

## APPENDIX 4

### CONSULTATION RESPONSES

#### Residential Consultation Responses for Consultation Period Ending 10/07/2015

<u>Resident 1 Response:</u>	Officer Comments
<p>Objection to the planning and rejuvenation of the Whitefield Estate based on the S73 Contamination Assessment Report.</p> <p>(BXC 17 – Supplementary Section 73 Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Assessment &amp; Geotechnical Development Report; Appendix F- Contamination Assessment Report and study.)</p>	<p>It is not clear from the letter of objection submitted what aspect of the Contamination Assessment is of concern in relation to the Whitefield Estate.</p> <p>A Contamination Assessment was submitted as part of the S73 Planning Permission Ref No: F/04687/13. Appendix F- Contamination Assessment Report forms part of the Supplementary Phase 1 Geo- Environmental Assessment, which was carried out to assess current ground investigations and summarises the contamination results obtained.</p> <p>Planning Conditions 31.1 – 31.7 of the Section 73 permission relate specifically to Remediation of Contamination, and are in place to protect human health, prevent any potential contamination and ensure necessary remediation at the site has been undertaken.</p> <p>Condition 31.1 is a Pre reserved matters condition which was submitted and approved for Phase 1A North, prior to submission of any reserved matters application. An initial framework and breakdown of areas of land for remediation along with schedules of earthworks and soil treatment activities relevant to each of these Remediation Zones or Sub-Zones have been provided for Phase 1A north.</p> <p>The Brent Terrace Triangles RMA in relation to Plots 53 and 54 has been determined and it is intended that the accommodation provided through this application will provide accommodation for Whitefield Residents displaced within Phase 1a (North). Planning Condition 1.10 (Residential Relocation Strategy) is currently under consideration. The aim of this Condition is to ensure the satisfactory relocation of Whitefield residents.</p>

**Resident 2 Response:**

The development will encourage vehicles to enter Oxgate Gardens in Dollis Hill and will increase the existing flow of traffic even further. Oxgate Gardens is a residential road with a primary school located nearby; It is already used as a cut through to avoid existing traffic lights and the proximity of the BXC development would increase noise and disturbances.

Parking is extremely tight and on daily basis the majority of spaces are used by the existing factory workers, leaving residents of Oxgate Gardens to park on surrounding residential streets. Residents of Oxgate Gardens are going to approach Brent Council to request parking permits or restrictions.

When the car parks are full or when people are unwilling or unable to pay for parking visitors will park on surrounding residential streets close to the development; this would have a further detrimental impact on parking conditions.

The installation of the traffic lights on Oxgate Gardens has caused a loss of privacy, and the proposed development will have a further impact.

Lorries during construction will use Oxgate Gardens to access the waste dump

Two Reserved Matters Applications are before this Planning Committee for consideration; and this particular RMA submission (RMA 15/02215/RMA) specially relates to the Central Brent Riverside Park. Whilst the objection letter refers to both RMA references, this issue is not dealt under this particular RMA and comments can be found under Appendix 6 in the committee report for the Reserved Matters Application 15/03312/RMA relating to Infrastructure works.

Please see answer above.

**Resident 3 Response:**

With reference to a newspaper article published in the Evening Standard on the 4<sup>th</sup> June 2015 titled '1300 people have died this year due to polluted air in the capital'; concerns have been raised whether the Brent Cross infrastructure development would create more pollution?

Staples Corner and the surrounding areas currently suffer from large volumes of traffic. The proposed development would increase the traffic flows.

**Resident 4 Response:**

The key in the plans for the Central Brent Riverside Park describes the lower-level path as 'incorporating planting to create 4m wide sinuous path'. The plan seems to show a path that continuously varies in width. What is the maximum and minimum for the path excluding and including the planting?

Cycling and walking should be segregated to reduce any potential conflict between user groups.

Please see answer above.

The Section 73 permission requires that a 6 metre wide Environmental Maintenance Route is provided in the Central Brent Riverside Park. The path proposed in this Reserved Matter Application is generally a minimum of 6m in width; however in order to create a route of enhanced interest, areas of planting will be allowed to encroach into the path effectively reducing the width to 4m in places. This effective reduction in width has been discussed with the Environment Agency who has not expressed any concerns about the proposal. Officers consider the proposal acceptable.

Since the path serves the purpose of the Environmental Agency, pedestrians and cyclists there is not sufficient room to provide a segregated route and so a shared pedestrian and cycle route is proposed.

**Resident 5 Response:**

Objection to the governance of the planning service. The closing date for comments mentioned in your letter sent in July was later than the date your system stopped accepting comments. That makes you in breach to consult under the Town and Country Planning Act 2000, as amended. How many letters were sent out? And why does your Planning database system does not indicate when consultation is going to end, this is in breach to the Human Rights Act 1998, Section 6, Paragraph 1.

Please see the main report for details of the number of residents consulted. Consultation time periods comply with the statutory requirements and the consultation expiry dates are also available on the Councils website. Comments have also been accepted after the consultation expiry date.

**Statutory Consultees and other interest groups Responses for Consultation Period ending 10/07/2015**

<p><b><u>Transport for London Response:</u></b></p> <p>Letter dated: 1<sup>st</sup> September 2015</p> <p>TfL welcome measures to improve access between the new bus station and the Brent River Park agreed by the Council and the applicant</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b><u>Consultative Access Forum (CAF) Response:</u></b></p> <p>Letter dated: 28<sup>th</sup> August 2015: <u>Tempelof Bridge ramp leading the Riverside Park:</u></p> <p>Inserting a landing at the midpoint of each slope to provide space will improve the usability of the ramp. However, it is not possible from the drawings provided to assess the gradients and the handrails which are critical aspects of ramps.</p> <p><u>Lift to the Riverside Park:</u></p> <p>A lift from the Living Bridge/ Bus station level to access the Riverside Park would enhance access from the Lower Riverside Walkway, and beneficially for those who require step free access.</p>	<p>Officers comments: The gradient for the ramp from Tempelhof Bridge ramp leading to the Riverside Park is 1 in 21 with a short 'dog leg' landing. Details and specifications regarding handrails and other details aspects will be considered at detailed design stage.</p>
<p><b><u>Thames Water Response:</u></b></p> <p>Letter dated: 6<sup>th</sup> July 2015</p> <p>No objections raised and does not affect Thames Water</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p><b><u>London Borough of Harrow Response:</u></b></p> <p>Letter dated: 28<sup>th</sup> July 2015 No objection raised</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b><u>Environmental Agency Response:</u></b></p> <p>Letter dated: 25<sup>th</sup> August 2015</p> <p>The Environmental Agency reviewed both Reserved Mattered Applications from the perspectives of potential impacts on the ecological environment, the Water Framework Directive (WFD), flood risks and the risks of surface water pollution. It was considered that the current proposal results in a reduction in ecological buffer zone of 1217m<sup>2</sup> compared to the proposals approved under the Section 73 application.</p> <p><b><u>Flood Risk:</u></b></p> <p>The EA considered that the flood modeled will not cause any unacceptable increases in flood risk. However, noted that the modeling demonstrates high sensitivity to channel roughness ,and if future design changes are made this would impact the modeled channel roughness; to prevent any potential flood risk they have proposed the following condition:</p> <p><b>Condition 1</b></p> <p>The river channel will be constructed in such a way that the roughness values used in the current flood model are representative of the physical channel. Any changes to channel attributes that would make the current modeled roughness values unrepresentative will not be permitted without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.</p> <p><b>Reason</b></p> <p>To prevent increased flood risk</p>	<p>Comments regarding flood modelling and concerns raised by the Environment Agency have been captured; officer comments can be found under Appendix 6 in the committee report for the Reserved Matters Application 15/03312/RMA relating to Infrastructure works.</p>

At the detailed design stage, the EA have requested that the development should demonstrate that assets/ street furniture are fixed appropriately to the ground or walls; to prevent entering into the river during a flood event. To minimise this they have requested the following condition:

**Condition 2**

Prior to the installation of bins, benches and bird boxes, full details of the design of these items will be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

**Reason**

To minimise blockages and pollution of the river during a flood event.

Surface Water Pollution:

The Environmental Agency is satisfied with the evidence provided to allow natural continuity between the surface water in the new river channel and groundwater. However, had concerns that if the contaminated groundwater is not managed correctly this could enter the River system and effect the surface water; therefore proposed the following condition to request a detailed method statement to assess environmental safeguards.

**Condition 3**

The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a detailed construction method statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The construction method statement will demonstrate how pollution to surface water will be prevented.

**Reason**

To prevent pollution of surface water

Please see answer above.