the materials, colour and texture of the external finish of the concrete batching plant, the office/messroom, hoppers, and rail unloading building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved scheme of details.
- 7) Parking, servicing and manoeuvring areas shall be surfaced with tar-macadam or concrete and drained before commencement of concrete batching. These areas shall be kept free from obstruction at all times, and shall not be used for any other purpose.
- 8) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of the washdown areas and facilities for cleaning out concrete mixer trucks shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall take place in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of concrete batching and shall thereafter be retained. Washing down and washing out of trucks shall not take place outside the designated washdown areas.
- 9) No breaking out of hardened concrete inside truck mixer drums shall take place on the site.
- 10) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of the means of enclosure for the boundaries of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall take place in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of concrete batching and shall thereafter be retained.
- 11) No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and these works shall be carried out as approved. This shall include details of measures to protect trees and vegetation to be retained, on or overhanging the site, during construction. Details of hard landscaping shall include surface materials, structures (e.g. refuse bins, signs, lighting, etc), communications cables, pipelines (indicating lines and manholes), etc. Details of soft landscaping shall include planting plans, written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate, an implementation programme and a landscape management plan. If, within a period of five years from the date of planting, any tree or plant is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies, another of the same species and size shall be planted at the same place, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

- 12) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of the levels of buildings, roads, parking areas and pathways within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
- 13) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a compliance noise monitoring programme specifying how, where, and when noise would be measured, who would be responsible, and how results would be assessed and used, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This programme shall establish baseline noise conditions at the residential dwellings in Wightman Road nearest to the site. Measurements shall be in accord with BS4142:1997, an equivalent successor standard or other noise measurement methodology approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the monitoring programme shall be approved in writing by the local planning authority. Throughout the lifetime of the development hereby permitted noise monitoring shall be carried out in accordance with the approved programme.
- 14) Notwithstanding the detail shown on Drawing Nos. 2416/10D and 20C, prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a scheme specifying physical and/or administrative provisions to control noise emanating from the site, to accord with the noise limit set out in condition 15 below, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and any sound insulation or attenuation measures specified in the approved scheme shall thereafter be retained.
- 15) The rating level of the noise emitted from the site shall not exceed the existing background noise level in the area, determined to be $L_{A90, 1hr} = 42$ dB at residential properties in Chettle Court and Uplands Road, and $L_{A90, 1hr}$ as determined in accordance with condition 13 above at residential properties in Wightman Road, by more than 5 dB. The measurements and assessment shall be made according to BS 4142:1997, an equivalent successor standard or other noise measurement methodology approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 16) Vehicles operating within the site and vehicles supplying the plant with materials shall have 'white noise' reversing sounders fitted and these shall be used at all times whilst the plant is operational.
- 17) Audible over-fill alarms of the 'white noise' type shall be fitted and used for the batching plant cement silos and shall thereafter be permanently retained.
- 18) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of the acoustic wall to be built between the batching plant and Chettle Court shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The acoustic wall shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of concrete batching and shall thereafter be retained.
- 19) No broadcasting or amplifying equipment shall be installed or used outside of the site offices.
- 20) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of measures to control and contain dust within the application site boundary (including dust from the aggregate unloading building, hoppers, batching plant, washdown areas and dry out areas) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to the commencement

of concrete batching and shall thereafter be retained and where relevant maintained in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.

- 21) Prior to the commencement of concrete batching all conveyor systems outside the plant buildings, and any new or replacement conveyors, shall be fully covered in accordance with details previously approved in writing by the local planning authority, and shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.
- 22) The loads of any vehicles transporting concrete from the concrete batching plant site or transporting waste materials from the dry out areas/settlement ponds, along Cranford Way, shall be enclosed, contained or otherwise covered and sheeted, so as to prevent concrete spillage and dust or other emissions from the loads.
- 23) All aggregates (including sand) shall only be transported to the site by rail, and not by any other means of transport (including by road) without prior written approval of the local planning authority.
- 24) The rail unloading building on the operational railway land shall be used only in connection with the delivery of materials to the concrete batching plant hereby permitted and for no other purpose.
- 25) There shall be no more than an average of four deliveries of aggregate (including sand), associated with the use hereby permitted, per week to provide a maximum of 4,050 tonnes of aggregate per week. The average number of deliveries shall be taken over a one month period. Unloading of the railway wagons in association with the use hereby permitted shall only occur within the rail unloading building and shall take place only within the operating hours as set out at Condition 38. Records of train delivery tonnages of aggregate shall be kept and made available for inspection by the local planning authority at the site office and a copy of these records shall be maintained for up to one year and made available to the local planning authority within five working days of such records being requested.
- 26) No development shall take place until details of a traffic control/management system for pedestrian and vehicular access has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of concrete batching and thereafter retained.
- 27) There shall be no more than an average of 50 operational mixer truck movements per day to and from the site (i.e. 25 in and 25 out) on a five day average (Monday to Friday) with a maximum of 60 operational mixer truck movements (i.e. 30 in and 30 out) on any one day (Monday to Friday) or 30 operational mixer truck movements (i.e. 15 in and 15 out) on a Saturday. The average shall be taken over the five days (Monday to Friday) in any one week.
- 28) There shall be no more than an average of six private concrete vehicle movements to and from the site (i.e. 3 in and 3 out) on a six-day average (Monday to Saturday) with a maximum of 10 private concrete vehicle movements (i.e. 5 in and 5 out) on any one day (Monday to Saturday). The average shall be taken over the six days (Monday to Saturday) in any one week.
- 29) There shall be no more than an average of three deliveries of cement (including cement replacement products such as pulverised fuel ash) by road per day to the site, on a six-day average (Monday to Saturday), with a maximum of four deliveries in

any one day (Monday to Friday) or two deliveries on a Saturday. The average number of deliveries to be taken over the six days (Monday to Saturday) in any one week.

- 30) Records of all HGV movements to and from the site (including the vehicle's registration, operating company's identity and time/date of movement), shall be available for inspection by the local planning authority at the site office and a copy of these records shall be maintained for up to one year and made available to the local planning authority within five working days of such records being requested.
- 31) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a scheme to include physical and administrative measures to prohibit the use of the 'western loop' part of Cranford Way by HGVs travelling to and from the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme prior to the commencement of concrete batching and any measures specified in the approved scheme shall thereafter be retained.
- 32) The use hereby permitted shall not include any aggregate crushing or concrete recycling and no such activity shall take place on the site.
- 33) No raw materials, finished or unfinished products, crates, packing materials or parts thereof or waste or any other materials shall be stacked or stored on the site except within the buildings or storage areas hereby permitted or such other areas as shall have been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 34) The concrete batching plant to be erected on the site shall be a Lanton Park LP2000 concrete batching plant or such other plant as shall be approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 35) No fans, louvers, ducts or any other external plant shall be installed without prior written approval of the local planning authority.
- 36) No external lighting shall be installed without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.
- 37) The office and mess room accommodation shall be used only for those purposes which shall be ancillary to the operation of the concrete batching plant.
- 38) No machinery shall be operated, no process shall be carried out, including the manufacture of concrete or the maintenance of plant, vehicles or equipment, and no deliveries taken at or despatched from the site outside the hours of 0700 to 1900 on Mondays to Fridays and 0700 to 1300 on Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.
- 39) Site and building works required to implement the development shall only be carried out between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays, and between 0800 and 1300 on Saturdays. No such works shall be undertaken on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.
- 40) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of a scheme for the future maintenance of the surface water system, including the settlement pits, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any subsequent amendment to the scheme shall be approved in writing by the local

planning authority. Throughout the lifetime of the development hereby permitted the surface water system shall be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

- 41) The construction of the surface and foul water drainage system shall be carried out before concrete batching commences in accordance with the details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water and foul water drainage system shall thereafter be retained.
- 42) No soak-away shall be constructed in contaminated ground.
- 43) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of a wheel-wash facility shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The wheel-wash facility shall be installed on the site in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of concrete batching and shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's instructions. Any vehicle leaving the concrete batching plant site shall only do so by passing through the wheel-wash facility.



INSPECTOR

ANNEX - POLICIES

1. The London Plan Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London 2004 (TLP).

- Objective 5 is to improve London's accessibility.
- Policy 3C.24 promotes the sustainable development of the full range of road, rail and water-borne freight facilities and seeks to improve integration between the modes. Policy 3D.12 deals with biodiversity and nature conservation.
- Policy 4A.5 sets out spatial policies to support better use of aggregates. Policy 4A.6 aims to reduce pollutant emissions and implement the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy. Formal air quality assessments should be undertaken where appropriate, particularly in designated Air Quality Management Areas. Policy 4A.14 aims to reduce noise by minimising the potential adverse impacts of noise from development proposals, and refers to the London Ambient Noise Strategy. The supporting text notes that major rail corridors are a principal source of ambient noise.

2. Haringey Unitary Development Plan 1998 (UDP).

- The appeal site lies partly within the Cranford Way Defined Employment Area (DEA). 'The Haringey Context' notes that economic activities are located in, amongst other areas, DEAs where the infrastructure exists primarily to serve a range of Business Use Class and related activities. It notes that access to and from some DEAs is through residential areas which if uncontrolled creates environmental problems.
- Policy EMP 1 and EMP 2 promote new employment uses and opportunities in appropriate locations, whilst Policy EMP 3 ensures that economic activities do not adversely affect the local amenity or transportation networks. Policy EMP 1.3 establishes that the priority within DEAs will be to sustain a special range of employment generating uses, including General Industrial Uses (Use Class B2). Policy EMP 3.1 aims for high standards in terms of, amongst other things, health hazard, pollution and noise control, townscape, local road networks and nature conservation interests.
- Policy DES 1 encourages good design in order to enhance the overall quality of the built environment, the attractiveness of the area for investment, economic regeneration and the amenity of residents. Policy DES 1.9 sets out criteria in order to protect the amenity of neighbours and, amongst other things, requires compliance with Policy RIM 3.2 (Pollution). Policy DES 5 aims to protect the character of residential areas and to sustain stable, secure residential neighbourhoods and communities. Policy RIM 3 seeks environmentally sustainable development by, amongst other things, minimisation of pollution and reduction of the need to travel. Policy RIM 3.2 seeks to protect or enhance the amenities of the area. It provides that planning permission would not normally be granted for development which caused noise, smell, smoke, soot, grit, dust, vibration or other forms of pollution or disturbance including traffic movements and vehicle obstruction above acceptable levels.
- Policy OP 4 seeks to create, enhance and protect areas for their ecological importance. Policy OP 4.1 presumes against development that would have an adverse effect on nature conservation. Policy OP 4.3 promotes nature conservation.

- Policy TSP 1 aims to integrate land use and transport. Policy TSP 1.1 requires proposals to be assessed for their contribution to traffic generation and their impact on congestion. Policy TSP 6.5 seeks to retain existing and provide additional rail freight facilities, provided that these do not give rise to undue local environmental disturbance.
3. Emerging Revised Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2004 (eUDP).
- The Cranford Way DEA is identified as an Industrial Location where Policy EMP1 aims to retain these areas solely for uses that fall with the B1(b) or (c), B2 or B8 use classes.
 - Policy UD2 sets out general principles for development. Policy UD7 supports proposals that take account of the function of adjacent roads and that would not result in inappropriate use or adversely affect the operation of roads in the area. Policy ENV5 seeks to control potential pollution. Policies EMP1 and EMP5 carry forward the aims of adopted employment policies. Policy OS5 aims to protect ecologically valuable sites and their corridors. Stroud Green Railway Embankment is designated as an 'Ecologically Valuable Site – Borough Grade II'. Policies OS10 and OS15 concern biodiversity. Policy M7 has a similar aim to adopted Policy TSP 6.5.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

James Maurici
of Counsel
He called

Instructed by the Head of Legal Services for the
Council.

Dani Fiumicelli

Capita Symonds Ltd, Buchanan House, 24-30
Holborn, London EC1N 2LX.

David Gurtler

Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners, 14 Regents Wharf,
All Saints St., London N1 9RC.

RULE 6(6) PARTIES

FOR GREEN N8:

Kulraj Dassaur of Counsel
Nick Flynn
Rachel Xuereb
They called

Instructed by Green N8.

Charles Keel
Kevin Sheridan
Cynthia Barlow
Jane Owen
Ofer Acco
Paul Soper

70A Uplands Road, London N8 9NT.
65 Burgoyne Road, London N4 1AB.
8A North Villas, London NW1 9BJ.
22A Uplands Road, London N8 9NL.
20 Uplands Road, London N8 9NL.
78 Inderwick Road, London N8 9JY.

FOR PARKSIDE RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION:

Cheryl Walton

14 Lothair Road, London N4 1EL.

FOR GREEN N4 & N15:

Mario Petrou

PO Box 45129, London N15 3XF.

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Russell Harris QC
He called

Instructed by Firstplan Ltd.

Doug Sharps CEng FIMechE FIOA

Sharps Redmore Partnership, The White House,
London Road, Copdock, Ipswich IP8 3JH.

Alexander Grant BSc(Hons) MSc

Partner, Smith Grant LLP, Station Road, Ruabon,
Wrexham LL14 6DL.

John Stephenson FRICS MCIArb

Senior Director, Grant and Partners, 50 Conduit
Street, London W14 S2 PD.

Graham David Bellamy BSc CEng
MICE

Partner, Bellamy Roberts, Clover House, Western
Lane, Odiham, Hampshire RG29 1TU.

Derek Casey

Managing Director, London Concrete Ltd, London House, 77 Boston Manor Road, Brentford, Middlesex TW8 9JQ.

Michael Woolner BA MRTPI

Director, Firstplan Ltd, 25 Floral Street, London WC2E 9DS.

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Lynne Featherstone MP

20 North Grove, London N6 4SL.

David Lammy MP

House of Commons, Westminster, London.

Joanne McCartney

Assembly Member, Greater London Authority.

Mandy Steele

65 Mayfield Road, London N8 9LN.

Elizabeth Adalian

21 Umfreville Road, London N4 1RY.

Marina Bloomfield

138 Chettle Court, Ridge Road, London N8 9NX.

Vivien Luxford

64 Tottenham Lane, London N8 7EE.

Frances Walsh

73 Rathcoole Gardens, London N8 9NE.

Stefan Hohmann

Chairman of Friends of Stationers Park, 43 Mayfield Road, Crouch End, London N8 9LL.

David Jennings

54 Denton Road, London N8 9NT.

Sean Wallis

7 Farnfields Court, Oakfield Road, London N4 4LA.

Cllr Peter Hillman

11 Bream Close, Tottenham, London N17 9DF.

Adam Coffman

117 Fairfax Road, London N8 0NT.

Peter Sanders

54 Inderwick Road, London N8 9LD.

Charles Bezzant

42 Nelson Road, London N8 9RU.

Andrew Wickham

Head Teacher, Weston Park Primary School, Denton Road, London N8 9WP.

Kit Greveson

190A Stapleton Hall Road, London N4 4QL.

Ali Nabeii

16 Dickenson Road, London N8 9ET.

Lydia Rivlin

Deputy Chairman, Tottenham Conservatives, 5 Bruce Grove, London N17 6RA.

Alison Smith

70 Stanhope Gardens, London N4 1HT.

Eleni Leoussi

57 Oakfield Road, London N4.

Gabi Brogan

87 Mayfield Road, London N8 9LN.

Janet Dean

100A Uplands Road, London N8 9NJ.

Lorna Brown

379 Wightman Road, London N8 0NA.

Clare Richmond

94 Denton Road, London N8 9NT.

Tarsem Flora

Purley and Woodcote Residents' Association, 38B Russell Hill, Purley CR8 2JA.

Daniel Smith

Smith Lance Larcade & Bechtol, 4-8 Canfield Gardens, London NW6 3BS.

Alisha Sufit

Stroud Green Residents' Association, 43 Ridge Road, London N8 9LJ.

Eldridge Culverwell

113 Stapleton Hall Road, London N4 4RD.

David Schmitz

88 Falkland Road, London N8 0NP.

Peter Budge

140B Nelson Road, London N8 9RN.

M Clunie

Teacher, Hornsey School for Girls, 33 Effingham Rd, London N8 0AA.

Cllr LR Edge

Civic Centre, Wood Green, London N22.

Cllr Takki Sulaiman

Civic Centre, Wood Green, London N22.

Cllr Prescott

Civic Centre, Wood Green, London N22.

Helen Riley	64 Mount View Road, London N4 4JR.
Anna Keeling	Parent Governor Sth Harringay Infants School.
Dave Morris	Haringey Federation of Residents' Associations, 42 Falmer Road, London.
Tina Harper	123a Wightman Road, London N4 1RJ.
Keith Flett	Haringey TUC, 38 Mitchley Road, Tottenham N17 9HG.
Vince Sudbery	10 Addington Road, London.
Harold Jimmick	72 Hampden Road, London N8 0HT.
M Longo	355 Wightman Road, London N8 0NA.
Joseph Farrugia	33 Nelson Road, London N8 9RX.
Peter Lorimer	83 Burgoyne Road, London N4 1AB.
Sally Walker	17 Priory Avenue, London N8 7RP.
Catrina Zahoor	100 Chettle Court, Ridge Road, London N8 9NX.
Darren Newland	Chair Chettle Court Residents' Association [including DVD by Youth Forum], 124 Chettle Court, Ridge Road, London N8 9NX.
John Grayson	2 Rathcoole Gardens, London N8 9NE.

DOCUMENTS³¹

Document	1.1	List of persons present at the Inquiry.
	1.2	List of persons present at the site visit.
Document	2	Council's letter of notification about the Inquiry and list of persons notified.
Document	3	Letters of representation. [including from Lynne Featherstone MP and David Lammy MP.]
Document	4	Statement of Common Ground. [including Drawing No.2416/15A scale 1:500, dated February 2006 and UDP Proposals Map requested by Inspector]
Document	5.1	Proof of evidence by D Fiumicelli.
	5.2	Summary.
	5.3	Appendices numbered A - I.
		<u>Submitted at Inquiry</u>
		J - Cross-examination note Mr Sharps.
		K - Bibliographical references.
		L - <i>Design Manual for Road and Bridges</i> , vol.11 Section 3 pt.7.
		M - <i>R v Bedford BC</i> .
		N - Revised Table 6.
Document	6.1	Proof of evidence by D Gurtler.
	6.2	Summary.
	6.3	Appendices numbered 1-3.
		<u>Submitted at Inquiry</u>
		4 - Traffic survey, Thursday 10 November 2005.
		5 - Photographs western loop.
		6 - <i>Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic</i> ,

³¹ All documents and plans submitted to the Inquiry, including proofs of evidence, are listed. The proofs are as originally submitted, in other words unless expressly stated they do not take into account how the evidence may have been affected by cross-examination or other aspects of the Inquiry.

- Institute of Environmental Assessment, Note 1.
- 7 - Drawing showing distances from appeal site.
- 8 - Appeal Ref: T/APP/H5960/A/98/299070/P5, dated 4 March 1999.
- 9 - Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/A/02/1084148, dated 20 September 2002.
- 10 - Bundle of objection letters.
- 11 - Committee Report.
- 12 - Minutes of Planning Applications Sub Committee, 10 October 2005.
- 13 - *Haringey Employment Study*, Atkins.
- 14 - email from Tradewinds 14 February 2006.
- 15 - Tables traffic figures (as amended).
- 16 - Correspondence re SOCG.
- 17 - Steer Davies Gleave letter dated 31 August 2005.
- 18 - HC Judgement CO/2739/2001.
- 19 - Harringay Club programme.
- 20 - Correspondence concerning average number mixer trucks.
- 21 - Haringey UDP bundle.
- 22 - extract from MPG6.
- 23 - extract from GPDO and EIA Regulations.
- 24 - eUDP Policy UD7.

- | | | |
|----------|-----|--------------------------------|
| Document | 7.1 | Proof of evidence by Green N8. |
| | 7.2 | Summary. |
| | 7.3 | Two DVDs. |

Submitted at Inquiry

- 1 - Statement of Objections.
- 2 - Accident statistics taken from Transport for London by Ms Barlow.
- 3 - *Ecological appraisal of Ferme Park, Hornsey* by Cresswell Associates, dated November 2003.
- 4 - Extract from BMJ 1996;312:649-650 concerning air pollution and extract from article by David V Bates.
- 5 - Press release by Association of Chief Police Officers entitled *National Police operation clamps down on defective goods vehicles*, dated 25 February 2005.
- 6 - Written statement by Jenny Cooper, resident of 191 Wightman Road.
- 7 - Development control committee report, Buckinghamshire County Council, dated 9 April 2002 concerning proposed variation of condition at London Concrete's Gerrards Cross plant.
- 8 - Extract from Watch Committee *Portland Cement Annex 1 Portland Cement Dust: Hazard Assessment* (2004).
- 9 - Extract from HSE Working Group on Action to Control Chemicals, 4 *Portland Cement: Assessment of the respiratory and carcinogenic hazards of Portland Cement*.
- 10 - HSE Construction Information Sheet No.36 Revision 1 *Silica*.
- 11 - Extract from PPS23.
- 12 - Extract from *Electronic Library of Construction and Occupational Safety and Health, Cement and Concrete Training Guide*.
- 13 - Extract from Worker Safety Series *Concrete Manufacturing*, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, US Dept of Labor.
- 14 - Extract from *Ready Mixed Concrete: Health & Safety Data Sheet* Bardon Concrete.

		15 - <i>Ferne Park, Hornsey Proposed Concrete Plant Airborne Dust Assessment for: London Concrete Ltd</i> , by Smith Grant LLP, November 2003.
		16 - Extract from <i>Moving Freight: how to balance economy and environment</i> , IHT May 2005.
		17 - <i>Analysis Pedal Cyclist Fatalities Involving Goods Vehicles from Jan 1999 - May 2004</i> , London Road Safety Unit.
		18 - Extract from <i>Applications and Decisions</i> , The Traffic Commissioner for the Eastern Traffic Area, No.4785.
		19 - Extract from <i>Sustainability</i> Aggregate Industries.
		20 - Letter dated 10 March 2006 from Weil, Gotshal & Manges to Bellamy Roberts concerning traffic figures in Table 6.
		21 - Letter dated 14 March 2006 from Weil, Gotshal & Manges to Smith Grant LLP.
		22 - Letter dated 17 March 2006 from Weil, Gotshal & Manges to Bellamy Roberts concerning traffic figures in Table 6.
		23 - Transcripts of Development Control Forums and Witness Statements.
Document	8.1	Proof of evidence by Parkside Residents' Association.
	8.2	Appendices numbered 1-3.
Document	9.1	Proof of evidence by Green N4 & N15.
	9.2	Appendices A - E.
		<u>Submitted at Inquiry</u>
		F - Suggested site visit route.
		G - Letter from Green N4 & N15 dated 15 March 2006 including descriptive narrative on circular route.
Document	10.1	Proof of evidence by DF Sharps.
	10.2	Summary.
	10.3	Appendices numbered A - F.
		<u>Submitted at Inquiry</u>
		G - Emails between Doug Sharps/Dani Fiumicelli.
		H - Witness details.
		J - Noise emission levels from bottom discharge rail wagons.
		K - Noise limit conditions.
Document	11.1	Proof of evidence by AD Grant.
	11.2	Summary.
	11.3	Appendices numbered 1-7.
		<u>Submitted at Inquiry</u>
		8 - <i>Peer Review of the Dust Assessment Report</i> , Casella Stanger, 19 September 2005.
Document	12.1	Proof of evidence by J Stephenson.
	12.2	Summary.
	12.3	Appendices numbered 1-2.
		<u>Submitted at Inquiry</u>
		3 - sbh Draft Particulars.

Document	13.1	Proof of evidence by GD Bellamy.
	13.2	Summary.
	13.3	Appendices numbered 1-13. <u>Submitted at Inquiry</u>
		14 - Note for Inspector re cycle accidents and Table 6, dated 17 February 2006.
		15 - Letter from Bellamy Roberts dated 14 March 2006 to Green N8 concerning Table 6.
		16 - Note in response to letter of 17 March 2006 from Green N8.
Document	14.1	Proof of evidence by D Casey.
	14.2	Summary.
	14.3	Appendices numbered 1-5. <u>Submitted at Inquiry</u>
		6 - Statutory Declaration by Malcolm Kodia and MK1-3.
Document	15.1	Proof of evidence by M Woolner.
	15.2	Summary.
	15.3	Appendices numbered 1-15. <u>Submitted at Inquiry</u>
		16 - Draft planning obligation.
		17 - Network Rail letter dated 2 December 2005.
		18 - Haringey UDP Comments and Council's Response.
		19 - Plans showing UDP proposal sites.
		20 - Extracts Green N8 website.
		21 - Extract from London Plan.
		<u>Statements/documents by those who spoke at the Inquiry</u>
Document	16.1	Letters submitted by Joanne McCartney, Assembly Member GLA.
	16.2	Statement by Frances Walsh.
	16.3	Statement by Lydia Rivlin, Deputy Chairman, Tottenham Conservatives.
	16.4	Statement by Stefan Hohmann, Chairman of Friends of Stationers Park.
	16.5	Statement by Eleni Leoussi - including Photographic Tour.
	16.6	Statement by Tarsem Flora, Chairman Purley and Woodcote Residents' Association - including maps and attachments.
	16.7	Statement by David Schmitz, The Ladder Community Safety Partnership - including appendices 1-3.
	16.8	Statement by Vivien Luxford.
	16.9	Statement by David, Lisa, Joshua and George Jennings.
	16.10	Statement by Tiana Harper.
	16.11	Statement by Vince Sudbery.
	16.12	Statement by Joseph Farrugia.
	16.13	Statement by Peter Lorimer - including photograph from Alexandra Park.
	16.14	Transcript of Youth Forum DVD.
	16.15	Statement by Pauline M Colledge for Stroud Green Residents' Association [presented by Alisha Sufit].
	16.16	Statement by Sally Walker St Mary's Infant School.
	16.17	Statement by Catrina Zahoor - including photographs Battersea spillage.
	16.18	Statement by Peter Sanders, Friends of Hornsey Church Tower.
	16.19	Statement by Lorna Brown.
	16.20	Statement by Harold Jimmick.
	16.21	Statement by Cllr Takki Sulaiman.

- 16.22 Statement by Adam Coffman.
- 16.23 Statement by Clare Richmond.

Other written representations submitted during the Inquiry

- 16.24 Letter dated 16 February 2006 from Paul McKay, Secretary Living Streets Haringey Branch, 10 Hewitt Rd, Haringay, London N8 0BL.
- 16.25 Letter dated 16 February 2006 from Tim McCall, 54 Woodlands Park Rd, Haringay, N15 3RX.
- 16.26 Letter dated 23 February 2006 from Dr Ann Marie Connolly, Director of Public Health, Haringey NHS.
- 16.27 Statement from Vaughan Melzer.
- 16.28 Letter from local businesses in Crouch End.
- 16.29 Letter dated 15 March 2006 from Patrick O'Sullivan.
- 16.30 Statement by Meg Mistry.
- 16.31 Letter dated 17 March 2006 and attachments from PD Wallis.
- 16.32 Letter dated 18 March 2006 and attachments from David Robins.
- 16.33 Letter dated 20 March 2006 from Cllr Peter Floyd.
- 16.34 Letter dated 16 March 2006 from Secretary, Haringay Traders Association.
- 16.35 Letter dated 19 March 2006 from Dr Bobbie Jacobson OBE, Director, London Health Observatory.

Obligation and conditions

- Document 17.1 Draft planning obligation.
- 17.2 Bundle of correspondence with Council's comments on draft obligation.
- 17.3 Inspector's letter dated 6 March 2006 concerning obligation/conditions and Appellant's response dated 13 March 2006.
- 17.4 Planning obligation dated 20 March 2006.

- Document 18 Suggested planning conditions (as amended throughout the Inquiry).

Opening and closing submissions

- Document 19.1 Appellant's opening submissions.
- 19.2 Opening on behalf of Haringey.
- 19.3 Closing statement by Parkside Residents' Association.
- 19.4 Green N4 and N15's closing submission.
- 19.5 Closing submission of Green N8.
- 19.6 Closing on behalf of the Council.
- 19.7 Closing submission on behalf of the Appellant.

PLANS

- Plan A Site Location Plan, Drawing No.FP/01, scale 1:2500, dated 3 December 2003.
- Plan B Proposed Ready Mix Concrete Plant, Drawing No.2416/01E, dated November 2003.
- Plan C Proposed Ready Mix Concrete Plant, Drawing No.2416/10D, dated June 2005.
- Plan D Details of Overhead Bins and Plant Working Area, Drawing No.2416/20C, dated June 2005.