

London Electricity Board Depot, BR3 4QY

Ref: APP/G5180/C/25/3363900 and APP/G5180/W/25/3365514

Exhibit TL01 – Schedule of Responses to 3rd Party Representations

The following table provides a summary response to the items raised during the Appeal Consultation. Comments are summarised from residents and grouped into relevant topics for ease of response and review. A number of comments appear multiple times throughout the consultation. It is also noted that 34 representations during the appeal consultation are identical.

Number	Author(s) / Topics	Date	Comments	Addressed in Appeal Documentation
1.	Cllr Jeremy Adams	22/06/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Detrimental Impact on Local Residents caused by Road Safety Concerns• Traffic concerns are due to the substantial number of vehicles leaving site.• Impact of noise on residents• Tarmacking the surface on site	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SLR Rebuttal Document and Mr Bancroft Proof of Evidence CD8.04 and CD11.01• Waterman Noise Report and Ms Urbanski's Proof of Evidence CD8.03 and CD10.01.• Tarmacking of the Site does not form part of the Appeal Scheme and is instead part of application 25/01827/ELUD under-determination by the LPA.

Number	Author(s) / Topics	Date	Comments	Addressed in Appeal Documentation
2.	Petition from Churchfields Primary School – Circa 200 responses	26/06/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on adjacent school associated with the use of the site and additional highway movements / HGVs. Agree with the original reason for refusal associated with the Appeal Scheme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLR Rebuttal Document and Mr Bancroft Proof of Evidence CD8.04 and CD11.01 Mr Lawsons Proof of Evidence and Statement of Case CD9.01 and CD8.01
3.	E Kingston	23/06/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in number of trips compared to original Planning Application. Survey results show busiest time aligns with the Primary School start and finish times. Trips are witnessed accessing the site on a Sunday. Vehicles cannot access the site safely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must maneuver into the centre of Churchfields Road. Larger articulated vehicles cannot make the turn in one maneuver. Mason overtakes queues on the access road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLR Rebuttal Document and Mr Bancroft Proof of Evidence CD8.04 and CD11.01 SOCG [CD7.01] - Proposed Planning Condition preventing vehicles arriving during 3.15pm and 3.45pm Masons Operational Plan – Appendix 1 to Mr Lawson Proof of Evidence CD9.01 Mr Lawson Proof of Evidence CD9.01

Number	Author(s) / Topics	Date	Comments	Addressed in Appeal Documentation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of access by HGV's is not an accurate reflection of the relative size of the vehicles used by Clancy and Masons. • The safety impacts of HGVs and LGVs differ significantly. • Significantly more HGV and LGV movements on site. • The Banksman proposed is inadequate and does not undertake the role. • SLR Report incorrectly interprets the peak hours of the surrounding area. • The booking system is not guaranteed to stay in place. • Road Safety Audit was not undertaken at an appropriate time. • Suggested planning conditions with regard to routing and hours of operation are inappropriate and unenforceable. 	

Number	Author(s) / Topics	Date	Comments	Addressed in Appeal Documentation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensification of the existing use exacerbates existing problems. • More appropriate sites elsewhere in the Borough. 	
4.	Road Safety	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over road safety associated with Mason Use • Site Access is inadequate for vehicle size. • Swept Path shows vehicles in the centre of the main road. • Large vehicles with poor visibility • Vehicles mainly come and go when children are leaving school. • Vehicles drive on the wrong side of the access road. • Relationship with school during pick up and drop off unacceptable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLR Rebuttal Document and Mr Bancroft Proof of Evidence CD8.04 and CD11.01 • SOCG [CD7.01] - Proposed Planning Condition preventing vehicles arriving during 3.15pm and 3.45pm • Masons Operational Plan – Appendix 1 to Tom Lawson Proof of Evidence CD9.01
5.	Traffic Congestion	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flawed Survey due to timing in school holidays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLR Rebuttal Document and Mr Bancroft Proof of Evidence CD8.04 and CD11.01

Number	Author(s) / Topics	Date	Comments	Addressed in Appeal Documentation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak times correspondence with school traffic • Churchfield Road is not sufficient to accommodate the number of vehicles proposed. • Churchfield Road surface likely to degrade due to the number of vehicles proposed. • Waste site already creates traffic concerns; appeal site will only make it worse. • Vehicles block road while waiting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOCG [CD7.01] - Proposed Planning Condition preventing vehicles arriving during 3.15pm and 3.45pm
6.	Air Quality	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for Air Quality Assessment • Impact on health of local residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Lawson Proof of Evidence CD9.01 • Delegated Officer Report CD 3.03 • Statement of Common Ground CD7.01 – Section 3

Number	Author(s) / Topics	Date	Comments	Addressed in Appeal Documentation
7.	Location Adjacent to Primary School	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety concerns associated with access location adjacent to Primary School • Lack of assessment of impact on school • Dust impacts on adjacent school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLR Rebuttal Document and Mr Bancroft Proof of Evidence CD8.04 and CD11.01 • Delegated Officer Report CD 3.03 • Statement of Common Ground CD7.01 – Section 3 – Agreed Compliance with respective policies.
8.	Noise	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate Noise Assessment • Unsociable Hours associated with use. • Palletization is unenforceable and no noise management plan secured. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterman Noise Report and Ms Urbanski's Proof of Evidence CD8.03 and CD10.01. • Masons Operational Plan – Appendix 1 to Tom Lawson Proof of Evidence CD9.01
9.	Active Travel	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal does not improve active travel routes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLR Rebuttal Document and Mr Bancroft Proof of Evidence CD8.04 and CD11.01 • Statement of Common Ground CD7.01 – Section 3 – Agreed Compliance with respective policies.

Number	Author(s) / Topics	Date	Comments	Addressed in Appeal Documentation
10.	Alternative Locations	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are more suitable sites elsewhere in the Borough. The site should be used to connect adjacent Parks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement of Common Ground CD7.01 – Agreed position this is an existing industrial site.
11.	Use of Site	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly more intensive than existing industrial use Use does not adhere to its proposed hours of operation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SLR Rebuttal Document and Mr Bancroft Proof of Evidence CD8.04 and CD11.01 Masons Operational Plan – Appendix 1 to Tom Lawson Proof of Evidence CD9.01 Statement of Common Ground CD7.01 – Proposed Planning conditions with regards to hours.
12.	Visual Impact	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction of cabins, lighting, CCTV, and open yard storage is visually intrusive and wholly out of keeping with the character of the surrounding residential area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement of Common Ground CD7.01 – Agreed position this is an existing industrial site. Delegated Officer Report CD 3.03 – Concluded no harm.

Number	Author(s) / Topics	Date	Comments	Addressed in Appeal Documentation
13.	Enforcement Notice	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground E <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Appellants' responsibility to ensure landowners are notified. ○ It is immaterial whether the notice was correctly served. • Ground F <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The only way to remedy the breach is the full cessation of the use. • Ground G <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Given the scale of public opposition and the proximity to vulnerable community spaces, swift compliance is both reasonable and necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Lawson Proof of Evidence CD9.01 • Mr Lawson Proof of Evidence CD9.01 Appendix 2 – Mason Relocation Statement
14.	Lighting	Various	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood lights left on at night • Karis Grae – Image showing lighting within video. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of Common Ground CD7.01 – Section 4 – Condition 9 and Section 5 – Agreed compliance. • Delegated Officer Report CD 3.03 – Concluded no harm. • Appendix 1 of this document which demonstrates image in Karis Grae document was the Refuse Site.

Appendix 1 – Mason Scaffolding CCTV Footage from

