

Item No	Application No. and Parish	Proposal, Location and Applicant
(2)	17/01684/MINMAJ	<p>Change of use to amend the approved details to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the Household Waste Recycling Facility</p> <p>Veolia Environmental Services, Padworth IWMF, Padworth Lane, Lower Padworth</p> <p>Veolia ES (West Berkshire) Ltd.</p>

To view the plans and drawings relating to this application click the following link:

<http://planning.westberks.gov.uk/rpp/index.asp?caseref=17/01684/MINMAJ>

Recommendation Summary: To **DELEGATE** to the Head of Development & Planning to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** for the reasons given below (Section 7.2).

Ward Members: Councillor Graham Bridgman
Councillor Mollie Lock

Reason for Committee Determination: The application is 'Major' in terms of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and the application site is Council owned land. Therefore in line with the Council Constitution the application must be referred to Committee.

Committee Site Visit: 16 May 2018

Contact Officer Details

Name: Andrew Morrow
Job Title: Team Leader (Minerals and Waste)
Tel No: (01635) 519117
E-mail Address: Andrew.morrow@westberks.gov.uk

1. Site History

08/01166/MINMAJ	APPROV	06.03.2009	Change of use of land and erection of buildings to form new Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF) to comprise; Waste Transfer Station (WTS), Material Recovery Facility (MRF), Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC), In-Vessel Composting Facility (IVC), municipal depot with workshop, fuelling and washing facilities, administration and visitor centre, weighbridge. Formation of associated parking, roadways and vehicular access. Landscape works, including tree removals and additional planting, formation of earth bunding and surface water drainage swales. Erection of new fencing.
09/02521/MINMAJ	APPROV	05/03/2010	Section 73 - Application for removal or variation of condition 2 of planning permission 08/01166/MINMAJ - Alterations to approved drawings.
11/00923/MINMAJ	APPROV	25/08/2011	Section 73 - Application for variation of Condition 2 - (Approved Plans), Condition 3 - (Building Details), Condition 9 - (Materials), Condition 38 - (Parking and Turning Details) and Condition 51 - (New scheme of planting) on Application No. 09/02521/MINMAJ.
13/01546/MINMAJ	APPROV	27/09/2013	Section 73A - Variation of Conditions 17: Travel Plans, 48: Ecological management, 49: BREEAM of planning permission 11/00923/MINMAJ: Section 73 - Application for variation of Condition 2 - (Approved Plans), Condition 3 - (Building Details), Condition 9 - (Materials), Condition 38 - (Parking and Turning Details) and Condition 51 - (New scheme of planting) on Application No. 09/02521/MINMAJ.
14/01111/MINMAJ	APPROV	29/04/2014	Section 73A: Variation of Condition 16 - Travel Plan, of planning permission reference 13/01546/MINMAJ.
17/01683/MINMAJ	BEING CONSIDERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH 17/01684/MINMAJ (this application)		S73: Variation of condition 7 'Hours of operation (HWRC)' of previously approved application 14/01111/MINMAJ: Section 73A: Variation of Condition 16 - Travel Plan, of planning permission reference 13/01546/MINMAJ.

2. Publicity of Application

Site notice expired: 10 August 2017
 Neighbour notification expired: 25 July 2017
 Newbury Weekly News press advert: 13 July 2017

Further site notice expired: 4 May 2018
 Further Newbury Weekly News Press Advert: 5 April 2018

3. Consultations and Representations

3.1 Consultations

Beenham Parish Council:

Support

Aldermaston Parish Council:

At its meeting on 11 July Aldermaston PC recorded No Objections to this application.

Padworth Parish Council:

Initial comments

'Object' because of the complete disregard to the effects of this application on the Parish of Padworth.

Further Padworth Parish Council comments (Motion):

Padworth Parish Council employed a transport consultant (Motion) who provided comment on 17/01683/MINMAJ in conjunction with the associated application 17/01684/MINMAJ. The full report is available on the public file, and is summarised / paraphrased below:

It was indicated that the Motion had reviewed the application documents and had found references to documents and data which were not available for review.

Motion set out the Transport Policy context, Design Standards and Assessment Guidelines which were considered relevant to assessing the transport impacts of the applications. Rural road safety was highlighted as an issue and it was indicated that the risk of being killed in a road accident walking along a rural lane is considerably greater than if walking on a footway or footpath, and that a contributory factor is the speed of traffic on rural lanes.

A description of the highways and the public rights of way network is provided for the area around the Padworth IWMF. Reference is made to traffic turning into Padworth Lane from the A4 being immediately confronted by a set of traffic signals and it is intimated that there is a risk of the queues extending into the A4 and interfering with the safe flow of traffic on that road. Community facilities in the area, and the road network to the south are described as is the role of Padworth Lane and Rectory Road in terms of the public rights of way network.

Automatic traffic count (ATC) surveys were undertaken to assess the volume, speed and classification of traffic using Padworth Lane. The ATC surveys were undertaken on Padworth Lane approximately 120m either side of the swing bridge over a one week period. The results of these ATC surveys are set out in Motion's report. During a weekend in September 2017 manual traffic surveys were undertaken at the entrance of the existing Newtown Road HWRC located in Newbury to assess the temporal characteristics of traffic

using a household waste recycling centre. The results of this survey are provided in Motion's report.

The lawful uses of the IWMF are considered.

The existing access to the IWMF is discussed and Motion indicates that the swing bridge reduces visibility for vehicles turning out of the access, and for vehicles approaching from the A4 either to turn right into the IWMF or to carry on southwards across the bridge.

Motion undertook a high level audit of the Transport Report in the context of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which sets out key issues to consider at the start of preparing a Transport Assessment or Statement. Motion indicate that the Transport Report failed to assess or consider many elements which would be expected in a Transport Assessment Report, concluding that it was not fit for the purpose of assessing the transport impact of the applications and that further information and assessment was required.

Motion refers to anomalies in the Transport Report, concluding that as a consequence of these anomalies the conclusions of the Transport Report have the potential to be flawed and should be considered with caution.

Motion undertook a high-level audit of the EA Addendum in the context of the IEMA Guidelines (1992) which are the industry standard for assessing the environmental impact of road traffic. Motion indicate that the EA Addendum fails to consider or assess all the elements which would be expected in an EIA, therefore concluding that the EA Addendum is not fit for the purpose of assessing the environmental impact of road traffic arising from the applications, and that further information and assessment was required.

Motion indicates that there are significant anomalies within the EA Addendum, concluding that as a consequence, the conclusions of the EA Addendum have the potential to be flawed and should be considered with caution.

Motion then considers in more detail: road safety at the access to the facility; road safety on Padworth Lane south of the Facility; environmental impact associated with changes in road traffic; and peak hour impacts of the applications.

Motion sets out possible mitigation measures that the applicant should consider, including:

- Introduction of 30mph speed limit on the route;
- Improvement of forward visibility including hedgerow maintenance and lowering of earth banks in the highway;
- Improved signing along the route to warn motorists of change in environment and that they should give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians;
- Improvements to PRow signing to ensure that PRow users are able to quickly and easily locate PRows and thereby minimise the length of time spent in the carriageway;
- Introduction of weight restriction along the route between Baughurst Road and swing bridge with exceptions for access to local businesses / emergency vehicles. Camera enforcement of restrictions;
- Introduction of formal one-way working at the canal and river crossings;
- Traffic management scheme at the junction of Rectory Road / Padworth Lane / School Road / Raghill to slow motorists and enable safe crossing for children attending schools; and

- Provision of pedestrian crossing facilities on Padworth Lane between the A4 and the Village Hall.

Motion considers that the applications currently fail to comprehensively assess the impacts of the proposals and so include no mitigation, and therefore the Council has no option but to refuse planning permission in accordance with NPPF. However, should the Council decide to approve the Applications, the following conditions should be added:

1. A study is undertaken to develop a scheme for managing traffic along the route in accordance with the Quiet Lanes principle, which is aimed at achieving positive changes in user behaviour on minor rural roads. This should include, but not be limited to:
 - Introduction of 30mph speed limit on the route;
 - Improvement of forward visibility including hedgerow maintenance and lowering of earth banks in the highway;
 - Improved signing along the route to warn motorists of change in environment and that they should give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians;
 - Improvements to PRoW signing to ensure that PRoW users are able to quickly and easily locate PRoWs and thereby minimise the length of time spent in the carriageway;
 - Introduction of weight restriction along the route between Baughurst Road and swing bridge with exceptions for access to local businesses / emergency vehicles. Camera enforcement of restrictions;
 - Introduction of formal one-way working at the canal and river crossings;
 - Traffic management scheme at the junction of Rectory Road / Padworth Lane / School Road / Raghill to slow motorists and enable safe crossing for children attending schools; and
 - Provision of pedestrian crossing facilities on Padworth Lane between the A4 and the Village Hall.
2. Having regard to the wide variety of social and community events that take place at locations along the route, regular recorded liaison between the Operators of the Facility and the Parish Council so that conflicts between the activities of local residents and activities of the Facility can be minimised.
3. A ceiling of 6,000 tpa of household waste is imposed at the Facility and that furthermore, no increase in that 6,000 tpa be allowed in the future unless a new planning application is submitted. The condition would also need to set out how the Applicant is required to record and report on tonnage.

Further Padworth Parish Council comments:

Padworth Parish Council has No Objection to the Household Waste Recycling Facility receiving non-recyclable waste , BUT it does Object to the Applicant stating that the effect on the residents will be INSIGNIFICANT.

For PPC to agree to this application we would ask the EAP Committee to tell Veolia that before approving the application they should agree to the following conditions:

Firstly we would like to remind councillors that Rectory Road and Padworth Lane have a 6'6" width restriction, are single track in long sections with passing places, have 3 schools,

one with 200 children, a college, 3 stables, 2 farms, one of Europe's largest fuel storage depots, a small industrial unit, a village hall and a recycling centre.

1. Signs... there are no signs to warn traffic about the single track sections, about the entrance to Veolia, especially at the canal bridge, (the visibility is only 27% of the required figure for the 60mph speed limit), about the schools or the x-roads.

2. The speed limit on the A4 and the Reading Road is 50 mph, yet Rectory Road and Padworth Lane with all its problems is 60mph. 85% of the traffic using these lanes is travelling at over 40mph, which means a closing speed of 80mph for two vehicles on blind corners and single track sections. The increase in traffic volume is estimated (by Veolia) to be up to 90%.

3. Improve forward visibility, hedgerow maintenance, and lowering of earth banks, especially at White Copse Corner, which is only 40 meters from the entrance to Jubilee School where children cross the lane every day, and is completely blind to oncoming traffic in both directions. Improve the 'Passing Places' which are all in a very poor condition and too small.

4. The 6'6" width restriction is ignored daily, bring in a weight restriction as well.

5. Apply Traffic Light Controls on the Canal and River Bridges.

6. Enforce the 'Turn Left Only' rule when leaving the Veolia Site. One sign says 'All Traffic turn Left' and another says 'HGV's Turn Left'.

7. Regular meetings between the Parish Council and Veolia to discuss any problems.

8. A ceiling of 6000 tonnes per annum be enforced, and no increase without a new Application.

I repeat Padworth Parish Council is only asking for conditions which will ensure the safety of its residents and the many people who use these lanes, especially the parents making 4 trips per day.

The cost of these conditions would not be high and are vital if people's safety is of a concern.

Further Padworth Parish Council comments (Motion):

Padworth Parish Council employed a transport consultant (Motion) who provided comment on 17/01683/MINMAJ in conjunction with the associated application 17/01684/MINMAJ.

Following the submission of further assessment work undertaken on behalf of Veolia ("the Applicant") relating to their proposed development at Padworth (planning application reference 17/01684/MINMAJ) I have now had an opportunity to review this information.

I am disappointed to note that the additional information provided by the Applicant fails to deal with the concerns I have previously raised in relation to the transport and traffic related environmental impacts arising from the planning application proposals.

These concerns continue to be:

- Road safety at the access to the Waste Recycling Centre. Visibility to and from the south is significantly less than required for the observed speed of traffic (a mere 27% of the desirable safe visibility). Forward visibility from traffic waiting to turn right

in to the Facility to on-coming traffic is around one third of the desirable safe visibility.

- Road safety on Padworth Lane south of the Facility. With a combination of narrow road width (less than 5.5m) and 85th percentile speeds in excess of 40mph, that there is a much increased risk of pedestrians walking along Padworth Lane being killed if they are involved in a road accident;
- Environmental impact associated with changes in road traffic. Increases in traffic volumes of up to 90% are expected (based on the Applicant's submitted data). Irrespective of whether the Applicant considers receptors along Padworth Lane – such as children playing, parents pushing children in prams – to be traffic sensitive or not, the increases in road traffic of this magnitude require further, detailed assessment and mitigation; and
- Peak hour impacts of the Applications. The analysis shows that during the Sunday peak hour of 12:00-13:00 two to three additional vehicle movements are expected every minute outside the Village Hall. This approximately equates to more than one vehicle every minute turning right into the Site. To the south of the swing bridge traffic flow increases are expected to be lower but nonetheless are expected to result in increases of between 35% and 47% compared to the existing flows. Increases in hourly traffic movements of this magnitude on a quiet rural lane with traffic travelling in excess of 40mph have the potential to cause severe environmental and road safety impacts.

As I have previously raised with the Council, the Applicant's assessment work fails to comprehensively assess the impacts of the proposals and continues to do so. As a consequence of this failure no consideration is given to mitigation notwithstanding my conclusions, previously provided to the Council, that the residual impacts arising from increases in road traffic will be severe.

In the absence of mitigation, the Council has no option but to withhold planning permission in accordance with paragraph 32 of National Planning Policy Framework.

In the alternative that the Council decides to approve the Applications, I would recommend that the following conditions / restrictions should be added:

Condition 1

A study is undertaken to develop a scheme for managing traffic along the route in accordance with the Quiet Lanes principle, which is aimed at achieving positive changes in user behaviour on minor rural roads.

This should include, but not be limited to:

- i. Introduction of 30mph speed limit on the route;*
- ii. Improvement of forward visibility including hedgerow maintenance and lowering of earth banks in the highway;*
- iii. Improved signing along the route to warn motorists of change in environment and that they should give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians;*
- iv. Improvements to PRow signing to ensure that PRow users are able to quickly and easily locate PRowS and thereby minimise the length of time spent in the carriageway;*
- v. Introduction of weight restriction along the route between Baughurst Road and swing bridge with exceptions for access to local businesses / emergency vehicles. Camera enforcement of restrictions;*
- vi. Introduction of formal one-way working at the canal and river crossings;*
- vii. Traffic management scheme at the junction of Rectory Road / Padworth Lane / School Road / Raghill*

to slow motorists and enable safe crossing for children attending schools; and
viii. Provision of pedestrian crossing facilities on Padworth Lane between the A4 and the Village Hall.

Condition 2

Having regard to the wide variety of social and community events that take place at locations along the route, regular recorded liaison between the Operators of the Facility and the Parish Council so that conflicts between the activities of local residents and activities of the Facility can be minimised.

Condition 3

A ceiling of 6,000 tpa of household waste is imposed at the Facility and that furthermore, no increase in that 6,000 tpa be allowed in the future unless a new planning application is submitted. The condition would also need to set out how the Applicant is required to record and report on tonnage.

West Berkshire Highways:

Initial comments

1. I have viewed the above planning applications [17/01683/MINMAJ and 17/01684/MINMAJ], the supporting statement and transport statement (TS) prepared by AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. I have also viewed letters of representation.
2. The Padworth IWMF provides an operational base for the fleet of waste collection vehicles, a Waste Transfer Facility, a Materials Recycling Facility, a Composting Facility, a Mini Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) and ancillary uses including offices and vehicle workshops.
3. Planning permission for the IWMF was granted in March 2009 under the planning application 08/01166/MINMAJ, with the facility becoming operational during November 2011.
4. Condition 7 was applied with a following planning application to planning 14/01111/MINMAJ and limited opening hours for the HWRC from 12.30 to 18.30 hours on Monday to Fridays and 07.30 to 18.30 hours on Saturdays and Sundays. The application seeks to vary the condition to allow opening hours from 08.00 to 18.00 on Mondays to Sundays and bank holidays
5. Since opening in November 2011, the use of the HWRC has been significantly less than projected during consideration of the original planning application in 2008/ 2009. A number of reasons have been put forward for this in the supporting statement including the limited opening hours, the exclusion of non recyclable waste at Padworth and an increase in recyclables being collected from households. Another possible factor is the use of the Smallmead HWRC at Reading which is likely to have been more attractive to use for West Berkshire residents in places such as Tilehurst.
6. It also needs to be stated that projections made within the original planning application in 2008 were deliberately made to be excessive by highway officers to provide a robust assessment at that time. For instance the projection considered the highest

projection for waste being processed through the site, took account of vehicles with trailers, and also used higher seasonal levels.

7. According to the TS, the original planning application for the IWMF had anticipated 5,700 tonnes per annum in 2012, and 7,200 tonnes by 2025 that would be taken to the HWRC. Visits to the HWRC were expected to average 441 per day on weekdays and 1,093 per day on Saturdays. By 2015/2016 they had still only reached an annual input of circa 1,300 tonnes, some 15% of the original projection. Vehicle movements for the HWRC were surveyed for a week in September 2015 with movements ranging between 10 and 50 during weekdays with 97 to 117 movements at weekends.
8. There were reciprocal arrangements where residents of neighbouring authorities could use an HWRC including West Berkshire residents using the Smallmead HWRC at Reading. However this ended on June 30th 2016 forcing West Berkshire residents to use the Padworth HWRC. According to the TS, the unaudited figure for 2016 /2017 is circa 2,300 tonnes through the HWRC, however even this is still only 30% of the original projection.
9. According to the TS, a survey of the users during the same week in September 2015 sought views on the operation of the HWRC including if they would like to be able to also bring non recyclable waste. The survey revealed that 97% of residents wanted to be able to bring general household waste to Padworth. This is perhaps not surprising as the only location where West Berkshire residents could take non recyclable waste is the Newtown Road HWRC in Newbury. Also residents wanting to use an HWRC on weekday mornings would also have to drive to Newbury.
10. This planning application seeks to allow West Berkshire residents to take non recyclable waste to Padworth. It is understood from a survey undertaken in September 2014 that there was circa 4,800 tonnes of waste per year from West Berkshire residents being taken to the Smallmead HWRC in Reading. A further survey from September 2015 revealed that 500 tonnes of recyclable waste came from Hampshire residents in locations such as Tadley equating to some 41% of all waste being taken to the HWRC
11. Taking all of the above into account, The TS assumes it possible that the waste being taken to the HWRC could increase to between 5,000 to 6,000 tonnes per annum.
12. With the above changes from the cessation in the reciprocal arrangements, I consider that the traffic distribution should be checked and amended if required to reflect that visitors to the HWRC will now only be from West Berkshire. I will also need to be more certain that the 7,200 tonnes limit will not be breached significantly in the future. I would therefore like more detail on how this 6,000 tonnes per annum figure has been arrived at and the assumptions made. I also have concerns regarding the September 2015 survey, as this is prior to the reciprocal arrangements with neighbouring authorities that ended in June 2016, so therefore in my view any surveys undertaken earlier are now unfortunately in my view now somewhat out dated. Updated surveys of the number of vehicles entering and leaving the site during weekdays and weekends are now required.
13. For any future traffic assessment, the TS uses the above expected 6,000 tonnes per annum. To take account of the changes sought in respect of the hours of operation hourly movements have been generated based on the patterns currently experienced

at the Newtown Road HWRC in Newbury which operates similar hours and waste types as is being proposed with this planning application. To clarify this further I request the latest survey data that is available from the HWRC in Newbury.

14. As requested, updated traffic surveys have been undertaken during February and March 2017 weekday peak hours covering the following four study junctions:
 - A4 Bath Road / A340 Basingstoke Road / Pips Way Roundabout
 - A4 Bath Road / Padworth Lane priority junction
 - Padworth Lane Railway Bridge traffic signals
 - Padworth IWMF Site Access / Padworth Lane priority junction
15. I do however need to see the traffic count and queue data and this would normally be submitted with the TS. There is a further more serious issue being that the original Transport Assessment included survey data from weekends. Sunday between 11.00 and 12.00 was originally surveyed, but whether this is still the case may depend upon the updated surveys of the number of vehicles entering and leaving the site during weekdays and weekends requested earlier. Further surveys are therefore required including weekends.
16. The TS summarises the traffic survey results so far obtained in the following tables on page 8 of the TS that are mostly reproduced below. The TS then compares the 2017 survey data taken for the original planning application in 2004. The TS notes that there has been a reduction in traffic levels on the A4 corridor since 2004, possibly due to the fact that there were works ongoing on the M4 at Junction 13 at that time. Further evidence of this reduction is contained within survey data from May 2017 from planning application 16/01656/COMIND for the redevelopment of the White Nurseries Garden Centre to the north of Aldermaston. This also shows a reduction in traffic along the A4 corridor.

Location	2004	2017	Change	% Change
A4 west of the A340 roundabout	1,764	1,462	-302	-17.1%
A340 south of the roundabout	983	937	- 46	- 4.7%
A4 between Padworth Lane and the A340 roundabout	2,790	2,477	-313	-11.2%
A4 east of Padworth Lane	2,743	2,389	-354	-12.9%
Padworth Lane between the site entrance and the A4	146	222	76	52.1%
Padworth Lane south of the site entrance	133	209	76	57.1%

Comparing traffic levels from 2004 to 2017 AM peak 08.00 to 09.00 hours

Location	2011	2017	Change	% Change
A4 west of the A340 roundabout	1,771	1,487	-284	-16.0%
A340 south of the roundabout	861	842	- 19	- 2.2%
A4 between Padworth Lane and the A340	2,615	2,480	-135	- 5.2%

roundabout				
A4 east of Padworth Lane	2,551	2,355	-196	- 7.7%
Padworth Lane between the site entrance and the A4	117	204	87	74.4%
Padworth Lane south of the site entrance	114	190	76	66.7%

Comparing traffic levels from 2004 to 2017 PM peak 17.00 to 18.00 hours

17. While the TS shows a reduction in traffic along the A4 corridor, the TS shows an increase in traffic along Padworth Lane. The TS suggests this could be due to the IWMF / HWRC. However I am not entirely convinced by this as the HWRC is not open during weekday mornings. I would suggest the possibility of other factors at work, however that is not for this planning application to solve and I can only assess any additional impact from the proposal.
18. The letters of representation often refer to the narrowness of Padworth Lane and that there is a speed issue. It is true that Padworth Lane is narrow in places; however there is no evidence that there is a speeding issue. Speed surveys were taken outside Lodge Farm on Padworth Lane to the south of the IWMF from July 30th to August 5th 2015 revealed 85th percentile speeds of 38 mph northbound and 37mph southbound. Considering that the speed limit is 60mph, this does not in my view suggest a speeding issue. This is supported by a Speed Limit review undertaken by the Council during September 2015 that concluded that no changes to the speed limit should be undertaken.
19. A further issue being raised is the possibility of prohibiting vehicles from turning right from the site. This was considered at length with the original planning application. Firstly with the access being private, it is not possible to apply a traffic regulation order upon it to prohibit vehicles turning right. Even if it was possible to apply a traffic regulation order, it is highly unlikely to ever be enforced in such a location. It may be possible to physically prevent vehicles from turning right with items such as kerbed islands. However any islands would need to be small enough to still enable large vehicles to turn into and out of the site, but in making them smaller, this then reduces their effectiveness in preventing smaller vehicles from turning right. None of this is in my view practical and therefore with the original planning application we settled on providing a sign that encouraged traffic not to turn right.
20. The performance of the four study junctions has been tested using the industry standard software packages including Junctions 9 for priority junctions and roundabouts and LinSig 3 for signalised junctions. I would ask that further model runs be undertaken for 2022 with traffic growth, any committed developments in the area including any proposals for within the adjacent Oil Pipeline Agency site plus all updates mentioned earlier included. All model outputs should then be submitted.
21. I can only make any conclusions on these planning applications, once all of the above requested information has been submitted. I am obliged to follow paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework that states "all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:

- the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

22. I will therefore assess all updated information when submitted and will then consider if there is or if there isn't any severe impact on the network.

Further WBC Highways comments:

Traffic Distribution and generation

1. The Section 73 planning application for variation of condition 7 of Planning Permission 14/01111/MINMAJ to extend the opening hours of the Household Waste Recycling Centre to include weekday mornings by varying the condition to "the Household Waste Recycling Centre shall not be open for the receipt of waste except between the following hours: 0800 - 1800 Monday to Sundays and bank and public holidays
2. The change of Use Application is to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the Household Waste Recycling Centre in addition to the recyclable waste already received there.

Traffic Distribution

3. I refer to my previous memorandum dated August 29th 2017 and the updated information received on March 29th 2018 including a Technical Note. With the cessation in the reciprocal arrangements with neighbouring authorities, I asked that the traffic distribution be checked and amended if required to reflect that visitors to the HWRC will now only be from West Berkshire. I am yet to consider that this has been completed to my satisfaction, so I have undertaken this exercise myself
4. I consider that the facility will serve the following wards: Aldermaston, Basildon, Birch Copse, Burghfield, Calcot, Mortimer, Pangbourne, Purley On Thames, Theale and Westwood. I also consider that most of Bucklebury will be served except the Hermitage area and the B4009 corridor that will gravitate towards Newbury. I would also expect some of Thatcham to gravitate towards Padworth. From this I have provided a gravity model as shown below that shows the area served and the likely routes of traffic to and from the site:

Wards	Population Numbers	Population %	Route		Traffic Distribution %			
					A4 East	A4 West	A340	Padworth L
Aldermaston	2742	4.8	A4 West	50%		2.4		
			A340	50%			2.4	
Basildon	3235	5.7	A4 East	100 %	5.7			
Birch Copse	7771	13.7	A4 East	100	13.7			

				%				
Bucklebury #1	4700	8.3	A4 East	30%	2.5			
			A4 West	70%		5.8		
Burghfield	5935	10.5	A4 East	70%	7.3			
			Padworth L	30%				3.1
Calcot	8651	15.3	A4 East	100 %	15.3			
Mortimer	5838	10.3	Padworth L	80%				8.2
			A4 East	20%	2.1			
Pangbourne	3066	5.4	A4 East	100 %	5.4			
Purley On Thames	6524	11.5	A4 East	100 %	11.5			
Thatcham North #2	1170	2.1	A4 West	100 %		2.1		
Thatcham South #2	1420	2.5	A4 West	100 %		2.5		
Theale	2910	5.1	A4 East	100 %	5.1			
Westwood	2739	4.8	A4 East	100 %	4.8			
Totals	56701	100.0			73.4	12.8	2.4	11.4

Expected area being / to be served by facility and associated traffic distribution

#1 Bucklebury excluding the B4009 corridor that will gravitate towards Newbury

#2 20% of the Thatcham North and South wards

Source 2011 Census data

- This provides a distribution of 73.4% A4 East, 12.8% A4 West, 11.4% Padworth Lane and 2.5% A340. This compares with 55%, 15%, 20% and 10% contained on page 17 within the Transport Assessment work. I am therefore concerned that the transport assessment work cannot yet be relied upon at this stage until we can agree the distribution. This is pivotal as the distribution will determine the traffic increases on each route. There is also the possibility that there could be some pass by trips from other locations in West Berkshire to the facility, but I would expect these to be very small in number.

Traffic Generation

- Also within my previous memorandum I asked for more detail on how this 6,000 tonnes per annum figure has been arrived at and the assumptions made. Some detail is contained within the submitted Supporting Statement in paragraphs 3.9 to 3.12. 1,500 tonnes are already deposited at Padworth including some 500 tonnes from Hampshire residents that are now no longer able to use the facility, thus leaving 1,000 tonnes from West Berkshire residents. The Supporting Statement the states that "*in September 2014 indicated that there was probably approximately 4,800 tonnes of waste per year from West Berkshire residents being deposited at the*" Reading Smallmead HWRC. 1,000 plus 4,800 provides circa 5,800 tonnes, rounded to 6,000 tonnes

7. I am somewhat concerned regarding the “probably approximately” part of this, so I have made my own inquiries. I have been informed by West Berkshire Council Waste Services that dwellings in West Berkshire took 205kg of waste and recycling to an HWRC produce on average during the 2017/18 year. Again referring to the above wards that are likely to be served by the facility, we can calculate the following expected tonnages:

Ward	Dwellings	Tonnes
Aldermaston	1295	265
Basildon	1243	255
Birch Copse	2989	613
Bucklebury #1	1690	346
Burghfield	2341	480
Calcot	3604	739
Mortimer	2427	498
Pangbourne	1299	266
Purley On Thames	2697	553
Thatcham North #2	445	91
Thatcham South #2	562	115
Theale	1290	264
Westwood	1077	221
Totals	22959	4707

Expected tonnes of waste and recycling to be taken to the HWRC

#1 Bucklebury excluding the B4009 corridor that will gravitate towards Newbury

#2 20% of the Thatcham North and South wards

Source 2011 Census data

8. I have therefore calculated that some 4,700 tonnes including the existing 1,000 tonnes mentioned earlier could be expected per annum at the facility. As the TA is based on 6,000 tonnes, I will therefore accept the 6,000 tonne figure and consider that a robust assessment is being provided in this regard
9. A survey undertaken at Padworth observed that 0.061 tonnes per trip (i.e. load) were made, whereas at the Newbury HWRC the tonnes per trip were recorded as 0.058. The lower 0.058 (58kg) has been used within this assessment, as it results in a higher number of trips overall and therefore provides a more robust assessment.
10. With these proposals at Padworth, the projected increase to 6,000 tonnes will be from the current 1,500 tonnes per annum of waste brought to the facility. To calculate the additional hourly traffic profiles with this increase, traffic counts were taken at the Newbury HWRC in September 2015, except that adjustments have been made as no trips take place at the Newbury HWRC between 0800 and 0830 and that trips occurring after 1800 have been omitted from the profile generation.
11. From data from the Newbury HWRC, 64% of trips occur on weekdays with 36% over weekends. With the projected 6,000 tonnes per annum expected at Padworth HWRC,

this results in a projected 3,840 tonnes per annum being brought to Padworth on weekdays. By dividing this figure by 260 weekdays per year, this results in 14.7 tonnes of waste expected to be delivered per weekday. Finally by applying the 0.058 tonnes per trip it is estimated that there would be 254 trips per day on weekdays.

12. This produces the following traffic projection for the proposal in comparison to the existing generation:

Hour Commencing	Existing Weekday Trips	Proposed Weekday Trips	Net Change Weekday Trips
08:00	0	17	+17
09:00	0	28	+28
10:00	0	32	+32
11:00	0	32	+32
12:00	4	29	+25
13:00	8	29	+21
14:00	10	32	+22
15:00	12	25	+13
16:00	3	18	+15
17:00	6	12	+ 6
Totals	43	254	+211

Existing and proposed weekday traffic generation

#1 Trips are vehicle movements in and out. E.g. from 08:00 17 in, and 17 out are projected

#2 The figures do not include staff and WBC contractor waste deliveries, etc.

13. This leaves a remaining 2,160 tonnes expected to be brought to the HWRC on the remaining 102 weekend days. Again using 0.058 tonnes per trip this equates to 365 trips per day and again using the day profile from the Newtown HWRC, the following is projected for the weekend on a Sunday:

Hour Commencing	Existing Sunday Trips	Proposed Sunday Trips	Net Change Sunday Trips
08:00	1	30	+29
09:00	2	30	+28
10:00	17	40	+23
11:00	12	44	+32
12:00	12	40	+28
13:00	10	42	+32
14:00	21	44	+23
15:00	17	39	+22
16:00	17	31	+14
17:00	7	25	+18
Totals	116	365	+249

Existing and proposed weekend day Sunday traffic generation

14. I note that Padworth Parish Council have used consultants Motion to assess these applications. Motion also took traffic surveys at the Newbury HWRC, but in September 2017. I note that a similar hourly traffic profile was found to the applicants consultants AECOM.
15. I consider that September is a robust month to take surveys at an HWRC to use for projections.
16. According to the submitted Transport Report on page 16, there will be at most one additional HGV per day and according to paragraph 3.3.2 of the Environmental Statement there is no change to the required staff numbers at the as a result of the proposed changes. Therefore we are only considering West Berkshire residents using the facility.

Conclusion

17. It must be reminded that the original planning applications for this site were expecting a throughput of 7,200 tonnes per annum. It has only been 1,500 tonnes per annum, so should these proposals be approved, the throughout is still lower than originally envisaged and projected.
18. I can now accept the above traffic projections and consider them to be robust with a likely over projection in tonnages per annum to be brought to the site and a higher number of trips with the lower 0.058 tonnes expected per trip to be brought to the HWRC by residents. However to consider this further, additional work or justification is needed on the traffic distribution that in turn effects all of the traffic modelling on the impact of the proposal.

Further WBC Highways Comments

Introduction

1. The Section 73 planning application for variation of condition 7 of Planning Permission 14/01111/MINMAJ to extend the opening hours of the Household Waste Recycling Centre to include weekday mornings by varying the condition to “the Household Waste Recycling Centre shall not be open for the receipt of waste except between the following hours: 0800 - 1800 Monday to Sundays and bank and public holidays
2. The change of Use Application is to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the Household Waste Recycling Centre in addition to the recyclable waste already received there.

Access

3. The site access was approved with the 2008 planning applications and is acceptable with regards to width and sight lines. To the north more than adequate sight lines are provided. To the south 2.4 x 24.0 metre sight lines are provided which with reference to the governments *Manual for Streets* were suitable for 85th percentile speeds of 19 mph that were recorded during consideration of the 2008 planning applications. This was looked at in great detail at that time, and I am not expecting any aspect of this to have changed. Pedestrian links including a footway from the site was also provided in

2008. I consider that as the arrangements were acceptable for a throughput of 7,200 tonnes, they should be acceptable for 6,000 tonnes.

Traffic Distribution

4. I refer to my previous memoranda regarding traffic distribution dated April 20th 2018. With the cessation in the reciprocal arrangements with neighbouring authorities, I asked that the traffic distribution be checked and amended if required to reflect that visitors to the HWRC will now only be from West Berkshire. To calculate my own distribution, in my previous memorandum I provided a gravity population model that produced a distribution of 73.4% A4 East, 12.8% A4 West, 11.4% Padworth Lane and 2.5% A340. At the time, this compared with 55%, 15%, 20% and 10% being suggested by the applicant's highway consultants AECOM. In response on May 3rd 2018 AECOM suggested a distribution that "followed the gravity model (population) based approach advocated by WBC, but...completed this at a more granular level using output areas rather than [electoral wards, in order to reduce the requirement for assumptions on percentage splits by ward. The attached figure shows the route assigned by Output Area, with the spreadsheet providing the supporting data and subsequent calculations by route. The assessment is based on 2011 Census Data" With this further work, we have therefore agreed a distribution of 62.8% A4 East, 18.1% Padworth Lane 15.0% A4 West, and 4.1% A340.

Traffic Generation

5. As explained within my previous memorandum dated April 20th 2018, I consider that the expected 6,000 tonnes per annum throughput is a robust projection and I therefore concur with the traffic projections outlined within my previous memorandum.
6. With an agreed traffic distribution, I am now able to compare the projected traffic generation to the level surveyed with the Manual Classified Counts (MCC) from February and September 2017 and to the level of traffic consented with the original planning applications of 2008. The results are as follows:

Hour	Consented 2008	Surveyed 2017	Projected 2018
08.00 to 09.00	40	17	51
09.00 to 10.00	12	26	82
10.00 to 11.00	12	32	96
11.00 to 12.00	12	34	98
12.00 to 13.00	234	82	132
13.00 to 14.00	204	75	117
14.00 to 15.00	166	64	108
15.00 to 16.00	115	44	70
16.00 to 17.00	119	36	66
17.00 to 18.00	103	20	36

Site Access weekday traffic flows - total in and out

Hour	Consented 2008	Surveyed 2017	Projected 2018
------	----------------	---------------	----------------

08.00 to 09.00	50	39	44
09.00 to 10.00	57	47	52
10.00 to 11.00	75	60	64
11.00 to 12.00	79	64	70
12.00 to 13.00	72	60	65
13.00 to 14.00	79	68	74
14.00 to 15.00	81	67	71
15.00 to 16.00	82	69	73
16.00 to 17.00	83	67	70
17.00 to 18.00	64	51	54

Site Access weekend day traffic flows - total in and out

Hour	Consented 2008	Surveyed 2017	Projected 2018
08.00 to 09.00	241	222	250
09.00 to 10.00	174	185	231
10.00 to 11.00	97	113	165
11.00 to 12.00	94	112	164
12.00 to 13.00	273	149	190
13.00 to 14.00	277	171	205
14.00 to 15.00	244	160	196
15.00 to 16.00	182	124	145
16.00 to 17.00	255	187	212
17.00 to 18.00	272	204	217

Padworth Lane – North of access. Weekday total traffic flows both ways

Hour	Consented 2008	Surveyed 2017	Projected 2018
08.00 to 09.00	91	21	50
09.00 to 10.00	85	37	65
10.00 to 11.00	105	35	58
11.00 to 12.00	115	46	78
12.00 to 13.00	97	61	89
13.00 to 14.00	92	69	101
14.00 to 15.00	103	53	76
15.00 to 16.00	93	70	92
16.00 to 17.00	103	39	53
17.00 to 18.00	91	33	51

Padworth Lane – North of access. Weekend day total traffic flows both ways

Hour	Consented 2008	Surveyed 2017	Projected 2018
08.00 to 09.00	213	209	215
09.00 to 10.00	160	163	173
10.00 to 11.00	83	87	99

11.00 to 12.00	82	86	98
12.00 to 13.00	112	85	94
13.00 to 14.00	129	106	114
14.00 to 15.00	128	110	118
15.00 to 16.00	101	88	93
16.00 to 17.00	174	159	164
17.00 to 18.00	205	190	193

Padworth Lane – South of access. Weekday total traffic flows both ways

Hour	Consented 2008	Surveyed 2017	Projected 2018
08.00 to 09.00	50	39	44
09.00 to 10.00	57	47	52
10.00 to 11.00	75	60	64
11.00 to 12.00	79	64	70
12.00 to 13.00	72	60	65
13.00 to 14.00	79	68	74
14.00 to 15.00	81	67	71
15.00 to 16.00	82	69	73
16.00 to 17.00	83	67	70
17.00 to 18.00	64	51	54

Padworth Lane – South of access. Weekend day total traffic flows both ways

7. Except for a few hours during the morning, the projected traffic levels are consistently below the levels approved with the original 2008 planning applications. This is due to the original expectation that there would be a throughput of 7,200 tonnes per annum through the site. It has however only been 1,500 tonnes per annum, which would have been recorded with the MCC. It is now expected that there will be 6,000 tonnes per annum. Compared to 2008, there will be increases in traffic generation up to 12.00. The biggest increases seem to be between 09:00 to 12:00 hours, but these hours are generally off peak with lower traffic levels overall compared to the 08:00 to 09:00 hours peak. I therefore have no concerns subject to the traffic modelling results for the peak hours.
8. To obtain a trend, for the A4 corridor, I have compared the 2017 traffic surveys to levels surveyed in 2004. For Padworth Lane, I have compared the 2017 levels to levels surveyed in 2007. It would seem that overall traffic levels have fallen in the area or at least remained at similar levels.

Traffic Modelling Results

9. The consultants AECOM arranged for updated traffic surveys at the following junctions. The weekday surveys were undertaken during February 2017, with a weekend undertaken during September 2017:
 - a. Padworth Lane / Site access
 - b. A4 / Padworth Lane

c. A4 Bath Road / A340 / Pips Way Roundabout

10. Junction 9 ARCADY and PICADY traffic modelling software was used to model the above junctions. In addition LinSig software was used to model the traffic signals over the Padworth Railway Bridge.
11. The following modelling scenarios have been provided:
 - a. 2017 base from the traffic counts and surveys
 - b. 2017 with development – 2017 base plus proposed changes
 - c. 2022 base – 2017 base plus traffic growth and committed developments
 - d. 2022 with development – 2022 base plus proposed changes
12. Within these scenarios, models have been provided for the weekday 08:00 to 09:00 AM and 17:00 to 18:00 PM peaks and Sunday 12:00 to 13:00 hour's peak.
13. The following committed developments are included within the 2022 models:
 - a. Lakeside, The Green, Theale (15/02842/OUTMAJ) – Proposed 325 residential dwellings
 - b. Woolhampton Quarry, Aldermaston (12/01220/MINMAJ) – Proposed mineral extraction site
 - c. White Tower Garden Centre, Aldermaston (17/01656/COMIND) – Proposed farm shop, butchery and plant centre
 - d. Land Between A340 and The Green, Theale (site reference THE009) – Housing Site Allocations DPD (2006-2026) (adopted May 2017), proposed 100 residential dwellings
 - e. Oil Pipeline Agency Site. Padworth Lane – Potential Oil Transfer Operations. 50 oil tankers in and out per day
14. I am content with the inclusion of these committed developments along with the expected overall traffic growth.

A4 Bath Road / A340 Basingstoke Road / Pips Way Roundabout

15. I have checked the traffic model, and even compared it to the model submitted with the White Tower Garden Centre, Aldermaston (17/01656/COMIND) for the proposed farm shop, butchery and plant centre. I would say that the road geometry input into the model is less than I would have expected, but this has the advantage of providing a more robust model, as narrower lanes decreases capacity. The 2017 model compares well regarding traffic queue lengths compared with the lengths surveyed in 2017.

Arm	Projected traffic queues (passenger cars stationary vehicles)				
	2017 surveyed	a.2017 modelled	b. a. with development	c.2022 base	d. c. with development
A4 Bath Road East	2.4	1.7	1.8	2.4	2.5
A340	13.8	8.6	9.4	36.3	39.7

A4 Bath Road West	33.7	30.5	33.6	70.2	73.3
Pips Way	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

A4 Bath Road / A340 Basingstoke Road / Pips Way Roundabout AM peak

Arm	Projected traffic queues (passenger cars stationary vehicles)				
	2017 surveyed	a.2017 modelled	b. a. with development	c.2022 base	d. c. with development
A4 Bath Road East	1.0	2.3	2.4	3.3	3.4
A340	19.9	18.9	19.6	70.8	71.9
A4 Bath Road West	11.8	11.4	11.7	31.3	31.9
Pips Way	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

A4 Bath Road / A340 Basingstoke Road / Pips Way Roundabout PM peak

Arm	Projected traffic queues (passenger cars stationary vehicles)				
	2017 surveyed	a.2017 modelled	b. a. with development	c.2022 base	d. c. with development
A4 Bath Road East	-	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.9
A340	-	0.5	0.5	0.9	1.0
A4 Bath Road West	-	1.7	1.8	2.5	2.7
Pips Way	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

A4 Bath Road / A340 Basingstoke Road / Pips Way Roundabout Sunday 12:00 to 13:00 peak

16. It is clear that there is already a traffic congestion issue at this roundabout at times during peak hours that will need to be addressed by the highway authority in the future. This issue was also picked up with the models for the White Tower Nursery (17/01656/COMIND) however the actual the development seems to have limited or no effect on the junction.

A4 / Padworth Lane junction

17. I have checked the models and concur with all figures input into the models

Arm	Projected traffic queues (passenger cars stationary vehicles)				
	2017 surveyed	a.2017 modelled	b. a. with development	c.2022 base	d. c. with development

	d		nt		nt
Left onto A4	-	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.0
Right into Padworth Lane	-	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4

A4 Bath Road / Padworth Lane junction AM peak

Arm	Projected traffic queues (passenger cars stationary vehicles)				
	2017 surveyed	a.2017 modelled	b. a. with development	c.2022 base	d. c. with development
Left onto A4	-	1.1	1.2	2.0	2.2
Right into Padworth Lane	-	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2

A4 Bath Road / Padworth Lane junction PM peak

Arm	Projected traffic queues (passenger cars stationary vehicles)				
	2017 surveyed	a.2017 modelled	b. a. with development	c.2022 base	d. c. with development
Left onto A4	-	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3
Right into Padworth Lane	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

A4 Bath Road / Padworth Lane junction Sunday 12.00 to 13.00 peak

18. It would have been advantageous to have had some traffic queue survey results to have compared the models with, but I am confident that traffic queues at this junction are low on most occasions. The development seems to have a very limited impact.

Padworth traffic signals

19. I have checked the models and concur with all figures input into the models

Arm	Projected traffic queues (passenger cars stationary vehicles)				
	2017 surveyed	a.2017 modelled	b. a. with development	c.2022 base	d. c. with development
Southbound	-	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.9
Northbound	-	1.5	1.7	1.7	2.0

Padworth Lane traffic signals AM peak

Arm	Projected traffic queues (passenger cars stationary vehicles)				
	2017 surveyed	a.2017 modelled	b. a. with development	c.2022 base	d. c. with development
Southbound	-	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.4
Northbound	-	2.3	2.4	2.7	2.8

Padworth Lane traffic signals PM peak

Arm	Projected traffic queues (passenger cars stationary vehicles)				
	2017 surveyed	a.2017 modelled	b. a. with development	c.2022 base	d. c. with development
Southbound	-	0.9	1.3	1.1	1.4
Northbound	-	0.7	1.1	0.9	1.3

Padworth Lane traffic signals Sunday 12.00 to 13.00 peak

20. It would have been advantageous to have had some traffic queue survey results, but I am confident that traffic queues at these signals are low on most occasions. The development seems to have a very limited impact.

Padworth Lane / Site access junction

21. This junction clearly operates well within capacity. Therefore no further checks have been made.

Conclusion

22. The projected traffic levels are generally below the level that was approved with the site with the original 2008 planning applications. With the original planning applications, the site was expected to have a throughput of some 7,200 tonnes, a level that was never actually achieved. With this proposal, it is now expected to have 6,000 tonnes. This is still less than what was originally envisaged and is shown within the traffic projections. The projected traffic levels are generally below the level that was originally approved with the original 2008 planning applications. There is however an increase during weekday mornings due to the proposal to open the site at 09:00 hours, however increases seem to be off peak during the morning when overall traffic levels are lower.
23. Access arrangements were approved with the original planning application and were carefully considered at that time. I consider that as the arrangements were acceptable for a throughput of 7,200 tonnes, they should be acceptable for 6,000 tonnes.

24. As the site is now exclusively for West Berkshire residents, the traffic distribution has been reconsidered. I have checked the traffic models and concur that the proposal will have a limited impact on the highway network, and would still be a lesser impact than the level approved with the 2008 planning applications.
25. The government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that *"development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe"*. I consider that due to the reasons outlined above, there are no severe impacts with the proposal. I therefore conclude by raising no objection to the planning applications. As no physical changes are proposed, I also have no conditions to request.

WBC Highways Consultant (WSP)

Initial comments:

1. INTRODUCTION

West Berkshire Council are in receipt of planning applications by Veolia for changes to the above Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) at Padworth. WSP have been provided with the following documents and asked to provide an *independent* review of the submission proposals based on the following documents [for ease of reference I have given each a document reference, D1, D2 etc.]:

- Supporting Statement, June 2017, Veolia [D1]
- Environmental Statement Addendum, June 2017, Aecom [D2]
- Transport Review, September 2017, Motion (on behalf of Padworth Parish Council) [D3]
- Consultation Response, 29/8/17, Paul Goddard on behalf of WBC as Highway Authority [D4]
- Planning Consents:
 - 08/01166, June 2008, WBC [D5] and associated legal agreement [D6];
 - 09/02521, December 2009, WBC [D7]
 - 11/00923, May 2011, WBC [D8]
 - 13/01546, June 2013, WBC [D9]
 - 14/01111, April 2014, WBC [D10]

Some of the consented uses incorporate variations of the waste use proposed over time, including an In-Vessel Composting (IVC) Facility.

2. INFORMATION

I have requested information for any screening opinions, scoping requests and planning history; and have been advised that no further information was submitted prior/with the application being directed to the planning portal.

Motion offer a detailed review of the documents submitted and identify where information is omitted or absent. Respecting the Government's 'Planning Guarantee' I will contemplate how the planning authority might positively determine the application or request additional information; where appropriate offering a balanced opinion which can be used to inform the determination of the planning application(s).

3. INTERPRETATION OF PROPOSALS

The site benefits from an *extant* consent, based on an assumed capacity of 7,200 tonnes per annum (tpa), subject to a number of restrictions including the hours of opening. The S106 Agreement also includes planning obligations including contributions of £30,900 towards public open space in Padworth and £50,000 towards highway improvements on the A4 and A340 roundabout. I have been provided with a response from the Highway Authority [D4] but I do not have information relating to the spending of these contributions: it might be reasonable to assume that these monies have already been spent funding improvements to local infrastructure thus the Local Planning Authority is obliged to consider these measures positively and contemplate material changes that may have arisen in the interim.

The applications seeks to vary the type of waste/recycling operations and (HWRC) open hours to reflect changes across neighbouring authorities. Unfortunately many of the criticisms made by Motion on behalf of the Parish Council are true thus the following sections outline my attempts to reconcile the baseline data and forecasts incorporated into supporting documents:

Volume of Waste & Associated Operations

Veolia indicate that the existing HWRC generates *approximately* 1300tpa, 2015/16 (paragraph 3.4, D1) which is broadly consistent with some documents (1272 tpa, D2 paragraph 3.2.2) but differs from others (approximately 1,500tpa, D3,1.1 paragraph 2).

Various sections report that the existing use is operating around 15% of the consented use: the reported data suggests this could be quite different ($1272/7200 \text{ tpa} = 0.1767$ or 17.67%). As some baseline data appears to coincide with operational changes in HWRC uses across Berkshire the use of the more recent data ($\sim 2300/7200 \text{ tpa} = 0.3194$ or 31.94%) might be appropriate for some conversions of waste and associated traffic flows.

Baseline Data & Traffic Flows

The noise surveys were undertaken in April 2017 (7.4.1, D2). The Air Quality model is derived from local monitoring data (2016) and observed traffic data (February 2017, 1.5.1 D2, not a neutral month as defined by the Design Manual for Roads & Bridges (DMRB)) and seemingly converted to 2016 for air quality model validation. The use of and conversion of neutral month traffic flows (Average Annual Daily Total (AADT) and Average Annual Daily Flow (AADF) two-way) is normal practice. It is unclear why data sources/surveys were collected over different periods; this approach simply adds to confusions in the documents and does not help transparency in the planning process contributing to the criticism levied by Motion and Padworth Parish Council.

The noise and air quality assessments contemplate traffic speeds within the assessments. Speeds are reported in miles per hour (mph, Appendix 1) and kilometres per hour (kph, Table 2, Appendix 2, D2) using the same numbers.

Comparing the Aecom data with the Motion data (Table 3.2, D4) it appears that all speeds should be *mph* thus the noise assessment should be corrected/repeated. Based on the statements of uncertainty (5.3, Appendix 2, D2) it might be reasonable to conclude that the baseline models are less accurate and may therefore offer an unsuitable basis for forecast years.

Veolia indicate that the existing HWRC generated the following traffic flows in September 2015 (paragraph 3.4, D1) highlighting seasonal variation was a factor.

- 10-50 vehicles per day (vpd) weekday; and

- 97-117vpd weekends

None of the descriptions of traffic movements are reported as one-way or two-way. Based on Appendix 1 it might be reasonable to interpret these as *one-way* traffic flows.

Forecasts

The proposals report that there is no change to the required operational staff numbers for the HWRC (D2, 3.3.1). If this statement is correct it might be reasonable to assume that other non-operational staff numbers might increase.

The S106 Agreement includes obligations to monitor and influence (staff) travel mode share. I have not been provided with Travel Plan monitoring reports so I am unable to comment on the scale of change that may have occurred (since 2009) or how targets might apply to future year assessments. It might be opportune to request this evidence also.

The ES explains (D2, 3.2.3) that the consented use (2008) was forecast to generate the following visits per day:

- 441 visits per day, weekday
- 1093 visits per day, weekend

The report explained that the consent use (7,200tpa) would reduce (to around 6,000tpa) incorporating variations in waste handling, similar to the Newtown Road facility in Newbury. Some of the forecasts (4.1.1 & 4.1.3, Appendix 2, D2) adopt different baseline or forecast skip/traffic figures therefore some elements of the development forecasts may be less reliable.

Across the ES Chapters (5-8, D2) forecast traffic flows appear consistent. Some related Chapters report on traffic effects (6.6.7, D2) highlighting that the consented development “...*would have a neutral effect on road traffic accidents*” and explains that the four minor accidents that have occurred since 2008 have been “...*dealt with in accordance with the Veolia Management System.*” I have not been provided with information relating to the Veolia Management System so I am unable to comment on any safety implications. I note some of the concerns expressed by Motion, flag concerns associated with maintenance of vegetation adjacent to the highway and its effect on visibility. The Highway Authority may wish to contemplate pursuing maintenance obligations of such vegetation (under licence) some of which might fall upon the HWRC operator.

If the existing use is around 17% of capacity and the September 2015 data represents a slightly higher seasonal demand then it might be reasonable to estimate the following traffic flows. I believe these remain broadly consistent with those reported in the 2008 forecast:

- 57-283 vpd (one-way), weekday
- 549-662 vpd (one-way), weekend

The AADT is normally in the order of 91-92% of a typical weekday flow. The 2017 traffic flows on Padworth Lane (Appendix 1, D2) suggest that the difference between the ‘with’ and ‘without’ development scenarios are 420vpd (twoway).

Given the mix of confusing data sources the forecast AADT/AADF might be considered marginally below the likely average and thereby balancing the variations in seasonal data.

Motion have completed a survey of the Newton Road facility which generates 1646vpd (two-way, Saturday) and 1718 (two-way, Sunday, Table 3.3 D4). Whilst Aecom/Veolia draw comparisons between the two HWRC elements of these waste sites, the capacities of the two facilities are quite different (Consent 06/00960 refers). Furthermore, whilst September is a neutral month (in network traffic terms, DMRB) it would be a seasonally high period for the HWRC use. Taking account of combined effect of changes it is reasonable for the Parish Council to be sensitive to traffic changes assessed in detail, e.g. Driver Stress and Delay in line with the Institute of Environmental Assessment (IEA) Guidelines³, but the overall magnitude of effects are likely to remain negligible in most cases.

Traffic Noise varies around 1-2dB/10kph thus the traffic flow/speed errors are unlikely to be significant but Air Quality is a lot more sensitive to changes in speed. In terms of comparisons between (correct) baseline conditions and forecasts (including the A4/A340 operation at capacity during peak periods) the development effects are still likely to be negligible but the cumulative effects might be more sensitive. It would be reasonable for WBC to insist that these assessments are repeated using correct data to examine the overall magnitude of effects.

Based on the descriptions of the areas to be served by the facility it appears that the HWRC would serve around 30-35,000 homes serving wards in the east of West Berkshire. The forecast traffic distribution appears to be based on existing traffic flows future traffic may differ as the use of the HWRC increases. Again, it would be reasonable for WBC to insist that these assessments are repeated based on an agreed traffic distribution but I expect the traffic flow changes will remain negligible in most cases.

Summary

There appears to be some inconsistencies in the calculation/reporting of traffic flows associated with the existing and proposed use. Based on the overall volumes of traffic involved these are unlikely to result in a significant change to the forecast effects of the development, considered further below.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

There is no requirement to complete a sequential test of alternative sites as available sites will have been contemplated as part of the emerging Minerals & Waste Local Plan. Section 4 (D2). Beyond this the application demonstrates that reasonable alternatives have been considered and dismissed.

The ES (Chapter 8, D2) does not follow the IEA Guidelines and associated sections of the DMRB⁵. The ES focuses on the differences between the consented use(s) and the proposals, seemingly scoping out elements of the Assessment based on the extant use. Based on the IEA Guidelines, authors are invited to adopt a degree of professional judgement on quantitative and qualitative matters; Aecom have applied a judgement (Table 8.2, D2) based on quantitative effects of traffic. Aecom/Veolia should have submitted a scoping opinion and, in response, I believe that the Council would be entitled to take a different view on qualitative effects of traffic changes, which may include a more detailed assessment of pedestrian and cycle amenity (for example).

Reflecting a similar view, Motion (D4) query some traffic flows and forecasts and highlight a number of issues that suggest they consider the scope as inadequate. In terms of the criticisms levied at the Aecom reports it might be reasonable to characterise most of these as identifying areas where 'sensitive receptors' might be affected and thus the thresholds

of material change should be considered differently. The data used by Motion is more transparent and attempts to clarify some of the data presented and omitted in the Aecom reports.

Scoping exercises may be regarded as 'good practice' but the suite of reports suggest the application was prepared and submitted in some haste. The apparent haste seems to have translated into confusion in the production of baseline data and forecasts, sufficient to cast doubt over the assessment(s).

5. SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

Motion pose various questions about the information provided and omitted; I agree with most of their criticisms of the data provided which create confusion and uncertainty. Whilst I agree with many of their criticisms I do not believe these would substantially alter the overall conclusions in terms of effects being largely negligible but they are sufficiently material that they should influence the Council's determination of the application.

Based on the overall volumes of traffic involved and the magnitude of effects resulting from the (modified) development proposals I remain satisfied that the forecast effects of the development will remain *negligible* in most cases. Overleaf I have attempted to proffer alternative approaches to the determination of the planning applications:

- using additional powers⁶ available to it to impose a planning obligation to monitor and mitigate the effects of development; or
- requesting additional information based on a correctly scoped Environmental Statement, calculating neutral forecasts derived from nearby permanent traffic count sites

Relevant Policies:

- **Waste Local Plan for Berkshire**, Joint Strategic Planning Unit, 1998:
- WLP1 "...considering proposals for waste management development...will have regard to... adverse impacts on humans and the natural environment."
- WLP27 "Planning applications for waste management will only be permitted if the local Planning Authorities are satisfied that: ...the development and its associated traffic would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental impacts...."
- **Core Strategy**, WBC 2012
- CS13 "Development that generates a transport impact will be require to... Improve and promote opportunities for healthy and safe travel... Minimise the impact of all forms of travel on the environment... Mitigate the impact on the local transport network..."

Positive Determination

Taking account of the estimated daily flow changes the resultant effects are likely to be negligible. The changes in flow patterns, compared with previous consents and resultant effects on some sensitive receptors, may be regarded as material thus the Local Planning Authority could determine the application(s) positively applying a planning obligation to monitor and mitigate the effects over 5-6 years. Such a condition could be worded:

Following the implementation of the development hereby approved the HWRC operators shall produce three biennial monitoring reports considering the environmental effects on the surrounding highway network which shall identify measures that remove, reduce or mitigate the effects of development traffic on the local transport network implementing such measures in accordance with a plans to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the effects of development traffic are mitigated in accordance with Policy C13 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Policies WLP1 and WLP27 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire.

Scope

If the Local Planning Authority is minded to request additional information before determining the application it could agree the scope of the Environmental Statement based on the IEA Guidelines. In so doing the assessors may consider the magnitude of change based on quantitative assessment in traffic flows, generally regarded as:

- 0-30% Negligible
- 30-59% Slight/Low
- 60-89% Moderate/Medium
- 90%+ Significant

But in terms of the quantitative and qualitative assessment of changes the Local Planning Authority may consider the need for more detailed assessments of the following considering certain qualitative effects due to sensitive receptors (listed overleaf), with the study area which shall be first agreed with the Authority:

- Noise & vibration (often considered as part of the Noise chapter)
- Dust & dirt (often considered as part of the Air Quality chapter)
- Severance
- Pedestrian & Cyclist Delay
- Pedestrian & Cyclist Amenity
- Accidents & safety
- Driver stress and delay
- Hazardous and dangerous loads

In my opinion the study area is broadly acceptable but, responding to representations by the Parish Council, I agree that the distribution of traffic movements should be revisited so it is possible to examine some issues in more detail.

Within the study area it would be reasonable to consider the following as sensitive, requiring closer examination:

- Padworth Village Hall/Playground – pedestrian/cycle amenity;
- River Kennet Towpath/Crossing of Padworth Lane – severance, pedestrian/cycle amenity & delay;
- Severance, particularly pedestrian/cycle amenity & delay for access to/from A4 bus stops and Aldermaston Station; and
- Driver stress & delay, including Padworth Lane, A4/Padworth Lane and A4/A340 Roundabout.

Further WBC Highways Consultant (WSP) comments:

1. Introduction

Veolia have submitted a planning application for changes to the above Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) at Padworth. West Berkshire Council (WBC) asked WSP to provide an *independent* review, offering an initial response taking account of representations made by Motion on behalf of the Parish Council. This memo provides a response to the additional information provided under Regulation 25 of the EIA

Regulations and should be read alongside the previous WSP response dated 14 December 2017.

2. BACKGROUND

I have been presented with a number of documents both for and against the proposals. To inform the structure of my response I have considered these in chronological order as set out below:

- 5 March 2018, Padworth Household Waste Recycling Centre, Further Information in Response to Regulation 25 Request
- March 2018, Padworth Household Waste Recycling Centre – Environmental Statement Supplementary Note, AECOM
- 26 March 2018, Letter from Mr Dimond – for Veolia (UK) Ltd, the applicants
- 27 April 2018 Letter from Mr Russell, Motion – on behalf of Padworth Parish Council

To inform my review I note references to the previous Environmental Statement (ES) which supported the 2008 application along with subsequent consents (08/01166/MINMAJ, 09/02521/MINMAJ & 11/00923/MINMAJ), approved with planning obligations; These decisions noted at Informative 3:

- “The proposed facility has the potential to generate amenity impacts that would have an adverse effect upon nearby residential and educational areas. However it is considered that through the imposition of conditions and controls under other legislation, these impacts can be maintained at a satisfactory level.”

The more recent consent, 14/01111/MINMAJ, includes highway improvements (Condition 36) and a Travel Plan (Condition 14) broadly consistent with earlier consents. I understand the highway improvements have been completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning and Highway Authority (LPA/LHA). I have not seen the Travel Plan or monitoring reports but trust these have been completed to the satisfaction of the LPA/LHA.

3. Interpretation of Proposals & Additional Information

Based on the above key documents and supporting data I would offer the following observations/opinions:

Regulation 25 Response

The Response provides further information, clarifications and corrections. The clarifications on traffic flows/speeds are helpful and highlight how small changes in traffic could be regarded as material. It appears that Aecom concede that some links should be considered as sensitive receptors but retain their view that the magnitude of effect remain negligible for each of the six links considered. In some instances, for the reasons outlined below, I disagree but one must apply professional judgement and weigh the balance of material considerations so I have examined these further below.

ES Supplementary Note, AECOM

The Supplementary Note clarifies the basis for professional judgement in terms of ES scope, based largely on the 2008 ES. Pertinent to the planning balance and Informative 3 referenced in Section 2, I understand and accept the application of professional judgement to ensure the assessments are broadly comparable. For the reasons set out below I do not always agree with the receptor ‘sensitivity’ applied in the assessment and do not entirely agree with the applied ‘magnitude of change’ but I do agree with the concluding ‘significance’ and suggest this is a sensible basis to determine the application.

Letter from Mr Dimond, Veolia (UK) Ltd,

Mr Dimond provides a covering letter detailing the content of additional information. Notably Mr Dimond provides survey and other data used to inform the assessments, considered below.

- I accept that there are daily and seasonal variations associated with
- baseline conditions; and,
- the existing and proposed use(s).
- I agree the use of data is statistically representative; but,
- for the reasons outlined below, I generally agree with Motion on Magnitude of Change.

Letter from Mr Russell, Motion

In his letter Mr Russell reviews the additional information considered above. He raises a number of valid points:

- Visibility at the site access junction – Condition 38 (14/01111MINMAJ) required visibility splays to be provided in accordance with Drw. No. PS-ENB-08-5D based on a 20mph design speed. The (Motion) traffic survey was undertaken around 120m from the access identifying an 85thile speed of 41mph, beyond the canal bridge; they also suggest the vast majority of traffic is local traffic and confirm there is no appreciable record of collisions at this point. I agree highway visibility is critical to road safety but for the reasons identified below it is not always appropriate to provide greater visibility or warning signs as this may contribute to increased speeds and crash risk.
- Highway visibility – The LHA have a statutory duty to maintain highways, preserving highway visibility is a critical part of maintaining road safety. Legal test cases have been upheld in the Lords¹ concluding a “...Council owed no private law duty to road users to do anything to improve...” visibility. “Drivers must take the highway network as they find it.” Mr Russell maybe right that road users on Padworth Lane should exercise more caution I therefore agree with Mr Russell in terms of Condition 1 (vi) as a defined priority on Padworth Lane (Canal Bridge) should help reinforce speeds appropriate to conditions.
- Sensitive Receptors – I agree there are a number of sensitive receptors within or near the study area. Applying professional judgement one might adjust the thresholds applied when considering the magnitude of change.
- Changes in road traffic – Based on the IEA Guidelines assessors should consider the greatest change in traffic flows. As the baseline traffic flows are very low Motion may be correct, for some time periods (hours) on some days the magnitude of change may be greater than presented by the applicants. Compounding sensitive receptors, based on a comparison of the HWRC operating hours, one should note that for brief periods the level of change might be described as moderate/high for limited time periods – considered further below.

4. Planning Balance

Motion have striven to present the ‘worst case scenario’ based on the information provided and (IEA) guidance, seemingly aligned with the European Union Guidance but such a position fails to contemplate subsequent changes in legislation, court decisions and guidance (Rochdale Envelope² et al.). The IEA guidelines and associated section of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Volume 11) has remained largely unchanged for 25 years and the LPA has a duty to positively determine planning applications, respecting the Government’s ‘Planning Guarantee’³.

Each party must apply professional judgement to the forecast scenario and weigh the planning balance of potential material considerations. By applying professional judgement

¹ Gorrington v Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council

² <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Advice-note-9.-Rochdale-envelope-web.pdf>

³ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/determining-a-planning-application>

Motion might contemplate worse cases in their assessment of the residual cumulative effect of development whilst Aecom might do the same and arrive at different conclusions. In my capacity as an independent professional I do not need determine the application but in delivering *independent* advice I can contemplate the previous LPA's decision which concluded that the extant use has the "...*potential to generate amenity impacts that would have an adverse effect...*" And, in determining previous applications, the LPA concluded "...*through the imposition of conditions and controls... these impacts can be maintained at a satisfactory level.*" As the planning test is a simple comparison between the consented use and the proposed changes I can conclude:

- Existing/Baseline conditions reveal some daily and seasonal variations;
- The proposed use(s) are also subject to daily and seasonal variations that will result in higher perceptions of change;
- The Applicant's ES under-estimates the sensitivity of some roads within the study area;
- The magnitude of change will in fact be material at times, largely because the baseline traffic flows are very low; but notwithstanding these,
- The significance of these changes remain low.

5. Summary & Conclusion

I have contemplated the evidence presented by both parties and conclude the significance of the proposed changes remains low. Motion seek to demonstrate that the development will effect pedestrian/cycle amenity and road safety, matters that have been considered before. In this context I note that the LPA has considered the waste use and, for various planning consents, concluded that the imposition of conditions and controls would ensure these are maintained at a satisfactory level.

Notwithstanding the conclusions of previous consents, the EIA Regulations 2017 introduced new powers to *monitor* EIA development and Motion have identified that speeds on Padworth Lane exceed those envisaged in previous years. The applicant is not responsible for the speed of traffic on the public highway and the LHA will prioritise its efforts and resources to addressing road safety risks as it sees fit.

Motion effectively advance a valid point which could be characterised to identify the proposals as an intensification of the use of an existing (sub-standard) access which the LPA must apply some weight however small the change in traffic flows.

Motion propose a series of obligations that are not without merit. Given the scale of change envisaged it might be unreasonable to modify the site access but to allow the application without any mitigation could create an unacceptable precedent. On balance, I agree with Mr Russell's suggestions in terms of Condition 1 (vi, road signs at the canal and river crossings) would contribute to reductions in traffic speeds and thereby deliver a proportionate remedy to the magnitude of change. I am therefore satisfied that there are no reasons to prevent the proposals and would encourage the Authority to impose the following obligation:

- The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until traffic signs and road markings on Padworth Lane have been delivered in accordance with plans to be submitted and approved in writing by the planning Authority
- REASON: To preserve and enhance Road Safety and Pedestrian/Cycle Amenity on Padworth Lane.

Further WBC Highways Consultant (WSP) comments:

1. INTRODUCTION

Veolia have submitted a planning application for changes to the above Household Waste Recycling Centre at Padworth, offering updates/additional information. West Berkshire

Council (WBC) asked WSP to provide an *independent* review, offering an initial response taking account of representations on behalf of the Parish Council. This memo notes the Aecom letter of 11/5/18 and contemplates the Aecom Briefing Note, Dated May 2018, examining the distribution of vehicle movements associated with the proposed Household Waste Recycling Centre application.

2. FORECAST DISTRIBUTION

The Aecom briefing note outlines a methodology to assign traffic to routes based on geographic home location and travel time, based on the (2011) Census. I agree that the Census is possibly the most comprehensive data-source but it is rapidly becoming dated and subtle variations might be reflected by developments in/near the spatial areas, contributing to negligible variations.

I do recognise why the Highway Authority is more sensitive to flow variations, as the roundabout is forecast to be close/above capacity during certain periods. Even though the change in traffic is very small the A340 and A4 (west) in the AM peak period and A4 (east) in the PM period are forecast to operate around capacity thus small increases could result in longer queues or greater risk taking (gap acceptance) at the roundabout.

I also agree that the methodology for the (manual) assignment of vehicle trips is logical based on spatial areas rather than wards. This provides a useful distinction in traffic distribution over the highway network. I attempted to recreate/reconcile the journey time of locations in Thatcham to the Newtown and Padworth sites, judging that areas to the northeast/east Thatcham may use Padworth whilst parts of south and west Thatcham might use Newtown. These distribution sensitivities are more critical for Thatcham and might ultimately contribute to flow variations at the A4/A340 roundabout (noted above). Whilst I very much doubt that pass-by trips would occur to a waste recycling centre to any meaningful extent, onward travel may influence trip patterns in more distant areas like Compton/Hampstead Norries as some residents might attempt to combine / link other trip purposes.

3. SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

It is apparent that some professional judgement has been applied to traffic distribution which might vary by time of day. Examining the magnitude of change, even contemplating typical traffic, noise and air quality sensitivities, I am satisfied the level of change is still negligible. For this reason I remain satisfied that the proposals are negligible in environmental terms.

Environment Agency:

No comments

WBC Environmental Health:

Initial comments

1. Identified Environmental Health issues relevant to Planning

Noise

Air Quality including odour

2. Conclusion

Noise

It is expected that provision of a facility to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste will increase the number of vehicle movements into and out of the site, It will intensify the use of the existing Household Waste Recycling Facility (HWRF) and will therefore increase the amount of noise arising. The number of skip changes at the existing HWRF, for example is likely to increase from 2 to 3 a day to 8 to 12 changes per day

I have reviewed the noise and vibration chapter of the submitted Environment Statement Addendum (AECOM June 2107) which concludes that there will be no significant impact arising from the predicted intensification of use. Noise from vehicles travelling from the Bath Road to the site entrance is predicted to cause a 'minor adverse' (not significant) noise impact and there will be no perceptible increase in noise at the nearest noise sensitive residential premises arising from the increased use of the HWRF. I have been to the nearest residential dwelling to assess the existing level of noise and could hear no noise from the site during my visit.

I am satisfied that there will be no significant noise impact arising from this proposed change of use

Air Quality

Air Quality is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Environment Statement Addendum. The assessment concludes that there will be no significant change in Air Quality in the vicinity of the site arising from the increase in number of vehicles movements. A small increase in the annual mean nitrogen dioxide concentration at Padworth Village Hall and at a residential property in The Crescent is predicted but this would not generate significant adverse effects. I have reviewed the assessment methodology and I am satisfied with the conclusions reached.

Odour and bio aerosols arising from the storage and movement of non recyclable waste have also been considered. As stated in the report control of odour is already subject to current action plans and on-going sampling. The report concludes that *'there is no change in the nature of the risk associated with fugitive emission, odour and bio aerosols as a result of the revise HWRC'*.

I have visited the site and noted that non-recyclable waste is already accepted and processed at the site. The non – recyclable waste that will be deposited in skips will be taken at regular intervals from the HWRC into existing buildings on the site where existing controls to prevent odour and fugitive emission are in place I am therefore satisfied with and agree the conclusions reached in the submitted report.

3. Recommendation (with conditions if appropriate):

I have no objections to this application

WBC Environmental Health further comments:

I have reviewed the AECOM responses to questions raised in response to Regulation 25 request.

Request 1

There was a question raised about the use of kilometres per hour instead of miles per hour for traffic speed and whether there would be an impact on the conclusions reached by the noise and air quality assessments. It is acknowledged that the use of KPH in Appendix 2, Table 2 was a typographical error only and that there would be no impact on the conclusions reached. I accept that this is the case.

Request 2

Questions have been raised about the traffic flow data. The data has been reviewed and it has been concluded that the traffic data used in the noise and vibration chapter was correct. Therefore, there would be no impact on the conclusions reached in the noise and vibration chapter. I accept this statement.

It has been confirmed the 1579 value referred to in Appendix 1 relates to AADT. The development traffic figure has been confirmed as correct for AAWT but not AADT. An inconsistency has been identified regarding the predicted development traffic which results in an increase in predicted two way traffic flow equivalent to 49 light duty vehicle movements per day. 39 on Padworth Lane north of the site and 10 south of the site. I accept that the predicted percentage increase in the movement of light duty vehicles will not have a significant effect on the overall outcome of the air quality assessment and there is no risk that there would be a breach of local air quality objectives on Padworth lane.

WBC Environmental Health further comments:

I have reviewed the AECOM Briefing Note (May 2018) which assesses the revised traffic distribution proposed by WBC. The note compares the revised distribution with the existing transport assessment and the results are presented in Table 1. This table shows that a lower proportion of traffic is assigned to the A340 Basingstoke Road and a higher share allocated to the A4 Bath Road East.

The changes in traffic flow resulting from the revised distribution (presented in Table 2 of the note) show that a minimal impact is predicted, with a maximum increase of four vehicle movements (two visits to the site) on the A4 Bath Road East.

The slight increase in predicted traffic flow will have no significant impact on the conclusions reached in the air quality and noise impact assessments submitted to support these applications and I remain confident there will be no significant impact on amenity or local air quality as a result of these applications.

CLH Pipeline System Ltd.

Thank you for your enquiry dated 04-07-2017. We can confirm that our client's apparatus, the CLH Pipeline System – Energy Act 2013 (CLH PS), may be affected by your proposals as indicated on the attached plan(s). The plan(s) supplied are intended for general guidance only and should not be relied upon for excavation or construction purposes. No guarantee is given regarding the accuracy of the information provided and in order to verify the accurate location of the pipeline in conjunction with your proposals you should contact, to arrange a site visit.

When contacting Central Services, please quote the File Ref/Unique Number given at the Inthis correspondence, which is specific to this enquiry. Please note that you should contact Central Services within 28 days of the date of this letter in order to validate this enquiry otherwise it will become void.

You should note that the interests of the CLH Pipeline System are conserved by means of the Energy Act 2013, in particular Part IV of the Act, and other legislation such as the Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996. It is, however, the Energy Act 2013 that prohibits any development and most intrusive activities within the Easement Strip without specific consent from CLH Pipeline System. CLH Pipeline System Easement Strips are 6 metres wide and can incorporate other associated CLH Pipeline System facilities.

Central Services will be able to provide guidance on the required procedures for entering into a Works Consent and provide confirmation on permitted development and intrusive activities. The whole process of obtaining Works Consent can take between four and six weeks depending on circumstances at the time of application.

To reiterate, you should not undertake any work or activity without first contacting the CLH Pipeline System Operator for advice and, if required, Works Consent. For your additional information please visit <http://www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk/index.php/useful-info>, standard requirements for working/crossing the CLH Pipeline System – Energy Act 2013. You should also be aware that landowners and third parties have a duty of care not to carry out any works that have the potential to damage CLH Pipeline System apparatus. This duty of care applies even if the works themselves are situated more than 3 metres from the pipeline. Examples of such works are mineral extraction, mining, explosives, piling and windfarms.

Please note that implementation of any unapproved work that affects a CLH Pipeline System Easement Strip may result in serious consequences in terms of health and safety, expense and other attendant liabilities. In such cases it is the perpetrator of the act, together with any other promoting organisation, that shall be held fully accountable for any resulting damage. Should you require any further assistance regarding this letter please contact the undersigned or alternatively, you can contact the Central Services

Officer note: This standard response was submitted twice in relation to the planning application. No physical development, construction or intrusive works would be undertaken in association with this development. The HWRC lies well outside the Easement Strip for the Pipeline.

Canal and River Trust:

Initial comments

The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is the guardian of 2,000 miles of historic waterways across England and Wales. We are among the largest charities in the UK. Our vision is that “living waterways transform places and enrich lives”. We are a statutory consultee in the development management process.

The Trust has reviewed the application. This is our substantive response under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Based upon the information available we have the following general advice to offer:

If the Highway Authority feel that this proposal would result in extra heavy traffic using the nearby swing bridge over the canal we would wish to discuss the proposal further with the council. Any additional HGV use will be of concern to the Trust as it may increase maintenance costs and the costs of repairs following bridge strikes.

The Trust ask the Highway Authority to consider the impact of this proposal on the bridge and consider whether any additional traffic regulations or restrictions, over and above the existing no right turn signs, are needed to prevent such usage or whether other improvements, such as CCTV cameras are necessary to protect our infrastructure.

Further Canal and River Trust comments

The Trust has reviewed the application and our comments remain unchanged.

Natural England:

Initial comments

Natural England has previously commented on this proposal and made comments to the authority in our letter dated 30th November 2016 (attached for reference). The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this application:

No Objection

Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on designated sites and has no objection.

Further Natural England Comments

The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this amendment although we made no objection to the original proposal.

Emergency Planning:

I have reviewed this application and note that it is in the outer area for consultation for AWE Aldermaston and adjacent to part of the Petroleum Storage Depot site, which is not subject to the COMAH regulations.

Having regard to the proposals and the potential impact on the AWE Off-Site Emergency Plan and the potential issues relating to the PSD site I have **no adverse comments** to make.

Office for Nuclear Regulation:

I have consulted with the emergency planners within West Berkshire Council, which is responsible for the preparation of the Aldermaston off-site emergency plan required by the Radiation Emergency Preparedness and Public Information Regulations (REPPiR) 2001. They have provided adequate assurance that the proposed developments can be accommodated within their off-site emergency planning arrangements.

The proposed developments do not present a significant external hazard to the safety of the nuclear site.

Therefore, ONR does not advise against these developments.

HSE Web application advice:

Do Not Advise Against, consequently, HSE does not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

National Planning Casework Unit:

No comment

WBC Archaeology:

I have reviewed the application using the approach set down in the National Planning Policy Framework and have checked the proposed development against the information we currently hold regarding the heritage assets and historic land uses in this area. This evidence suggests that there will be no major impact on any features of archaeological significance.

I do not, therefore, believe that any archaeological assessment or programme of investigation and recording will be necessary in relation to the current proposal.

WBC Transport Policy: No response

WBC Planning Policy: No response

WBC Trees: No response

WBC Ecology: No response

Thames Water Utilities: No response

Network Rail:

Initial comments

Whilst there is no objection in principle to this proposal I give below my comments and requirements for the safe operation of the railway and the protection of Network Rail's adjoining land.

HEAPING, DUST AND LITTER

It should be noted that because of the nature of the proposals we would not want to see materials piled against our boundary. Items to be heaped on site should be kept away from the boundary an equal distance as the pile is high to avoid the risk of toppling and damaging or breaching our boundary. We also have concerns over the potential for dust clouds and rubbish created from the processing at the site affecting the railway signal sighting. Therefore, adequate measures for preventing dust and rubbish blowing onto Network Rail property are to be in operation.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The materials contained within the site subject to the applicants control should be stored and processed in a way which prevents over spilling onto Network Rail land and should not pose excessive risk to fire. If hazardous materials are likely to be sited on the land then Network Rail must be further contacted by the applicant.

Further Network Rail comments

Network Rail has no objection in principle to the above proposal but due to the proposal being next to Network Rail land and our infrastructure and to ensure that no part of the development adversely impacts the safety, operation and integrity of the operational railway we have included asset protection comments which the applicant is strongly recommended to action should the proposal be granted planning permission. The local authority should include these requirements as planning conditions if these matters have not been addressed in the supporting documentation submitted with this application.

FENCING

If not already in place, the Developer/applicant must provide at their expense a suitable trespass proof fence (of at least 1.8m in height) adjacent to Network Rail's boundary and make provision for its future maintenance and renewal without encroachment upon Network Rail land. Network Rail's existing fencing / wall must not be removed or damaged and at no point either during construction or after works are completed on site should the foundations of the fencing or wall or any embankment therein be damaged, undermined or compromised in any way. Any vegetation on Network Rail land and within Network Rail's boundary must also not be disturbed.

DRAINAGE

Additional or increased flows of surface water should not be discharged onto Network Rail land or into Network Rail's culvert or drains. In the interest of the long-term stability of the railway, soakaways/attenuation ponds/septic tanks should not be constructed within 20 metres of Network Rail's boundary. Surface / foul water is to be discharged into the public sewer. Any surface water run-off from the site must drain away from the railway boundary and must NOT drain in the direction of the railway as this could import a risk of flooding and / or pollution onto Network Rail land. The Land Drainage Act is to be complied with.

SAFETY

No work should be carried out on the development site that may endanger the safe operation of the railway or the stability of Network Rail's structures and adjoining land. The developer must liaise with Network Rail's Asset Protection at the earliest point, with at least 3 months' notice, prior to work starting, to ensure the continued safe operation of the railway. The close proximity of the proposed site could bring a risk to the railway and Asset Protection involvement may be required. The applicant/developer may need to sign into a Basic Asset Protection Agreement, contact Richard Selwood at Network Rail on AssetProtectionWestern@networkrail.co.uk before works begin.

HEAPING, DUST AND LITTER

It should be noted that because of the nature of the proposals we would not want to see materials piled against our boundary. Items to be heaped on site should be kept away from the boundary an equal distance as the pile is high to avoid the risk of toppling and damaging or breaching our boundary. We also have concerns over the potential for dust clouds and rubbish created from the processing at the site affecting the railway signal

sighting. Therefore, adequate measures for preventing dust and rubbish blowing onto Network Rail property are to be in operation.

Ministry of Defence:

This application relates to a site outside of Ministry of Defence safeguarding areas. I can therefore confirm that the Ministry of Defence has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

WBC Sustainable Drainage: No response

3.2 Representations

Total: 11 Object: 10 Support: 1

Officer note: Some of the issues raised relate to the associated change in opening hours application rather than this 'receipt of non-recyclable waste'. However, as discussed in 6.3 below and throughout this report the applications are associated, and for completeness issues which are more likely to arise as a result of the associated development have been summarised below where they have been raised in representations on the 'receipt of non-recyclable waste' application.

The material planning considerations for this application that were raised as part of these representations were:

Object

Highways Issues (some of these concerns also relate to impact on amenity):

- More traffic on Rectory Road and Padworth Lane which are extremely narrow due to residents from Burghfield and Mortimer being more likely to use the site
- Queried as to whether the canal bridge can support the weight of increased and heavier refuse vehicles
- Cumulative traffic impact with 2 nursery schools, Padworth College, 3 farms which provide livery services, and the Oil Pipelines Agency site in the area, and large volume of traffic accessing nursery schools via A4 and Padworth Lane
- Nursery students cross the lane to use other facilities and Padworth college students walk on Padworth Lane particularly in evenings and at weekends
- Young people sent to Padworth College as it is a safe area away from big cities, heavy traffic and pollution.
- Closures on the A340 Aldermaston Road bridge sometimes mean traffic being diverted onto Padworth Lane/Rectory Road overloading the road network further
- Concern that increased traffic could cause cars to back up onto the A4 and cause other traffic problems on the A4
- Already gridlock if any problems on the M4
- Speed limit should be put in place on Padworth Lane / Rectory Road
- Queried as to whether the applicant should be asked to fund 'improvements' including on road network to the south such as additional signage, speed restrictions; traffic calming, more passing bays, access restrictions

- Concern over the canal bridge being closed and traffic building up rapidly from both directions with no escape route
- Queried as to whether the 'no right turn' sign at the entrance is a legal order
- Concern that where vehicles want to exit the facility and travel south on Padworth Lane they are required to either turn on private land such as the Village Hall carpark, or go onto the A4, around the roundabout and then turn right into Padworth Lane, before travelling past the facility again and across the canal bridge
- Queried as to how speed limits could be enforced and managed,
- Queried as to how the no right turn sign can be enforced as it is frequently ignored now
- Change the site access to force all traffic using the site to access and depart from the direction of the A4 only
- Should be signage to the south indicating no access to waste site.
- Entrance should be reconstructed to prevent entry from the south.
- View put forward that the existing access compromises safety
- Without mitigation an increase in vehicle numbers will result in a steep rise in accidents and potential fatalities.
- The subsequent expansion of the nursery school on to a second site and refurbishment of village hall have contributed to increased traffic in the area
- Padworth Lane / Rectory Road:
 - used by walkers, horses, cyclists
 - has no footpaths or street lighting
 - has several blind corners and single-track bridges with no warning or 'Priority' signs.
 - is not safe currently without any extra traffic
- potential additional movements of very large lorries to remove the extra household waste
- Opening times should not coincide with rush hour or pick up / drop off times for nursery schools
- Rectory Road is already used as a 'rat run' and is already seriously over loaded at peak rush hour times, not only in volume but by vehicles exceeding a safe speeding limit

Policy considerations:

- Site is outside the settlement boundary and is not a Protected Employment Area
- The NPPF requires that the three arms of sustainable development (economic, environmental and social) be sought 'jointly and simultaneously' through the planning system. It is not considered that the proposal meets the environmental and social requirements of sustainable development, nor that the economic benefits outweigh the other two.
- No good reason why a decision should deviate from adopted planning policies
- Not compliant with Core Strategy policy CS9, which directs economic growth to the Core Employment Areas, requires sequential information, and requires consideration in light of the *"compatibility with uses in the area surrounding the proposals and potential impacts on those uses"*
- Not compliant with Core Strategy Area Delivery Plan Policy 1 which seeks to direct development to the appropriate hierarchy of settlements

Amenity impacts:

- Odour and flies already a problem particularly in the hot weather
- The intensification in use of the facility is considered to result in significant noise and disturbance to residents to the detriment of their private amenity, especially as the type of waste proposed will now create greater environmental impacts than

at present.

- Risk of smell from household waste
- Concern that the waste would not be cleared regularly and would be left overnight
- The linkage of this application with the proposal to extend the hours of operation of the facility is considered to exacerbate the above issues, as residents would experience no relief from noise, odour or traffic generation on Sundays, bank or public holidays, as presently enjoyed.

Assessment:

- Traffic survey carried out on behalf of Veolia has not taken into consideration that traffic goes both ways north and south and doesn't simply enter the Veolia plant from the north/A4
- Queried whether impacts on road network to the south have been properly considered, particularly Rectory Road and Padworth Lane
- It is considered that since 2008, the use of the site has incrementally expanded, with each proposal cumulatively increasing harm.
- The development has not adequately assessed the effect of the development on highway safety, and should include a cumulative assessment of other planning permissions.
- The site was opened at a time when traffic flows nationally were reduced following the financial crisis of 2008/9 and traffic volumes have increased in recent years in line with national trends.

Other issues:

- waste sites should be open and available to any householder in any district without restriction.
- Has not first been evidenced as to why an agreement cannot be reached with the Smallmead site in Reading
- Queried as to why the existing site at Newtown Road, Newbury cannot be considered for expansion instead as it is in a highly sustainable location, within the settlement boundary, and accessed from the A339 with appropriate links to the wider Borough.
- Feared that this would lead to further applications of physical expansion to accommodate the additional waste.
- It has not been evidenced as to how the site will be properly managed to ensure there are no adverse ecological and water environmental impacts on the Kennet and Avon Canal.

Support

In favour of application

4 Policy and Procedural Considerations

- 4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the determination of any planning application must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory development plan comprises the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026 and those saved policies within the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 (Saved Policies 2007) (WBDLP), the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire (saved

policies) and the Replacement Minerals Local Plan (saved policies) and The South East Plan (May 2009), only insofar as Policy NRM6 applies.

4.2 Other material considerations include government legislation and guidance, and the West Berkshire Local Transport Plan, in particular:

- The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) (NPPF);
- By Design: urban design in the planning system: towards better practice (DETR/CABE);
- The National Planning Practice Guidance Suite (March 2014)
- The National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014)
- West Berkshire Local Transport Plan (2011-2026)

4.3 The policies within the West Berkshire Core Strategy (2006-2026) attract full weight. The following policies are relevant to this application:

- ADPP1: Spatial Strategy;
- ADPP6: The East Kennet Valley
- CS5: Infrastructure Requirements and Delivery
- CS9: Location and Type of Business Development
- CS13: Transport.

4.4 The policies of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007 attract due weight in accordance with their degree of consistency with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework. The following saved policies are relevant to this application:

- TRANS1: Meeting the Transport Needs of New Development;
- OVS5: Environmental Nuisance and Pollution Control
- OVS6: Noise Pollution

4.5 The Waste Local Plan for Berkshire (Waste Local Plan) is a key planning policy document relevant to this proposal. It is accepted that the Waste Local Plan is now dated, but it remains the adopted plan relating to waste proposals in Berkshire and provides a key local planning policy context. In accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) the Waste Local Plan was reviewed in 2007 and a number of policies were saved following this review process.

4.6 Despite the fact that the Waste Local Plan was adopted in 1998 it is clear from the NPPF that policies in existing adopted plans shall be still afforded due weight and more weight given to policies that are consistent with the NPPF. The NPPF does not contain any specific policies on Waste, referring to the NPPW but confirms that decision makers should have regard to policies in the NPPF and therefore it is considered that, where the policies in the Waste Local Plan are in conformity with the policies in the NPPF and NPPW then they should still be afforded due weight in the consideration of planning applications. The relevant saved policies for the determination of this application are:

- WLP1: Sustainable Development
- WLP11: Preferred Areas for waste management uses
- WLP27: Is development needed
- WLP30: Assessing the impact of development proposals

- WLP31: Information to be provided with application

4.7 The South East Plan was adopted on 6 May 2009 and carries due weight according to its degree of conformity with the Framework. Although this plan has been revoked, Policy NRM6 (Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area) remains in force. As such, the South East Plan is only relevant insofar as this policy applies. For the avoidance of doubt, for the purposes of this application the policy is not relevant as the site is not within nor does it influence the Thames Basin Heath SPA.

Environmental Impact Assessment

- 4.8 The application has been considered under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the EIA Regulations). The application has been submitted with an Environmental Statement and has been considered as EIA development.
- 4.9 For clarity the *Environmental Statement Addendum for Padworth Sidings, West Berkshire Preparatory Works and Integrated Waste Management Facility 2008 Environmental Statement [ES addendum]* and further information provided under Regulation 25 of the EIA Regulations, assesses the impacts of this application in conjunction with an application to extend the opening hours of the HWRC to include weekday mornings.
- 4.10 The aforementioned ES addendum and further information provided are considered to be an Environmental Statement for the purposes of the EIA Regulations in that they include the information reasonably required for reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the development on the environment, taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment.
- 4.11 For clarity, for the purposes of this report the term Environmental Statement will be used in the place of ES addendum.

5. Description of Development

- 5.1 This proposal is a change of use application which seeks permission to amend the approved details to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the Household Waste Recycling Facility.
- 5.2 The original planning application for the IWMF was submitted under application reference 08/01166/MINMAJ which was subsequently approved on 16th March 2009. The details submitted with the application described the nature of the development including the nature of the waste to be received at the HWRC (i.e. only recyclable waste).
- 5.3 The wider Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF) is located to the east of the main residential area of Aldermaston Wharf, and is bounded by the Great Western Main Line to the northwest, beyond which are a number of residential properties that are accessed via The Crescent and Oakend Way, and beyond these properties is the A4. On the northern side of the A4 are a number of industrial and commercial premises. To the south and south east of the IWMF are the Kennet and Avon Canal and towpath, while beyond the canal is a worked out mineral void which is now a water body. To the immediate northeast of the IWMF is the Oil Pipeline

Depot that is adjacent to Padworth lane, while to the east of Padworth Lane is Padworth Village Hall, the residential property known as Lothlorian, and open fields. To the west and south west of the IWMF are residential properties that form the outskirts of the residential area of Aldermaston Wharf.

5.4 The vehicular access to the IWMF and HWRC is via the south east corner of the site and directly onto Padworth lane. In close proximity to the access is Padworth Bridge, which is a swing bridge that traverses the Kennet and Avon Canal. The former sidings, that branch from the main line to the north, enters the north western corner of the IWMF site and follows the northern boundary before sweeping southwards along the eastern boundary.

5.5 There are residential properties in close proximity to the IWMF, the closest of which, Venture Fair (to the west), abuts the IWMF site boundary, however this property is some 250m from the HWRC. Other dwellings to the west, Orchard Bungalow and June Rose Bungalow are approximately 150m from the HWRC site. To the north east, and approximately 65m from the site entrance, is the property known as Lothlorian, while to the west of that property and also on Padworth Lane is the Padworth Village Hall, which also incorporates a residential dwelling for the resident caretaker for the hall. More residential properties are located to the northwest of the facility, beyond the railway line (approximately 300m from the HWRC site). There are 25 properties in this area (made up of the Crescent: 12 properties; Oakend Way: 8 properties; and 5 properties that are accessed via the Bath Road (A4)). Also in this locality, to the north east of Padworth Lane is the Holiday Inn Hotel, which is understood to have 50 rooms.

6. Consideration of the Proposal

6.1 The main issues for consideration in the determination of this application are:

- The role of the West Berkshire Council
- Two applications forming one project
- The principle of the development
- Traffic and transport
- Air quality, odour and bio-aerosols
- Noise
- Impact on amenity
- Community and social
- Alternatives
- Need for the development
- Points of clarity
- Suggested conditions
- Sustainable development
- Conclusion

6.2 The role of the West Berkshire Council

6.2.1 It is important that a distinction is made between the different statutory functions of West Berkshire Council as Waste Planning Authority and West Berkshire Council as Waste Management Authority. West Berkshire Council is both the Waste

Management Authority (Waste Collection and Waste Disposal Authority) and the Waste Planning Authority for its administrative area.

- 6.2.2 These are very separate functions that are carried out by different departments within the Council. It should also be noted that this application has not been submitted by the Waste Management Authority. It has been submitted by Veolia ES West Berkshire Limited, who have been awarded the waste management contract for West Berkshire.
- 6.2.3 The role of the Waste Planning Authority is to independently determine any planning application for development proposals submitted within their area.
- 6.2.4 The role of the Waste Management Authority is to manage the municipal waste generated in West Berkshire and, as part of this function, meet targets for types of waste management.

6.3 Two applications forming one project

- 6.3.1 Made in conjunction with this application is another application that is before this committee for determination (ref 17/01683/MINMAJ) seeking to extend the opening hours of the HWRC to include weekday mornings. These two applications together form one 'project' and have been considered as such, both by the applicant in the submission, and by WBC officers in terms of assessment. Notwithstanding this, two separate reports are being produced and there will ultimately be two separate resolutions and planning decision notices issued.

6.4 The principle of the development

- 6.4.1 Policy WLP11 of the WLPB confirms the allocation of the application site as a "preferred area" for waste management development. This policy has been saved and is thus relevant to this application. Policy WLP11 of the WLPB sets out a presumption that applications for waste management development on preferred areas will normally be permitted, provided that other policies in the WLPB are satisfied.
- 6.4.2 In addition to being within a 'preferred area' for waste management under WLP11, the permanent, existing Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) forms part of the wider permanent Integrated Waste Management Facility (IWMF). In essence waste would continue to be brought to the facility by the public, however the waste would be non-recyclable as well as recyclable. In principle terms this is not considered to be substantially different from the activities which are currently undertaken there. It is true that the original application was considered on the basis that the facility would only accept recyclable material, and that is the reason that a change of use application has been submitted. However, the principle of the development is considered acceptable.
- 6.4.3 Clearly when assessing development proposals, depending on the type of development, certain parts of the development plan will be more relevant than others. As this is a waste proposal on a permanent waste facility, WLP11 is quite rightly given a substantial amount of weight in the policy assessment. Reference has been made to the site not being within the settlement boundary or a Protected Employment Area, and that the development would not be compliant with ADPP1

and CS9. ADPP1 states inter alia, that most development will be within or adjacent to the settlements included in the settlement hierarchy, and that the majority of development will take place on previously developed land. ADPP6 generally directs economic development to Protected Employment Areas, however also broadly indicates that any development should respond positively to the local context. The fact that ADPP1 refers to 'most' development implies that this is not a hard and fast rule in all situations. CS9 stipulates that proposals for industry, distribution and storage uses will be directed to the District's defined Protected Employment Areas, and existing suitably located employment sites and premises. CS9 further states that proposals for business development should be in keeping with the surrounding environment, and not conflict with existing uses. As previously stated, the site is an existing, permanent waste management facility and the proposal is for a waste development, therefore in principle the development is considered to be acceptable.

6.5 Traffic and Transport

- 6.5.1 As already stated this application to allow the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the HWRC is made in conjunction with another application which, if approved would extend the opening hours at the HWRC to include weekday mornings. It is acknowledged that as a result of these proposals there would be an increase in the volume of traffic accessing the HWRC. The Transport Report and Environmental Statement jointly consider the traffic and transport impacts of both the proposals. As the number of vehicle movements will be directly linked to the tonnages of waste received in an HWRC, more information is provided below on how the tonnage of waste and associated vehicle movements were considered by the applicant and WBC officers.
- 6.5.2 Until 30 June 2016 members of the public at the eastern end of West Berkshire could have chosen to use the Smallmead HWRC in Reading to dispose of their waste but this reciprocal arrangement between the councils has now been withdrawn. The applicant has indicated in the provided Supporting Statement that a survey undertaken in September 2014 showed that at that time there was circa 4,800 tonnes of waste per year from West Berkshire residents being deposited at the Smallmead HWRC. Similar arrangements also existed for Hampshire residents from the Tadley area who have used Padworth HWRC as an alternative to using the HWRC in Basingstoke. This arrangement was withdrawn on 26 September 2016 and the use of the Padworth HWRC is now restricted to West Berkshire residents. Based on a survey in September 2015 waste from Hampshire residents was approximately 41% of the input to Padworth. In 2015 / 2016 this would have resulted in approximately 500 tonnes coming from Hampshire residents.
- 6.5.3 The applicant has indicated that while some of the waste displaced from Smallmead HWRC might be taken to the Newtown Road HWRC in Newbury, it seems likely, given the proximity, that the majority would be taken to the Padworth HWRC. This seems logical and therefore as a result of these two changes it is likely that a net tonnage increase in the order of 4,000 to 4,500 tonnes per annum to the Padworth HWRC could be expected. Based on the survey information future tonnage throughput could therefore increase to between 5,000 and 6,000 tonnes per annum.
- 6.5.4 With regard to determining an average volume of waste per car which projected vehicle movements could be derived from, the applicant has indicated that this was established through surveys of the Newtown Road HWRC and Padworth HWRC,

undertaken by the Waste Collection Authority during the same week of September 2015. The survey undertaken at Padworth observed that 0.061 tonnes per trip (i.e. load) were deposited, while at the Newbury HWRC the average deposits per trip were 0.058 tonnes. The lower 0.058 (58kg) was used in the applicant's assessment, as this results in a higher number of trips overall and it is agreed therefore that this provides a more robust assessment. The applicant has also stated that September was chosen as this represents a median month for waste inputs to HWRCs and also above the average level of monthly waste inputs. It is considered that this is a suitable approach and that seasonality is therefore accounted for within the data used.

- 6.5.5 From data derived from the September 2015 survey at the Newbury HWRC, it was established that 64% of trips occur on weekdays with 36% over weekends. It is expected that as a result of this and the associated application there would, on average per weekday be circa 211 extra car trips to the HWRC, while on a Saturday or Sunday there would be circa 249 additional HWRC trips. This compares with the current weekday and 'weekend day' trips of 43 and 116 respectively. WBC Highways are satisfied with the forecast traffic levels.
- 6.5.6 WBC Highways had queried the traffic distribution provided within the applicant's Transport Report which was 55% A4 East, 15% A4 West, 20% Padworth Lane and 10% A340. Through WBC Highways' own modelling a distribution of 73.4% A4 East, 12.8% A4 West, 11.4% Padworth Lane and 2.5% A340 had been calculated. In response the applicant reassessed distribution providing the supporting data and subsequent calculations. The distributions of 62.8% A4 East, 18.1% Padworth Lane 15.0% A4 West, and 4.1% A340 were subsequently agreed by WBC Highways.
- 6.5.7 Traffic surveys were undertaken at the following junctions, the weekday surveys being undertaken during February 2017, with weekend surveys undertaken during September 2017:
- Padworth Lane / Site access
 - A4 / Padworth Lane
 - A4 Bath Road / A340 / Pips Way Roundabout.
- 6.5.8 WBC Highways were satisfied with these junctions being modelled and this was undertaken factoring in consented developments. Regarding the A4 Bath Road / A340 / Pips Way Roundabout, it is acknowledged that there is already a traffic congestion issue at times during peak hours, however the actual development seems to have limited or no effect on the junction. Considering the A4 / Padworth Lane junction, the development also seems to have a very limited impact. The Padworth Lane / Site access junction is considered to clearly operate well within capacity, while the development is also shown to have very limited impact on the Padworth traffic signals.
- 6.5.9 Padworth Parish Council's transport consultant has indicated that no Transport Assessment was provided in support of the applications, however for the avoidance of doubt the submitted Transport Report is considered to be a Transport Assessment.
- 6.5.10 The applications were submitted with an Environmental Statement which has a Traffic and Transport chapter within it. Padworth Parish's consultant has criticised the Environmental Statement indicating that it is not fit for the purpose of assessing

the environmental impact of road traffic arising from the applications, and that further information and assessment is required. The Parish's consultant indicates that there are significant anomalies within the ES, and has concerns specifically about road safety at the access to the facility; road safety on Padworth Lane south of the Facility; environmental impact associated with changes in road traffic; and peak hour impacts of the applications. The Parish's consultant submits that impacts arising from increases in road traffic would be felt along Padworth Lane / Rectory Road and therefore traffic management measures should be employed in this area as mitigation. The suggested measures are set out in the 'suggested conditions' section of this report.

6.5.11 A transport consultant was commissioned by the Council to independently review the Traffic and Transport chapter in the Environmental Statement. This resulted in further information and clarification being requested in regard to the environmental impacts of the traffic associated with the development. Following the provision of such information, the Council's highways consultant has indicated that although the 'receptor sensitivity' and the 'magnitude of change' applied are not always agreed with in the Environmental Statement, the concluding 'significance' is agreed and it is suggested that this is a sensible basis upon which to determine the application.

6.5.12 The Council's highways consultant indicates that the Parish's consultant has striven to present the 'worst case scenario' based on the information provided and (IEA) (now IEMA – Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment) guidance, seemingly aligned with the European Union Guidance, and acknowledges that such a position fails to contemplate subsequent changes in legislation, court decisions and guidance. The IEA guidelines and associated section of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (Volume 11) has remained largely unchanged for 25 years. It is considered that by applying professional judgement the Parish's consultant might contemplate worse cases in their assessment of the residual cumulative effect of development whilst Veolia's consultant might do the same and arrive at different conclusions.

6.5.13 The Council's highways consultant concludes inter alia, that:

- Existing/Baseline conditions reveal some daily and seasonal variations;
- The proposed use(s) are also subject to daily and seasonal variations that will result in higher perceptions of change;
- The Applicant's Environmental Statement under-estimates the sensitivity of some roads within the study area;
- The magnitude of change will in fact be material at times, largely because the baseline traffic flows are very low; but notwithstanding these,
- The significance of these changes remain low.

6.5.14 The Council's highways consultant has not recommended mitigation with the exception of signage at the canal and river crossings, indicating that this would contribute to reductions in traffic speeds, thereby delivering a proportionate remedy to the magnitude of change. With regard to the canal bridge, the reasoning for this is stated as being sub-standard visibility to the south from the site access. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged by the Council's consultant that although highway visibility is critical to road safety, it is not always appropriate to provide greater visibility or warning signs as this may contribute to increased speeds and crash risk.

- 6.5.15 However, no mitigation is considered to be necessary by WBC Highways. Regarding the southward visibility at the site access, it is understood from WBC Highways that speeds on the canal bridge of traffic travelling in a northerly direction were measured as approximately 19mph in 2008, and there is no reason to think that this would have changed due to the physical constraints of the bridge. The sight lines are compliant in the context of this speed. For this reason no mitigation in the form of signage at the canal bridge is considered to be necessary.
- 6.5.16 Hypothetically if this application to allow the receipt of non-recyclable waste was approved, and the associated application to amend the opening hours was refused, the impacts would likely be different to those predicted in the Transport Report and the Environmental Statement. The expected increase in vehicle movements may be more concentrated as the facility would not be open on weekday mornings, however this situation has not been assessed. The assessments provided by the applicant considered the impacts of the applications jointly.
- 6.5.17 The West Berkshire Local Transport Plan (2011-2026) (LTP) is a statutory document and a material consideration, however it is not part of the development plan. LTP K2 Minimising Congestion is of particular relevance in terms of the highways impacts of the associated developments.
- 6.5.18 Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy and TRANS. 1 of the Local Plan are considered relevant to traffic and highway implications, while CS5 is concerned in part with the identification of requirements for infrastructure provision and services for new development. CS13 sets out the requirements for development that generates a transport impact, although it is stated that proposals may not be required to fulfill each criterion. The most relevant parts of CS13 in regard to this proposal are considered to be: *Minimise the impact of all forms of travel on the environment and help tackle climate change; Mitigate the impact on the local transport network and the strategic road network; and Prepare Transport Assessments/Statements and Travel Plans to support planning proposals in accordance with national guidance.*
- 6.5.19 The environmental impacts have been considered in the submitted Environmental Statement and Transport Report, and are deemed to be acceptable without the need for additional mitigation.
- 6.5.20 CS13 and WBC's Highways consultant make reference to Travel Plans, and therefore the provisions of the Travel Plan for the Padworth IWMF (approved under 14/01111/MINMAJ) are considered here. The key objectives of this Travel Plan are to minimise the use of single occupancy vehicles for staff and visitor travel; and to manage operational traffic so as to minimise its impact. The nature of the HWRC however, is such that the private motor car would be the main vehicle of choice, and public transport and car-sharing to access the HWRC would not be practical. It has been forecast that this application in conjunction with the application to extend the opening hours of the HWRC would result in one additional HGV trip (2 movements) per day, therefore the impact on operational HGV traffic would be negligible. Similarly, the applicant has indicated no changes in employment would result from the proposals, therefore again the developments would have no bearing on employee travel.
- 6.5.21 TRANS1 states inter alia, that the transportation needs of new development should be met through the provision of a range of facilities associated with different

transport modes including public transport, walking, cycling and parking provision. In a similar vein to the relevance of a Travel Plan to these proposals, the nature of an HWRC is that the private car would be used. This policy could potentially be seen as relevant in providing mitigation for walkers and cyclists for example, however mitigation is not considered necessary for the reasons outlined above and in 6.13 below.

6.5.22 WBC Highways have no objections to the development and the WBC Highways consultant agrees that any highways impacts would not be significant. This development is considered to align with CS13 and TRANS1.

6.6 Air quality, odour and bio-aerosols

6.6.1 Within the provided Environmental Statement which considers the impacts from this and the associated application jointly, is an air quality assessment which concludes that there will be no significant change in air quality in the vicinity of the site arising from the increase in the number of vehicles movements. The assessment indicates that there would be a small increase in the annual mean nitrogen dioxide concentration at Padworth Village Hall and at a residential property in The Crescent but it is not considered that this would generate significant adverse effects. WBC Environmental Health have reviewed the assessment methodology and are satisfied with the conclusions reached.

6.6.2 An inconsistency was identified regarding the predicted development traffic which resulted in an increase in predicted two way traffic flow equivalent to 49 light duty vehicle movements per day: 39 on Padworth Lane north of the site and 10 south of the site. It is considered that the predicted percentage increase in the movement of light duty vehicles would not have a significant effect on the overall outcome of the air quality assessment and there is no risk that there would be a breach of local air quality objectives on Padworth Lane.

6.6.3 It is noted that while non-recyclable waste is not currently accepted at the HWRC, it is already accepted and processed within the wider site. The non-recyclable waste deposited in skips would be taken at regular intervals from the HWRC into existing buildings on the site where existing controls to prevent odour and fugitive emission are in place. For these reasons the conclusions reached in the submitted report are considered satisfactory.

6.6.4 Hypothetically if this application to allow the receipt of non-recyclable waste was approved, and the associated application to amend the opening hours was refused, the air quality impacts would potentially be different from those predicted within the Environmental Statement. However, the assessments provided by the applicant considered the impacts of the applications jointly.

6.6.5 The policies within the West Berkshire Local Transport Plan (2011-2026) (LTP) are material considerations, and relevant LTP policies to impacts on air quality are LTP K6 Air Quality; and LTP K5 Climate Change, within which the reduction of carbon emissions associated with road transport is set out as an objective.

6.6.6 Saved Local Plan policy OVS.5 is concerned with 'Environmental Nuisance and Pollution Control' from development, while WLP30 specifies that traffic and traffic

related impacts should be taken into account when assessing waste proposals. WLP27 states, inter alia that waste management development will only be permitted if the development would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental impacts. The impacts in terms of air quality, odour and bio-aerosols are considered to be acceptable and there are no objections from Environmental Health. In view of this the development is considered to be in the spirit of LTP K6 and LTP K5, and to comply with OVS.5, WLP30 and WLP27.

6.7 Noise

- 6.7.1 Officers are satisfied that there will be no significant noise impacts associated with the receipt of non-recyclable waste in conjunction with the associated application. WBC Environmental Health have no objections to this application with regard to impact from noise.
- 6.7.2 It is expected that the provision of a facility to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste would increase the number of vehicle movements into and out of the site and it would intensify activities in and around the HWRC, increasing the amount of noise arising.
- 6.7.3 The acoustic modelling considered skip changes, material being deposited in the skips, on-site traffic, and off-site traffic accessing the HWRC, making certain assumptions. The noise and vibration chapter of the Environmental Statement concludes that there will be no significant impact arising from the predicted intensification of use. Noise from vehicles travelling from the Bath Road to the site entrance is predicted to cause a 'minor adverse' (not significant) noise impact and there will be no perceptible increase in noise at the nearest noise sensitive residential premises arising from the increased use of the HWRC.
- 6.7.4 Hypothetically if this application to allow the receipt of non-recyclable waste was approved, and the associated application to amend the opening hours was refused, the noise impacts would potentially be different from those predicted within the Environmental Statement. However, the assessments provided by the applicant considered the impacts of the applications jointly.
- 6.7.5 Saved Local Plan policy OVS.6 is concerned with 'Noise Pollution' from development, while WLP30 specifies that traffic related impacts should be taken into account when assessing waste proposals and this is inclusive of noise. WLP27 states, inter alia that waste management development will only be permitted if the development would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental impacts, again including noise impacts. For the reasons outlined above, in regard to noise impacts, the development is considered to align with OVS.6, WLP30 and WLP27.

6.8 Impact on amenity

- 6.8.1 Waste facilities of this nature, and the associated traffic movements have the potential to result in amenity impacts. There is cross-over between this section of the report and the following other sections of this report: Traffic and transport; Air quality, odour and bio-aerosols; Noise; and Community and Social.

- 6.8.2 The Environmental Statement has indicated that the estimated changes in traffic flows associated with the revised HWRC would not alter the broader traffic flow patterns and therefore there will be a negligible effect on severance, pedestrian and cyclist delay, pedestrian and cyclist amenity, and driver stress and delay. It is also specified in the Environmental Statement that the junction capacity assessments predict that driver delay will increase slightly but by a negligible amount.
- 6.8.3 As outlined in the 'Traffic and Transport' section of the report, the Council's highways consultant has indicated that although the 'receptor sensitivity' and the 'magnitude of change' applied are not always agreed with in the Environmental Statement, the concluding 'significance' is agreed (not significant) and it is suggested that this is a sensible basis upon which to determine the application. Therefore, likely resulting amenity impacts on pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers are considered to not be significant.
- 6.8.4 Air quality has obvious amenity implications and the air quality assessment which considers the impacts from this and the associated application jointly concludes that there will be no significant change in air quality in the vicinity of the site arising from the increase in the number of vehicles movements.
- 6.8.5 The risk of odour arising from the receipt of household waste has been highlighted as a potential issue in representations. The non-recyclable waste deposited in skips would be removed regularly to existing buildings within the wider IWMF where existing controls to prevent odour and fugitive emission are in place. For these reasons the amenity impacts relating to odour are likely to be negligible.
- 6.8.6 The assessment indicates that noise from vehicles travelling from the Bath Road to the site entrance is predicted to cause a 'minor adverse' (not significant) noise impact and there would be no perceptible increase in noise at the nearest noise amenity sensitive residential premises. Officers are satisfied that there would be no significant noise impacts associated with allowing the receipt of non-recyclable waste in conjunction with the associated application.
- 6.8.7 Conditions which have previously been imposed on 14/01111/MINMAJ relating to noise, odour, dust, lighting and litter would be re-imposed in order to control the impacts of the development. The HWRC operating hours which are the subject of the associated application (17/01683/MINMAJ) would be controlled, the specifics depending on the outcome of the associated application. For these reasons it is considered that there would not be a significant impact on amenity as a result of this development.
- 6.8.8 Representations relating to this application have also indicated that longer operating hours would result in significant noise and disturbance to residents to the detriment of their private amenity, and it has been indicated that the hours are proposed to extend into Sunday, bank and public holidays. Although this relates to the opening hours application as opposed to the receipt of non-recyclable waste application, as discussed, the applications are associated, and for completeness these potential impacts on amenity are considered in this report.
- 6.8.9 It should be noted that there is already a significant amount of HGV vehicle movement in and out of the site well before the proposed new opening times and the operating times at weekends and bank holidays would actually be slightly

reduced. Opening in the morning also has the potential to spread the expected increased number of vehicle movements over the day rather than concentrating the impact in the afternoons.

- 6.8.10 Hypothetically if this application to allow the receipt of non-recyclable waste was approved, and the associated application to amend the opening hours was refused, the amenity impacts would potentially be different from those predicted within the Environmental Statement. The predicted increased vehicle movements may be more concentrated as the facility would not be open on weekday mornings. This has not been assessed however. The assessments provided by the applicant considered the impacts of the applications jointly.
- 6.8.11 Saved Local Plan policies OVS.5 and OVS.6 are concerned with 'Environmental Nuisance and Pollution Control' and 'Noise Pollution' from development respectively. WLP30 specifies that traffic and traffic related impacts should be taken into account when assessing waste proposals. WLP27 states, inter alia that waste management development will only be permitted if the development would not give rise to any unacceptable environmental impacts. In regard to impact on amenity the development is considered to be compliant with OVS.5, OVS.6, WLP30 and WLP27.

6.9 Community and Social

- 6.9.1 'Community and Social' impacts are considered in the Environmental Statement. It is stated by the applicant that there is an overlap between this section and the Environmental Statement sections on air quality, noise and vibration, and traffic and transport. This is considered to be reasonable, and is true of this report as well, with there being cross-over between this section and the sections on 'traffic and transport', 'air quality, odour and bio-aerosols', 'noise' and 'amenity'.
- 6.9.2 Some information is provided on impact on employment and services. It is submitted that the proposals to amend the opening hours and allow the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the HWRC would not change the levels of employment generated by the IWMF, and that two operatives would continue to be employed at the HWRC. The revised HWRC will not affect any existing services or require any new services to be provided.
- 6.9.3 The applicant has set out in the Transport Report, and in the further information provided as part of the Regulation 25 request, information relating to road accidents. The analysis covers the most recent three year period of available Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data, provided by West Berkshire Council, for the period of 1 January 2014 to 31 December 2016, during which a total of two accidents were recorded within the study area. It is submitted that both were classified as being slight in severity and occurred at the A4 Bath Road / A340 Basingstoke Road / Pips Way roundabout, and that there were no serious or fatal accidents reported during the study period. Since the HWRC became operational in 2011, four accidents have been recorded at the HWRC, and it is claimed that these have all been minor in nature. Based on this it appears that there is no accident trend present within the study area.

6.9.4 The proposals are expected to increase car movements to and from the HWRC, however the applicant submits that the level of change has not been assessed as sufficient to change the accident rate in the study area. It is also indicated by the applicant, that within the study area, there are no changes proposed to the road layouts or junction layouts which may change driver behaviour or lead to a change in accident rates.

6.9.5 The following West Berkshire Local Transport Plan (2011-2026) (LTP) policies are material considerations: LTP K7 Highway maintenance which specifies as a focus, inter alia 'Improving the safety of the network for all users'; and LTP K8 Road Safety which is concerned with creating a safer road environment for all, specifying as a focus, inter alia 'Improving safety for vulnerable road users of all ages, such as pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists, and equestrian users.' As the level of change has not been assessed as sufficient to impact on the accident rate in the study area, the proposals are considered to be in the spirit of LTP K7 and LTP K8.

6.9.6 In regard to potential amenity related effects which would have a community and social dimension, the amenity section of this report should be consulted.

6.10 Alternatives

6.10.1 It has been indicated by the applicant that there were no viable alternatives to the project which encompasses this application and the application to amend the operating hours at the HWRC.

6.10.2 There was previously a joint arrangement with the re3 waste partnership of Bracknell Forest, Reading and Wokingham Borough Councils, which allowed residents from West Berkshire to use the Smallmead HWRC at Island Road, Reading. However, this arrangement was withdrawn following a period of public consultation as part of the 2016/17 budget decision, and it cannot be reinstated due to financial constraints.

6.10.3 Under Regulation 18(3)(d) of the EIA Regulations 2017 the applicant must include with an Environmental Statement (inter alia):

“...a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed development and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the development on the environment;”

6.10.4 The 2017 Regulations therefore do not require an applicant to consider alternatives, but where they have been considered their impact should be assessed.

6.11 Need for the development

6.11.1 WLP27 states inter alia, that planning applications for waste management development will only be permitted if the Local Planning Authorities are satisfied that: there is a need for the development; and there is a wider environmental benefit

resulting from the development which outweighs any adverse environmental and other effects resulting from it.

- 6.11.2 Currently residents in the east of the district can take recyclable waste to the Padworth HWRC, however general waste must be taken to the Newtown Road HWRC at Newbury. This is a significant round-trip for residents living in the east of the district wishing to dispose of general waste. From this perspective it is accepted that there is a need for the Padworth HWRC to accept non-recyclable waste. Regarding the associated application (17/01683/MINMAJ) the ability to dispose of non-recyclable waste on weekday mornings at the HWRC would also be positive in terms of providing an adequate service for residents.
- 6.11.3 It is acknowledged that as a result of accepting non-recyclable waste at the Padworth HWRC, local levels of traffic would increase from their current levels. Due to the associated proposal to change the opening hours there would also be implications for the levels of traffic on weekday mornings. This has been assessed by the applicant and in turn by the Council, and is discussed at length in this report. The impacts are considered to be acceptable.
- 6.11.4 There is also considered to be a substantial sustainability benefit in terms of the travel distances involved for residents in the east of the district disposing of general waste to HWRCs. Rather than travelling to Newbury, eastern residents would likely choose to use the Padworth HWRC and the journey would be shortened significantly in many cases. As described, the opening of the HWRC on weekday mornings would assist in spreading the vehicle movements over the day.
- 6.11.5 It is acknowledged that some residents who live in the south east of the district may use the minor roads to access the Padworth HWRC rather than the A4 and Padworth Lane from the north. It is considered possible that currently some of these residents, should they wish to deposit non-recyclable waste or use an HWRC in the morning, may be already utilising these same minor roads in order to gain access to the A4 to travel to the Newtown Road HWRC site at Newbury.

6.12 Points of clarity

- 6.12.1 Several issues have been raised in the consultation responses and representations relating to various matters, and these have been responded to below.
- 6.12.2 Reference is made to traffic turning into Padworth Lane from the A4 being immediately confronted by a set of traffic signals and it is intimated that there is a risk of the queues extending into the A4 and interfering with the safe flow of traffic on that road. It is however, understood from the Highway authority that this could not happen due to there being sensors which would automatically turn the lights green at the railway bridge where traffic was backing up onto the A4 from Padworth Lane.
- 6.12.3 It has been indicated that the extant planning permission for the IWMF permits a throughput of 95,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) of waste excluding non-recyclable household waste. Although the HWRC does not allow the receipt of non-recyclable waste, the wider IWMF already accepts non-recyclable waste from the street-side collections undertaken throughout West Berkshire.

- 6.12.4 It has been indicated that a speed limit should be put in place on Padworth Lane / Rectory Road. This is considered to be a separate matter to the planning application and is not considered necessary in order to make this development acceptable. It should be acknowledged that circa 82% of traffic accessing/exiting the HWRC is predicted via the north to/from the A4. It is acknowledged that the road network to the south is narrow in places, however there is no evidence that there is a speeding issue. Speed surveys were taken outside Lodge Farm on Padworth Lane to the south of the IWMF from 30 July to 5 August 2015 revealing 85th percentile speeds of 38 mph northbound and 37mph southbound. Considering that the speed limit is 60mph, it is not considered that there is a speeding issue. This is supported by a Speed Limit review undertaken by the Council during September 2015 that concluded that no changes to the speed limit should be undertaken.
- 6.12.5 The issue has arisen of whether more could be done in terms of encouraging drivers exiting the site access not to turn right. The view has also been put forward that the entrance should be reconstructed to prevent entry from the south. With the access being private, it is not possible to apply a traffic regulation order upon it to prohibit vehicles turning right. Even if it was possible to apply a traffic regulation order, it is highly unlikely to ever be enforced in such a location. It may be possible to physically prevent vehicles from turning right with items such as kerbed islands. However any islands would need to be small enough to still enable large vehicles to turn into and out of the site. In making them smaller, this then reduces their effectiveness in preventing smaller vehicles from turning right. None of this is considered practical and therefore with the original planning application it was decided to provide a sign that encouraged traffic not to turn right. No further works or mitigation is recommended in regard to the site access.
- 6.12.6 Regarding access from the road network to the south, representations have also indicated that there should be signage indicating that there is no access to the waste site from the south. This however, has not been considered necessary in order to make the development acceptable.
- 6.12.7 It has been suggested that waste sites should be open and available to any householder in any district without restriction. This goes beyond the scope of this planning application.
- 6.12.8 In the representations reference has been made to the use of the site incrementally expanding, with each proposal cumulatively increasing harm. It has also been indicated that the submission should include a cumulative assessment of other planning permissions. The following is a summary of the planning permissions that have been granted following the grant of 08/01166/MINMAJ:
- 09/02521/MINMAJ was a variation of conditions application which sought minor physical changes within the IWMF including changes to building height, internal layout of buildings, site layout, fencing, the lighting scheme and landscape planting scheme.
 - 11/00923/MINMAJ was a variation of conditions which again sought minor physical changes within the IWMF including changes to buildings, internal layout, landscaping, infrastructure and erection of a fence.
 - 13/01546/MINMAJ was retrospective in that submissions should have been made pursuant to conditions imposed on permission 11/00923/MINMAJ relating to a

Travel Plan; Ecological Management; and BREEAM and they were not. This was an application to regularise this.

- 14/01111/MINMAJ related to the submission of a Travel Plan

6.12.9 As can be seen above none of the subsequent variations after the 2008 consent would have resulted in an intensification or expansion of the site activities. It is also the case that locally where a planning permission has been implemented (and is already generating a traffic impact), this would be picked up through baseline monitoring of traffic levels. Regarding committed developments, these have also been factored into the traffic modelling.

6.12.10 It has been suggested that the existing site at Newtown Road, Newbury could be considered for expansion instead of the Padworth HWRC. This goes beyond the scope of this planning application which relates to the Padworth HWRC.

6.12.11 Reference has been made to the fact that this development may lead to further applications for physical expansion to accommodate the additional waste. The assessments provided are considered to be robust and the planning authority can only determine the application that is before them rather than considering a hypothetical situation with no evidence to back it up.

6.12.12 Potential adverse ecological and water environmental impacts on the Kennet and Avon Canal have been raised as a concern, however the proposed development is not considered likely to have any implications in these regards.

6.13 Suggested conditions

6.13.1 A number of conditions have been recommended by Padworth Parish's consultant (Motion) in the situation where the Council was to grant planning permission. They have been reproduced below followed by appropriate discussion.

1. A study is undertaken to develop a scheme for managing traffic along the route in accordance with the Quiet Lanes principle, which is aimed at achieving positive changes in user behaviour on minor rural roads.

This should include, but not be limited to:

- i. Introduction of 30mph speed limit on the route;*
- ii. Improvement of forward visibility including hedgerow maintenance and lowering of earth banks in the highway;*
- iii. Improved signing along the route to warn motorists of change in environment and that they should give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians;*
- iv. Improvements to PRow signing to ensure that PRow users are able to quickly and easily locate PRow and thereby minimise the length of time spent in the carriageway;*
- v. Introduction of weight restriction along the route between Baughurst Road and swing bridge with exceptions for access to local businesses / emergency vehicles. Camera enforcement of restrictions;*
- vi. Introduction of formal one-way working at the canal and river crossings;*
- vii. Traffic management scheme at the junction of Rectory Road / Padworth Lane / School Road / Raghill to slow motorists and enable safe crossing for children attending schools; and*
- viii. Provision of pedestrian crossing facilities on Padworth Lane between the A4 and the Village Hall.*

Discussion: It is true that Padworth Lane is narrow in places; however there is no evidence that there is a speeding issue. Speed surveys were taken outside Lodge Farm on Padworth Lane to the south of the IWMF from 30 July to 5 August 2015 revealing 85th percentile speeds of 38 mph northbound and 37mph southbound. Considering that the speed limit is 60mph, this does not suggest a speeding issue. This is supported by a Speed Limit review undertaken by the Council during September 2015 that concluded that no changes to the speed limit should be undertaken. There would be a negligible impact from HGV traffic as a result of the two associated applications, therefore a weight limit would not be relevant to these applications.

It is considered that the submitted Transport Report, and the Environmental Statement are fit for purpose. The submitted documentation has been assessed. Planning conditions, or planning obligations can only be used in order to make a development acceptable which would otherwise be unacceptable. In this respect it is considered that this condition is unnecessary.

2. Having regard to the wide variety of social and community events that take place at locations along the route, regular recorded liaison between the Operators of the Facility and the Parish Council so that conflicts between the activities of local residents and activities of the Facility can be minimised.

Discussion: Planning conditions can only be used in order to make a development acceptable which would otherwise be unacceptable. In this respect it is considered that this condition is unnecessary. In the situation where issues arise it may be that the liaison meetings which previously took place could be reintroduced, however a planning condition would not be required for these purposes.

3. A ceiling of 6,000 tpa of household waste is imposed at the Facility and that furthermore, no increase in that 6,000 tpa be allowed in the future unless a new planning application is submitted. The condition would also need to set out how the Applicant is required to record and report on tonnage.

Discussion: A ceiling of 6,000 tpa on the throughput at the HWRC would not be effective in terms of minimising impacts. The projected tonnages and associated vehicle movements are exactly that: a modelled situation based on assumptions. It is considered that both the assessment that has been undertaken, and specifically the figure of 6,000 tpa are robust, however it would be impossible for an assessment of this nature to be 100% accurate. Where the tonnages received were in excess of that which has been predicted and it was considered that the resulting impacts represented a material change of use, this would then potentially require a planning application to be submitted with further assessment. This would be the case even without an upper limit on tonnage for the HWRC. Another point is that where any upper limit was reached (and the HWRC was not accepting waste for a period of time), it is highly likely that residents would not be aware and would drive to the HWRC, and this has the same traffic impact as if the HWRC was still accepting waste material. In reality the applicant already monitors throughput in the constituent parts of the IWMF, and the planning authority receives this data annually, however condition 4 now includes specific reference to monitoring throughput in the HWRC.

Padworth Parish Council itself also put forward recommended conditions in the situation where planning permission was granted. Again they have been reproduced below with appropriate discussion following:

- 1 *Signs... there are no signs to warn traffic about the single track sections, about the entrance to Veolia, especially at the canal bridge, (the visibility is only 27% of the required figure for the 60mph speed limit), about the schools or the x-roads.*

Discussion: Planning conditions or obligations can only be used in order to make a development acceptable which would otherwise be unacceptable. In this respect it is considered that this condition is unnecessary. Visibility to the south from the site entrance is suitable for the speeds at which vehicles travel across the bridge.

- 2 *The speed limit on the A4 and the Reading Road is 50 mph, yet Rectory Road and Padworth Lane with all its problems is 60mph. 85% of the traffic using these lanes is travelling at over 40mph, which means a closing speed of 80mph for two vehicles on blind corners and single track sections. The increase in traffic volume is estimated (by Veolia) to be up to 90%.*

Discussion: See discussion on Motion's suggested condition 1

- 3 *Improve forward visibility, hedgerow maintenance, and lowering of earth banks, especially at White Copse Corner, which is only 40 meters from the entrance to Jubilee School where children cross the lane every day, and is completely blind to oncoming traffic in both directions. Improve the 'Passing Places' which are all in a very poor condition and too small.*

Discussion: This appears to be a separate matter to impacts from the planning applications. Planning conditions or obligations can only be used in order to make a development acceptable which would otherwise be unacceptable. In this respect it is considered that this condition is unnecessary.

4. *The 6'6" width restriction is ignored daily, bring in a weight restriction as well.*

Discussion: This appears to be a separate matter to impacts from the planning applications. The resulting impacts from HGVs from this development would be negligible. Planning conditions or obligations can only be used in order to make a development acceptable which would otherwise be unacceptable. In this respect it is considered that this condition is unnecessary.

5. *Apply Traffic Light Controls on the Canal and River Bridges.*

Planning conditions or obligations can only be used in order to make a development acceptable which would otherwise be unacceptable. In this respect it is considered that this condition/obligation is unnecessary.

6. *Enforce the 'Turn Left Only' rule when leaving the Veolia Site. One sign says 'All Traffic turn Left' and another says 'HGV's Turn Left'.*

See section 6.12.5 of this report

7. *Regular meetings between the Parish Council and Veolia to discuss any problems.*

Discussion: See discussion on Motion's suggested condition 2

8. A ceiling of 6000 tonnes per annum be enforced, and no increase without a new Application.

Discussion: See discussion on Motion's suggested condition 3

6.14 The assessment of sustainable development

- 6.14.1 The NPPF requires local authorities to 'approach decision-making in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development' (paragraph 186). Paragraph 187 further stresses that 'decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible'.
- 6.14.2 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF sets out the Government's economic, environment social planning policies for England, with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The policies of the NPPF, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system and emphasises that a presumption in favour of sustainable development should be the basis for every plan, and every decision. Planning applications must result in sustainable development with consideration being given to the economic, social and environmental sustainability aspects of the proposal.
- 6.14.3 Economic Dimension: The proposed development would not create any new employment, however the HWRC and wider IWMF already offer employment opportunities. In this respect, allowing the proposal would at least help to retain some benefit to the local economy.
- 6.14.4 Environmental dimension: Where residents in the east of the district wish to access an HWRC to deposit non-recyclable waste, they would currently have to travel to Newbury which is a significant round trip. This has implications in terms of use of resources (fuel) and carbon emissions. Shorter travelling distances to deposit waste would be an environmental benefit.
- 6.14.5 Social dimension: The proposal has been assessed as being acceptable in terms of amenity and social impacts. Again shorter travelling distances for residents in the east could be seen to have social benefits, as would better access to waste management facilities.
- 6.14.6 Saved policy WLP1 specifies that in considering proposals for waste management development, regard should be had to the extent to which the development: is sustainable in form and location, helps to conserve natural resources and the human and natural environment, and minimises traffic congestion, travel distances, waste generation and pollution, and adverse impacts on humans and the natural environment.
- 6.14.7 For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposed development is supported by the presumption in favour of sustainable development and aligns with WLP1.

7. Conclusion

7.1 Reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the proposed development Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended)

7.1.1 Regulations 26(1)(b), 26(1)(c), and 29(2)(b)(i)(aa) requirements

- 7.1.1.1 The Environmental Statement considers impacts from allowing the receipt of non-recyclable waste (this application) in conjunction with extending the opening hours of the HWRC.
- 7.1.1.2 The Environmental Statement has been assessed by parties associated with the Council who have sufficient expertise to consider whether the Environmental Statement is fit for purpose.
- 7.1.1.3 Within the provided Environmental Statement is an air quality assessment which concludes that there will be no significant change in air quality. It is stated within the Environmental Statement that odour is already subject to current action plans and on going sampling, and that there is no change in the nature of the risk associated with fugitive emission, odour and bio aerosols as a result of the proposals. This has been assessed and the conclusions reached in the Environmental Statement are considered to be satisfactory.
- 7.1.1.4 Within the provided Environmental Statement is a noise assessment which concludes that there will be no significant impact arising from the proposals. Noise from vehicles travelling from the Bath Road to the site entrance is predicted to cause a 'minor adverse' (not significant) noise impact and there will be no perceptible increase in noise at the nearest noise sensitive residential premises arising from the proposals. This has been assessed and the conclusions reached in the Environmental Statement are considered to be satisfactory.
- 7.1.1.5 'Traffic and transport' is assessed within the Environmental Statement. The Council's highways consultant has indicated that although the receptor 'sensitivity' and the 'magnitude of change' applied are not always agreed with in the Environmental Statement, the concluding 'significance' is agreed and it is suggested that this is a sensible basis upon which to determine the application. It is considered that the Environmental Statement may under-estimate the sensitivity of some roads within the study area, and that the magnitude of change would potentially be material at times, largely because the baseline traffic flows are very low. However, notwithstanding these issues it is considered that the likely significance of these changes would be low.
- 7.1.1.6 The Environmental Statement considers 'Community and Social' impacts and it is submitted that the proposals to allow the receipt of non-recyclable waste and amend the opening hours at the HWRC would not change the levels of employment generated by the IWMF. The revised HWRC would not affect any existing services or require any new services to be provided.
- 7.1.1.7 The proposals are expected to increase car movements on weekday mornings and in general to and from the HWRC, however the level of change has not been

assessed in the Environmental Statement as sufficient to change the accident rate in the study area. No changes are proposed to the road layouts or junction layouts which may change driver behaviour or lead to a change in accident rates. Likely resulting amenity impacts on pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers are considered to not be significant.

- 7.1.1.8 As set out in 7.1.1.3 and 7.1.1.4 the provided Environmental Statement concludes that there will be no significant changes to air quality, odour and noise and these issues are considered to have amenity and social aspects. Where relevant to the proposals to change the HWRC, conditions which have previously been imposed on 14/01111/MINMAJ relating to noise, odour, dust, lighting, and litter, would be re-imposed on this new planning permission. Controls on operating hours (which are the subject of the associated application 17/01683/MINMAJ) would also be imposed. These conditions would adequately control the impacts of the development. For these reasons it is considered that there would not be a significant impact on amenity as a result of this development.

7.1.1 Regulations 29(2)(b)(i)(bb), 29(2)(b)(i)(cc) and 29(2)(b)(i)(dd) requirements

- 7.1.2.1 Regulations 29(2)(b)(i)(bb) and 29(2)(b)(i)(cc) are not relevant as it is not considered that the development will result in significant impacts in terms of the EIA Regulations. Regarding Regulation 29 (2)(b)(i)(dd) where relevant any monitoring measures are set out in the conditions (and within the schemes referred to in the conditions) recommended to be attached to the decision notice although the imposition of conditions and monitoring measures does not denote significant impacts in terms of the EIA Regulations.

7.2 Concluding comments

- 7.2.1 The site is a permanent waste management facility in a 'preferred area' for waste management uses. In essence waste would continue to be brought to the facility by the public, however the waste would be non-recyclable as well as recyclable. In principle terms this is not considered to be substantially different from the activities which are currently undertaken there. It is true that the original application was considered on the basis that the facility would only accept recyclable material, and that is the reason that a change of use application has been submitted. However, the principle of the development is considered acceptable.
- 7.2.2 As a result of this and the associated proposal to allow the acceptance of general waste at the HWRC, it is likely that there would be an increase in vehicle movements to the site when compared to the current situation in the morning and in general. As discussed above the development has been assessed as being acceptable in planning and all other terms. There is also already a significant amount of HGV movements in and out of the site before the proposed new opening times, and the operating times at weekends and bank holidays will be slightly reduced. Currently residents in the east of the district must travel large distances to deposit non-recyclable waste or to use an HWRC in the morning. It is accepted therefore, that there is a need for Padworth HWRC to accept non-recyclable waste and to be open on weekday mornings.

7.2.3 Having taken account of the relevant policy considerations, and the other material considerations referred to above, it is considered that the development proposed is acceptable and a conditional approval is justifiable.

8. Full Recommendation

To **DELEGATE** to the Head of Development & Planning to **GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION** subject to the conditions set out below.

Conditions:

1. Approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following submitted documents and plans:

-HWRC Proposed layout plan A4623 204 M dated 30/03/09 as approved under planning permission 09/02521 (submitted as part of 17/01684/MINMAJ)
-Paragraphs 2.2 to 2.4 (inclusive) of 'Integrated Waste Management Facility, Padworth Lane, RG7 4JF Planning Application Supporting Statement in respect of 2 planning applications: 1. Change of Use Application to amend the approved details to enable the receipt of non-recyclable waste at the Household Waste Recycling Centre. 2. S73 planning Application for variation of condition 7 (to extend the opening hours of the Household Waste Recycling Centre to include weekday mornings) of Planning Permission 14/01111/MINMAJ' (June 2017) (submitted as part of 17/01683/MINMAJ and 17/01684/MINMAJ)

The details of which are approved except as amended by the following conditions.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to adequately control the development, to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with policy WLP31 of Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

2. Hours of operation

The Household Waste Recycling Centre shall not be open for the receipt of waste except between the following hours:

0800 – 1800 Monday to Sundays and bank and public holidays

No operations shall take place on Christmas Day, Boxing Day or New Years Day.

Reason: In the interests of the local amenity in accordance with policy WLP30 in the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 in the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

3. No non-recyclable waste left in the open overnight

General or non-recyclable waste deposited in any container utilised for such purposes in the HWRC shall not be left out in the open overnight. Such containers shall be emptied on a daily basis and taken to the Waste Transfer Station (as shown on the Site Layout Plan A4069 AL100P Rev P4 dated 27/06/11, approved under 11/00923/MINMAJ) and where there is non-recyclable waste left in such a container when the HWRC closes for the day, the container shall be covered overnight.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to adequately control the development, to minimise its impact on the amenities of the local area in accordance with policy WLP31 of Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

4. Records of waste

From the date on this decision notice the operators shall maintain records of the monthly receipt of waste at the HWRC and shall make them available to the Local Planning Authority at any time upon request. All records shall be kept for at least 24 months following their creation.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority can monitor the receipt of waste to the site in accordance with policy WLP31 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

5. Traffic management scheme

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following Traffic Management Scheme (approved in accordance with condition 16 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00842) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- Drawing 100604_001a dated 05/04/11
- Drawing 100604_001b dated 05/04/11
- Drawing 100604_001c dated 05/04/11

The scheme hereby approved shall be implemented in full and the approved signage shall thereafter be maintained at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to accord with the WBC freight strategy in accordance with Policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

6. Odour

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the 'Odour Management Plan' (dated February 2010) (approved in accordance with condition 21 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786) as applicable to the HWRC, excepting where Section 3.3 of the 'Odour Management Plan' (dated February 2010) references the sole acceptance of recyclable waste at the HWRC.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

7. Artificial Lighting

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following lighting scheme (approved in accordance with condition 22 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00986) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- External Lighting Statement.
- Schedule of lights, mountings and images.
- 3D images showing external lighting.
- Site Plan showing external lighting, Drawing 4069 AI119 Rev C1 dated 05/04/11.
- Lighting time plan (Monday to Friday).
- Lighting time plan (Weekend).
- E-mail from Mr O. Dimond dated the 22nd July where that relates to lighting matters.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

8. Operational Dust

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following operational dust scheme (approved in accordance with condition 23 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- Dust and Litter management plan, dated February 2011.
- Mist Air dust and odour suppression system.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

9. Litter

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following litter management scheme (approved in accordance with condition 24 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- The Dust and Litter management plan, dated February 2011.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

10. Reversing Beepers

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following reversing alarm details (approved in accordance with condition 29 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- Reversing Alarms, Plant and Machinery report dated February 2011
- Brigade Alarm Technical Drawing
- Brigade Smart White Sound Reversing Alarm - SA-BBS-97
- Brigade Declaration of Conformity, dated 10 November 2009
- Details of the Michigan L90
- Hitachi Zaxis 160W details

No plant, machinery and operational vehicles shall be used within the site unless fitted with the approved reversing alarms and only those approved alarms shall be used.

Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 and policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

11. Operational Noise

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following noise scheme (approved in accordance with condition 34 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786, as amended by this permission) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- The Noise Mitigation scheme detailed in the Noise Report D126362-NOIS-R1/01 dated February 2010
- Planning Statement dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923
- Environmental Statement Addendum dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923 including appendix 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.

The existing background noise levels (LA90) measured one metre from the façade and 1.5 metres above ground level, at the noise sensitive locations identified in (a) and carried out in (e) or as requested by the Local Planning Authority, shall not be exceeded, as a consequence of operational noise levels (LAeq) generated at the site.

Reason: To protect the amenities of local residents in accordance with policy OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006 and policy WLP 30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006.

12. Oil tanks/fuel/chemical storage

Any chemical, oil, fuel, lubricant and other potential pollutants on site shall, at all times, be stored in containers which shall be sited on an impervious surface and surrounded by a suitable liquid tight bunded area. The bunded areas shall be capable of containing 110% of the container's total volume and shall enclose within their curtilage all fill and draw pipes, vents, gauges and sight glasses. The vent pipe should be directed downwards into the bund. There must be no drain through the bund floor or walls.

Reason: To minimise the risk of pollution of the water environment and soils in accordance with policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policy OVS.5 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

13. Plant

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and thereafter operated in complete accordance with the following plant details (approved in accordance with condition 36 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- Reversing Alarms, Plant and Machinery report dated February 2011
- Brigade Alarm Technical Drawing
- Brigade Smart White Sound Reversing Alarm - SA-BBS-97
- Brigade Declaration of Conformity, dated 10 November 2009
- Details of the Michigan L90
- Crambo Turned container drawing
- Crambo Installation layout drawing, dated 03.02.11
- Hitachi Zaxis 160W details
- Komptech Crambo 5000 details
- Baler location drawing Z-049050-0 Rev D
- Planning Statement dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923
- Environmental Statement Addendum dated April 2011 approved under Planning Permission 11/00923 including appendix 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4 are hereby approved as the formal Plant and Machinery details as required by condition 36 of planning permission 09/02521/MINMAJ.

The plant and machinery shall be operated and maintained in accordance with the approved details and the approved acoustic attenuation measures retained.

Reason: To ensure that the plant and machinery operates in accordance with policies WLP30 and WLP31 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998-2006 and policies OVS.5 and OVS.6 of the West Berkshire District Local Plan 1991-2006.

14. Parking/turning in accord with plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following parking and turning details (approved in accordance with condition 38 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 10/00786 as amended by this permission) as applicable to the HWRC. The approved details are:

- Car Parking Management Plan Dated January 2010
- Planning Site Layout Plan A4069 AL100P Rev P4
- Traffic Management Schematic plan A4623 205 E dated 30/03/09

The parking and turning space shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans before the development becomes operational and shall be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and/or light goods vehicles) at all times and not used for any other purposes).

Reason: To minimise traffic related impacts in accordance with Policy WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.

15. Visibility Splays

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following visibility splay details (approved in accordance with condition 39 of planning permission 09/02521 under planning reference 11/00480). The approved details are:

- The overview of proposed improvements visibility splays drawing PS-ENB-08-5 Rev D dated June 2008.

These visibility splays shall be provided prior to the occupation of the buildings and shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions to visibility over a height of 0.6 metres above carriageway level.

Reason: In the interests of road safety in accordance with WLP30 of the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998 - 2006.