

## **SCRUTINY REVIEW PANEL 3 – AIR QUALITY MINUTES**

**Thursday 27 September 2018**

**PRESENT:** Councillors: Anthony Young (Chair), Linda Burke, Karanvir Dhadwal, Paul Driscoll, Kate Crawford (Vice-Chair), Anthony Kelly, Kamaljit Kaur Nagpal Kamaldeep Sahota.

**Other Members Present:** Cllr Julian Bell (Leader and Regeneration and Transport).

### **LBE Officers Present:**

Harjeet Bains	Scrutiny Review Officer
Alison Forde	Head of Property Regulation, Planning Enforcement and Environment
John Freeman	Regulatory Services Officer
Paula Portas	Democratic Services Officer

### **Others:**

Damian Leydon	Berkeley Homes, Operations Director
Alex Nielsen	Berkeley Homes
Steve Dunn	C. A. Blackwell.
Nicola Harper	C. A. Blackwell
Sarah Horrocks	Atkins
Jon Houghton	Atkins
Mark Whelehan	F.M. Conway, Head of Operations - Asphalt & Aggregates Division
Chris Lowe	Environment Agency
Andy White	Environment Agency
David Marsden	The Clean Air for Southall and Hayes Campaign

### **1. Apologies for Absence** (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Abdullah Gulaid, Councillor Gary Busuttil, Councillor Mik Sabiers (Portfolio Holder for Environment and Highways), Robie Kamanyire (Head of Environmental Hazards and Emergencies London Unit, Public Health England), and Bill Hickson (Antisocial Behaviour and Environment Manager, London Borough of Hillingdon).

Councillor Anthony Kelly substituted for Councillor Gulaid.

**2. Declarations of Interest**  
(Agenda Item 2)

There were none.

**3. Matters to be Considered in Private**  
(Agenda Item 3)

There were none.

**4. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 19 July 2018.**  
(Agenda Item 4)

**Resolved:** That the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 19 July 2018 be agreed as a true and correct record.

**5. Air Pollution from Construction Projects**  
(Agenda Item 5)

The Chair welcomed John Freeman, Regulatory Services Officer, to introduce an item detailing the air pollution issues from construction projects.

John Freeman said that construction and demolition activities could contribute to air pollutant emissions in the borough, not only through the generation of visible dust and road soiling, but particularly through the exhaust emissions from (mainly diesel-powered) mobile machinery and plant (Non-Road Mobile Machinery - NRMM). Three charts derived from the 2013 London Atmospheric Emissions Inventory were presented in slides illustrating, the various sources of emissions of the pollutants PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> (oxides of nitrogen) in the borough. The charts showed that the proportion of air pollution derived from emissions from mainly diesel-powered off-road plant (NRMM) was large. NRMM contributed to a considerable proportion of the total NO<sub>x</sub> emitted within the borough.

John Freeman noted that Ealing Council's duty to manage local air quality was partly tackled through taking appropriate measures to control pollution from construction activities. This was achieved through the role of the Council as Local Planning Authority. Applicants for planning permission needed to demonstrate that their construction methods, as well as the built development itself, minimised any contributions to pollutant emissions.

The Council's Planning Enforcement and Environment Teams within Regulatory Services provided specialist comment on planning applications and would recommend a range of conditions to be applied if a decision was taken to grant a

permission. In most cases a condition was recommended requiring the submission to the Council for approval of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) setting out the measures that the applicant/developer proposed to take in mitigating emissions during the construction phase of the development. The condition would point to the relevant London Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). Applicants had to demonstrate that they had fully considered and mitigated all potential risks, in keeping with the risk-based approach adopted in the SPD.

In addition to the measures implemented via the planning process, the Council's Noise and Nuisance Team provided a responsive service dealing with a variety of construction-related pollution and nuisance issues. At present, due to resource limitations, there was no pro-active inspection of NRMM across the borough to check on the registration of plant and compliance with London-wide emissions standards.

The Chair thanked officers for the introductory report and invited Panel Members to comment and ask questions.

### **Questions and comments.**

Panel members:

- Queried to what extent the Council would be able to tighten up controls on air pollution derived from construction projects.  
Officers responded that controls mostly depended on the details of individual applications. The Council ensured that the measures proposed by applicants represented best practice.
- Asked whether there were plans to change the Construction Management Plans and whether every application was given the same pro-forma.  
Officers noted that because of the wide range of construction projects potentially covered by a CMP there was no standard template to be followed, rather the applicant had to demonstrate that they had fully considered and mitigated all potential risks.
- Noted that there were areas where higher air quality standards were implemented and enquired whether those standards could be expanded to other areas ahead of time.  
Officers responded that the intention was for the emission standards to be progressively tightened at all locations. The Central Activity Zone standard would be adopted in Ealing in one or two years' time. It would be possible to adopt the standard ahead of time but it should be considered that there was right of appeal against planning conditions. If conditions were considered unreasonable or not proportionate an appeal against the decision could be upheld.
- Queried what sources of funding were available for Ealing Council to tackle pollution source.

Officers noted that there were some funding streams currently available. Officers would shortly be considering an application for the Mayor of London's Air Quality Fund-supported inspections jointly with other West London boroughs along the lines of schemes successfully implemented by other local authority groups in London.

**Resolved:** That the report on Air Pollution from Construction Projects be received.

**6. Pollution Issues Relating to the F.M. Conway Ltd Asphalt Plant in Hayes and the Regeneration Work at the Southall Waterside site.**

(Agenda Item 6)

The Chair invited John Freeman to present to the Panel the report on the pollution issues relating to the FM Conway Ltd asphalt plant in Hayes and the regeneration work at the Southall Waterside site report.

**F.M. Conway**

John Freeman said that two industrial sites in or adjacent to West Southall had been the subject of numerous odour complaints from residents and businesses in Southall Green and Southall Broadway wards. These sites were the roadstone coating (asphalt) plant located in North Hyde Gardens, Hayes, operated by F.M. Conway Ltd and the 'soil treatment hospital' within the Southall Waterside development site (the former Southall Gasworks). A map was shown with the location of the two sites in relation to the surrounding residential and commercial areas of Southall.

The F.M. Conway Ltd roadstone coating plant comprised equipment for heating asphalt and mixing it with stone and other additives to produce a range of road surfacing materials. Planning permission had been granted to F.M. Conway in August 2013 by the London Borough of Hillingdon and the plant started operating in 2014. Ealing Council had been consulted on this application.

Complaints about strong tar odour coming from the plant were received from July 2014. The London Borough of Hillingdon was the regulator of the plant, and from the outset, complaints made to Ealing Council were referred to Hillingdon Council. Where possible, officers from Ealing's Response team attended to witness odour at the complainants' residences and to assist Hillingdon in their enforcement role.

The response from the London Borough of Hillingdon was twofold. Firstly, Hillingdon officers asked F.M. Conway Ltd to undertake measurements of odorous emissions from their plant and commissioned an environmental monitoring consultancy to carry out a survey of emissions both from the chimney and the loading bay to the plant. Secondly, due to widespread health concerns, the London Borough of Hillingdon also

sought assistance from Public Health England, whose Environmental Hazards and Emergencies Department undertook an analysis of the emissions survey results.

Public Health England found that monitoring results for benzene from the main stack of the plant were above UK standards . However, it noted that theirs was a cautious approach as these emissions would be diluted and dispersed limiting any possible health impact. The levels of aromatic volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were found to exceed WHO guidelines – yet the report cautioned that it was relying on short term monitoring. The report concluded that some of the VOCs were odorous but were not necessarily present at levels to have a toxicological effect. However, it acknowledged that odour could cause nuisance, and there could be health impacts from odours even when the substance causing the odour had no health impact.

As a result of this report, F.M. Conway Ltd agreed to undertake improvements to their plant in an attempt to reduce odorous emissions. The works agreed included an increase in the height of the chimney serving the plant to the maximum permitted by the Civil Aviation Authority and the provision of an extraction and filtration system to the loading bay to prevent the escape of odorous emissions during the loading of lorries with (hot) coated material for dispatch. These improvement works were completed in April 2016. The improvements contributed to reducing, yet not altogether stopping the complaints.

The lessons to be learned from this case were:

- The Council should continue to ensure that applications for polluting developments continue to be properly scrutinised.
- The level of odour emissions was not effectively anticipated. From a technical point of view, it had been surprising that a brand-new plant would cause odour when the older plant did not.
- There was a need to maintain clear lines of communication between the local authorities involved in the regulation of the plant. The uptake of issues and complaints from residents and even from senior officers had been slow.

The Chair invited Mark Whelehan, Head of Operations, Asphalt & Aggregates Division, at F. M. Conway, to address the Panel.

Mark Whelehan said that the company had worked to mitigate the cause of odours. Their identifying of what had gone wrong had been problematic, as the odours and levels of complaints had not been expected. The site of the plant had been occupied previously by a coffee factory, which also typically produces odours. However, that plant had not generated complaints. It was difficult to identify a clear source of the problem as there were other problematic sites nearby. The company was collaborating closely with Hillingdon and Ealing Councils. However, despite improvements, residents still associated odours to the F.M. Conway site.

The Chair invited David Marsden, from The Clean Air for Southall and Hayes Campaign, to address the Panel.

David Marsden said that in the residents' experience there had not been a problem with odours on that site until F.M. Conway opened their plant. The problem was now also compounded by odours coming from a nearby second site, the Southall Waterside. The problem with odours was that these were being experienced in residents' homes and schools, and whilst officers said that measurements of air quality were taken at source – and had shown high levels of benzene - the issue was why there were no measurements also taken at residents' homes. Hence, it was unclear whether the odour levels in their homes would pose negative health effects to residents. Residents were concerned that it was uncertain what chemicals were causing the odours. Furthermore, odours also produced symptoms, which was problematic. F. M. Conway representatives had claimed that only water emanated from the chimney, yet residents had no way to verify that claim. Residents were not receiving answers to their complaints and concerns. They would like to receive proof of the claims being made that there were no risks to health.

Mark Whelehan said that from the chimney of the plant both heat and water emanated. Heat had odours. However, there was no tar emanating from the chimney. Hydrocarbons were dispersed in the manufacturing process and not released from the chimney.

The Chair thanked participants for their contributions and invited Panel Members to comment and ask questions.

### **Questions and comments:**

Panel members:

- Asked about the measurements of air quality at this site.  
Heard that measurements were taken at source. Yet it was difficult to record and examine the dispersion of odours. Mark Welehan noted that some of his family members resided in Hayes and did not report such levels of smells to him. This exemplified how there were different experiences and perceptions of smell.
- Enquired what the role of the Environment Agency (EA) was regarding F.M. Conway.  
Heard that the EA had not added to Hillingdon Council's regulatory intervention.

### **The Southall Waterside**

John Freeman explained that the Southall Waterside was a brownfield regeneration scheme located on the former Southall Gasworks site. The developer, Berkeley

Group, had permission for a large mixed-use development across the site. There was, however, extensive contamination of the soil, which arose from the former gasworks and chemical works that operated on the site from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century until the late 1960s. The contaminated soil had to be treated to make the land safe and suitable for its new uses. In situ remediation methods had been deployed for this site. Various soil remediation operations were being carried out on the site within a designated area known as a “soil treatment hospital”, so that treated soil could be returned to the site for reuse.

He said that the treatment process involved the turning over of stockpiles of material, with the consequent release of odorous substances where these are present. The permission for this development included several conditions to ensure that contamination was comprehensively identified, that an approved remediation scheme was carried out and that the completion of remediation was properly verified. The developer had appointed C.A. Blackwell (Contracts) Limited to carry out the remediation of the site. Responsibility for the implementation of these requirements and the discharge of the relevant planning conditions rested with Ealing Council as the Local Planning Authority. In consultation with the Environment Agency (EA), the Council had maintained close oversight of all operations undertaken to deal with contaminated material and groundwater. However, the soil remediation activities themselves, since they involve the handling and treatment of soil deemed to be contaminated waste material, were subject to regulation by the Environment Agency under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.

The first odour complaints relating to the Southall Waterside site were received by Regulatory Services in June 2017. On the advice of the EA, Ealing Council's Regulatory Services staff referred complainants to the EA's Pollution Incident Hotline. The advice to the public remained that odour suspected as originating from the soil treatment work should be reported to the Hotline. Ealing Council's officers contacted the EA as well as representatives of Berkeley Group and their environmental consultants (Atkins) to ask about measures to improve odour suppression. The result of the EA and Ealing Council's efforts was that measures had been taken by the developer to mitigate odour coming from the site. Additional odour suppression units were deployed at the boundary around the soil hospital and new methods trialled to reduce odour emissions.

Complaints raised concerns of the health hazards associated with the odours arising from emissions of benzene and asbestos. However, the results of monitoring received to date had shown that levels were very low at the soil hospital boundary.

John Freeman said that two possible lessons could be learned from the case, with the caveat that the matter had not yet been concluded. Firstly, an effective process of engagement with all parties needed to be in place from the beginning. Secondly, it was for the Panel to scrutinise whether any or all of the odour issues could have been prevented or reduced in severity.

The Chair invited David Marsden to address the Panel and explain his experience of the odours from the Southall Waterside site.

David Marsden said that the heatwave during the summer of 2018 had made the odours difficult to bear. It did not matter what the wind direction was or weather conditions generally because some residents in the perimeter of the development site would be affected by the odours — even if not all residents were affected at the same time. Residents had tried to engage with the developer but had felt that they were being misled on the number and sources of complaints and from where the company had received. There was talk of the “levels of benzene or asbestos” at the soil hospital which was unspecific and unclear. Therefore, it did not allay residents’ concerns. Residents’ believed that it was not enough to say that ‘levels were low’ – specific data and measurements were required.

John Freeman clarified that Ealing Council did not monitor the site independently. The monitoring of the contaminated soil and its composition was undertaken by reputable private laboratories. Council officers had attended residents’ homes to witness odours there.

David Marsden expressed surprise that Ealing Council did not conduct direct monitoring by gathering its own data. He asked what the specific measures of these odorous substances were on the site.

John Freeman responded that he did not have, but could provide, the specific measures requested. He said that officers at the EA would be able to clarify the relevant issues further.

The Chair invited Environment Agency officers to address the Panel.

Andy White, Team Leader at the Environment Agency, said that the EA had carried out site visits and joint visits with the London Borough of Ealing. The EA regulated and measured the activities on the site. C.A. Blackwell had held a ‘mobile plant permit’ - a type of environment permit issued by the EA to a specific company with a set duration of one year— which allowed it to carry out works at the site. As the year completed, the EA decided that this permit would not be renewed as not enough controls were in place. Therefore, the operator was advised to apply for a ‘fixed permit’ as works were carried out in a permanent site - the fixed permit was attached to that specific land. This advice was issued in April 2018 following complaints about odours emanating from the site.

The Chair thanked all for their contributions and invited Panel Members to comment and ask questions.

## **Questions and Comments**

Panel members:

- Noted that the EA advice to the company to request a ‘fixed permit’ had been issued before the warm weather in the summer of 2018.  
Andy White said that at that point EA officers considered issuing that advice because of residents’ complaints and due to the EA officers’ view that not all measures to control odours were being put in place.
- Queried what would be the appropriate measures to control odours.  
Andy White said that EA considered that no significant controls to prevent odours from escaping from the site were in place.
- Queried how many complaints there had been about the Gasworks site, and whether the EA was aware of the complaints passed on to it by Ealing Council, as responsiveness to these complaints was a key issue. They also asked whether the EA was aware that residents had expressed dissatisfaction with the hotline and, if so, what measures to improve it had been undertaken.  
EA officers replied that they did not have the exact figures about the number of complaints received about the site, but they could provide these to the Panel after the meeting. Most of the complaints had been directed to the EA’s hotline. He said that the EA was aware of residents’ difficulties. The EA was now directly reporting residents’ complaints to DC Blackwell for the operator of the site to be aware of them and able to check these promptly. Andy White said that the receipt of those complaints had not been automatic and that there was a possibility of some complaints that the EA was unaware of. Customers could, nevertheless, ask for feedback on their complaints. There were different regulatory bodies with responsibilities over the Gasworks site which had created confusion for residents wishing to complain. It was noted that not only the number of complaints was relevant but also their quality. Due to the nature of the matter – i.e. odours — complaints needed to be submitted promptly and contain as much accurate and detailed information (for instance, about wind direction) as possible for them to be effective. The EA hotline was staffed 24/7 – calls were received by a call centre in Sheffield that filtered the complaints down to the relevant area for officers to assess.
- Enquired what happened if a resident asked for feedback on their complaint.  
Andy White said that they would call the resident back to advise them of the actions taken by the EA in relation to their complaint. At this point they were passing the details of the complaints to the operator for investigation.
- Asked whether any pattern had been identified from the complaints that could help establish causation in the odour problem and the actual number of people complaining, as opposed to the number of complaints received, was being monitored.  
Andy White said that it was very difficult to establish patterns from the complaints received because it was not easy to determine the source from

which odours emanated - i.e. from which site it was coming from. Weather conditions, as well as the resources available, had an impact on that task. Chris Lowe, EA, said that the EA expected operators to take reasonable steps and actions to investigate the complaints and mitigate the problem. The aim was to look at the root cause and so efforts were focused on that.

- Queried the resources put into monitoring and whether it would be restricted by not taking a longitudinal view.  
EA officers responded that emphasis was placed on the operator addressing the problem.
- Queried what further steps could have been taken to improve the situation for residents affected by the odours and whether stopping the works temporarily could have been an option.  
Representatives from CA Blackwell said that the company had responded to all complaints coming to them from the EA in an extensive and detailed manner. They had undertaken additional measures by not just to masking but removing odours. The origin of the odours was clear: these emanated from the contaminated land.
- Probed whether the EA accepted the figures and the data evidence being provided to them by the developer and associated companies.  
Officers from the EA responded affirmatively. They said there were EA guidelines detailing the requirements that the data provided needed to comply with to be accepted.
- Queried what was CA Blackwell's turnaround time to deal with complaints.  
CA Blackwell's representatives said that complaints were usually dealt with within a 48-hr frame, but were generally addressed as quickly as possible. People would be sent to the area noted in the complaint to gather data.
- Noted that residents continued to complain about odour despite diverse measures applied to deal with the problem.  
EA officers expressed disappointment about that situation. They noted that a range of measures had been implemented to deal with odour emanating from the site since April 2018. Yet it was an ongoing process.
- Asked the EA whether they had requested the cessation of operations from the developer and associated companies once the number of complaints surged during the hot weather.  
EA officers said that they did not have the powers to ask the developer to cease operations. Such a measure would require a slow legal process. For the EA to properly assess what happened during the hot weather it would be necessary to have the specific dates of the complaints to assess the companies' response and measures implemented.

- Suggested that a liaison group between residents and the developer and associates could be set up to open a dialogue between them.
- Noted that it would have been helpful for the Panel to have heard the EA's odour experts.

The Chair then invited the representatives of Berkeley Homes to address the Panel.

Damian Leydon, Operations Director, Berkeley West Thames and his associates presented a slide mapping the governance of the works at the site. The developer company, Berkeley Homes, had contracted Atkins and CA Blackwell to conduct the remediation work. Arup provided filtering and remediation experts. They were regulated by the EA and Ealing Council. Ramboll has provided an ecological assessment. Therefore, a considerable number of professionals were involved in the works.

The project was fully compliant with all relevant health, safety and environmental legislation. There had been regular and frequent liaison with London Borough Ealing and Environment Agency prior to and throughout project. There were 26 planned EA visits including three unannounced visits plus over sixty planned LBE visits. The site was utilising industry best practice with proactive measures in place to address issues as and if they arose. Besides, lessons were continuously learnt and shared to inform future working practices

The site had been thoroughly investigated. Teams had spent over two years doing investigation and design work. The pre-remediation investigation had included:

- 272 groundwater samples
- 124 boreholes
- 504 trial pits
- 627 soil samples

The investigation had also been furthered by contractors during the tendering process. The planning stages, prior to remediation work, had also provided:

- Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessment
- Remediation Strategy
- Detailed (area specific) remediation method statements
- Soil Treatment Hospital has permission from Environment Agency to operate

There was continuous monitoring and sampling of the area:

- Air monitoring data was gathered from fixed stations located at the perimeter of the site
  - Continuous measurements were recorded for dust, noise and VOCs.
    - Total VOCs were measured in real time to protect the workforce and the public
    - Elevated levels automatically notified and prompt review of site activities and management.
- Air sampling for VOCs

- Sampled for offsite laboratory analysis to identify individual VOCs.
- Could detect compounds at very low (ppb) levels.
- Benzene was used as a conservative marker.
- Review of Benzene.
  - Associated with vehicle exhaust, chemical works and domestic activities (heaters, gas cookers).
  - Tightly controlled in UK through legislation which mirrors EU Air Quality Directive (AQ).
  - Aim was to reduce concentrations to lowest practical level to minimise health risks.

The health based criteria for Benzene was two-fold, and distinguished:

- Occupational exposure:
  - Set by UK Health and Safety Executive (HSE)
  - Found in EH40/2005 Workplace exposure limits (as amended 2018)
  - Designed to protect workers from a wide range of substances hazardous to health.
  - 3250 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (1000 ppb) as an average over 8 hours.
- Protection of the general public:
  - Limit value for benzene was set in European Air Quality Directive and had been incorporated in UK Air Quality Strategy (AQS) and Regulations.
  - Designed to protect public health over a long period.
  - Much more stringent than workplace limit
  - 5 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (1.5 ppb) as an annual average.

A slide presented a graph which showed benzene concentrations at Southall were below the EU and UK ambient AQS of 5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. The average benzene concentration during the summer was lower than the AQ objective (5 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) at all locations. The conclusion was that there was no public health risk. Furthermore, concentrations of benzene dissipated with increasing distance from the soil hospital. In addition, the annual average would be lower than summer month averages

Particulates of dust and asbestos were also monitored.

- Dust
  - PM<sub>10</sub> was being monitored continuously.
  - Concentrations on residential boundary were well below UK AQ objectives.
- Asbestos
  - Very low quantities of asbestos had been identified on site (because of fly tipping, existing buildings, etc.).
  - It was safely managed in full accordance with The Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012.
  - Assurance air monitoring had been undertaken and would continue throughout the works.
  - No asbestos fibres have been detected.

Steps for the future included:

- Mitigation and monitoring activities to continue in accordance with approved methods.
- Continue to liaise with LBE and EA.
- Programme
- Substantial completion of highly impacted areas by end of 2018
- Small areas (currently inaccessible) would remain, however area/volumes anticipated to be very small.

David Marsden said that residents were upset and angry that operators had not stopped the works during the summer when complaints about odours had surged due to the heatwave.

The Chair thanked the representative of Berkeley Homes and its associates for their presentation and invited Panel Members to comment and ask questions.

## **Questions and comments**

Panel members:

- Queried the location of the air monitoring undertaken.  
It was clarified that real time monitoring took place at the boundary of the site. The reason for this location was that it was likely to be the place where emissions would be found at higher concentration levels. It was important to monitor at source to increase the likelihood of identifying the cause of odours.
- Asked if the EU and UK ambient AQS guidelines for benzene had ever been breached.  
Heard that it had been breached. Instances when there had been elevated levels of benzene had been automatically notified, samples sent to the laboratory, and assessment taken on how to proceed, as the developers also had a primary responsibility to their workforce.
- Asked if benzene was the main odorous material in the site.  
Heard from Berkeley Homes and associates' representatives that benzene was odorous at high concentration. What was being measured was a complex mixture of chemicals. Often the human nose was more sensitive to odours than any measuring technique, that was why sniff tests (using nasal rangers) was one of the best ways to detect an odour. The fact that there were odours did not mean that the company operated in an unacceptable way, as some odours were not harmful. Looking at benzene as a marker substance was a way to ensure that there were no public health concerns.
- Enquired whether there were statutory limits to the emission of odorous substances.

Heard from the EA officers that there were no such statutory limits as the perception of odours was too subjective. There were guidelines and case law about appropriate levels of odour. Whether odour emissions amounted to serious pollution depended on many factors. There was no single method of reliably measuring or assessing odour pollution, and any conclusion was best based on several pieces of evidence: frequency of detection, intensity as perceived, duration of exposure, offensiveness and receptor sensitivity. Environmental permits required a business to provide an Odour Management Plan, which was a live document, to consider the measures they would take to control odour. There were limits to what operators would be expected to do, however, they would be expected to implement the best available techniques in the market.

- Enquired what changes were implemented by the operators after the volume of complaints began to rise.

Heard from representatives of Berkeley Homes and their associates that the methodologies used to carry out the works at the site had changed. The volume of material excavated was reduced and the volumes of material going through the soil hospital were also reduced. There were now fewer complaints.

- Queried Berkeley Homes whether they had considered the possibility of stopping works in relation to the odour emissions.

Heard from Berkeley Homes and associates' representatives that when there were complaints about odours operators took measures, such as trying alternative methods to do the work. There were no formal scores in relation to odour complaints that would trigger a decision to stop. They had worked with stakeholders and used all the techniques available to minimise odours. The level of odour was checked, and measurements of the air quality had been taken and would continue to be taken until the works were completed. As a result of increased complaints, the work on the site was reduced and/or ceased. They understood that odours were annoying for residents. However, it should be taken into account that these were not harmful for human health.

**Resolved:** That the report on Pollution Issues Relating to the F.M. Conway Ltd Asphalt Plant in Hayes and the Regeneration Work at the Southall Waterside site be received.

## 7. Panel Operations (Agenda item 7)

The officer report asked the Panel to agree the agenda items and actions for the next meeting which were included in the appended Updated Work Programme.

**Resolved:** that the Updated Work programme be approved.

**8. Date of Next Meeting**  
(Agenda Item 8)

The Panel were advised that the next meeting of the Panel would take place on Thursday 22 November 2018.

Councillor Anthony Young, Chair.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm.