

### Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting held in the Village Hall, Recreation Ground, Cottenham on Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> May 2018 at 7.00pm

**Present:** Cllrs Mudd (Chair), Collinson, Graves, Nicholas, Young, SCDC Cllrs Gough and Wilson, the Clerk and Asst Clerk

**In attendance:** 26 members of the public, Emma Fitch, Case Officer CCC

**18P/084. Election of Chair** – Cllr Mudd elected as Chair for the Committee.

**18P/085. Chairman's Introduction and Apologies** – Apologies accepted from Cllrs Bolitho (work), Kidston (sick), Ward (work), Wilson (meeting) and CCC Wotherspoon.

**18P/087. To accept Declarations of Interest and Dispensations** – Cllr Graves declared an interest in S/3372/17.

**18P/088. Minutes** – Resolution that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2018 be signed as a correct record. Proposed Cllr Graves, seconded Cllr Collinson. **RESOLVED.**

**18P/086. Any Questions from the Public or Press** – Standing orders suspended 7.08pm. Cllr Morris arrived at 7.09pm and took the Chair for this section of the meeting. He outlined the format and reason for the meeting along with the planning process for the Amey application including their permit and operation. Ran through the list of material considerations. SCDC Cllr Wilson queried whether concerns made would be taken into account by the EA. Emma Fitch said they will be recorded but no weight given – it is a separate process. Everyone who comments will be contacted with details of the separate EA consultation. It is very important that people comment now (consultation closes 29<sup>th</sup> May). The application looks at use of the land, not the operator.

Q. Why is the facility needed? A. Too much rubbish is going into landfill from our black bins despite the filtering process. The landfill pollutes and the suggestion is that by burning the rubbish, landfill can be reduced by 2/3<sup>rd</sup>. Comment made that the UK have been referred to the EU for poor air quality. Noted that this also includes emissions from vehicles etc. If designed and managed properly, there would be limited emissions. Public Health England (PHE) state there is an insignificant risk to public health.

Q. How much electricity will be generated? A. It has been defined by the number of homes, now 63,000 (this is a mid-range figure and varies depending on whether new homes or less efficient older properties). The site would include the ability for a heat pipe to the Research Park but only if they have a contract. The 63,000 homes is equivalent to 27.4MWh and Amey will take what they need first. The Waterbeach development may qualify for cheaper electricity.

Noted that rubbish would be imported from the Isle of Wight however there is an incinerator being built there which will eventually take that waste. NB: household waste is only a small stream and most would come from construction. Amey can't restrict themselves as a business and are not able to sign a condition to restrict where the waste comes from. In reality the majority would be from Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. Traffic: Highways has said that there is such a minimal increase in traffic that there doesn't need to be any mitigation. Government has a waste hierarchy and landfill is at the bottom with the use of incinerators above it.

Q. Will fossil fuels be used? Yes, but only a tiny part of the process.

Comments regarding size of the main body of the building, which would swamp the main body of Ely Cathedral. Application mentions the chimney size but plays down the size of the overall building. Ash removal: bottom ash will be used in agriculture but the 'bad waste' is put in sealed tanks and taken away. Amey Liaison Group – doesn't work well and needs to be more transparent. Consultation and information hadn't been well shared. Why weren't Amey looking at other solutions?

Q. Where will the traffic for the Mitchell Hill application go? A. The application has come in separately so there hasn't been a cumulative assessment. There are routing agreements to keep to the A10/A14. NB: study re. A10 widening is currently only at a strategic stage in the process.

Q. Regarding heritage, how widely have Ely parishes been consulted? A. Haddenham, Wilburton, Stretham and East Cambs in general had been consulted but difficult to get the information out to everyone. Noted that all applications are under pressure to be decided quickly and Amey could go for non-determination if the application wasn't dealt with in the appropriate timescales. Additional comments made regarding devaluation on houses (not a material concern), noise levels (screens included in plans), whether there would be restrictions on the type of waste, size of the main body of the building, cadmium being over acceptable levels, the technology to be used not disclosed, PHE report into the

pollution effects from ultrafine particles on babies not yet published. Clerk to put list of material planning considerations on CPC website. Standing Orders reinstated 8.14pm. Cllr Mudd took the Chair.

**18P/089. Planning Applications:**

- **S/3372/17/CW** - Application for full planning permission for the construction and development of a Waste Recovery Facility (Waterbeach Waste Recovery Facility – WWRF) at Levitt’s Field, Waterbeach Waste Management Park (WWMP), Ely Road, Cambridge comprising the erection and operation of an Energy from Waste Facility to treat up to 250,000 tonnes of residual waste per annum, Air Cooled Condensers and associated infrastructure: including the development of an internal access road; office/welfare accommodation; workshop; car, cycle and coach parking; perimeter fencing; electricity sub-stations; weighbridges; weighbridge office; water tank; silos; lighting; heat off-take pipe; surface water management system; hardstanding; earthworks; landscaping; and bridge crossings, Levitt’s Field, Waterbeach Waste Management Park, Ely Road, Waterbeach. It was acknowledged that the Cllrs had a very difficult job and that it was hard to understand all of the information. Comments made regarding increase in traffic, noise being generated which could affect the new Waterbeach development, pollution and the reduction of clean air, not convinced that it will be a well-managed facility however it was recognised that there was a need to reduce land fill. Cllr Collinson clarified for residents that the Parish’s role was purely advisory. The application was originally presented as a local solution but now clear that this isn’t the case. Cllr Collinson stated that although the government won’t restrict where waste comes from there are guidelines which state waste must be treated near to where it was produced, therefore the 30% imported waste is of concern. There are wider commercial considerations and incinerators are vying with each other for waste. Noted that on the subject of pollution/health the documents state that it is not predicted to affect health; this is too vague. PHE document is also vague and some of the nano particles can’t be trapped and to date not a lot of work has been done on how to measure the particles. Cambridge is the asthma capital of the UK and the documents provided say that there is nothing to rule out that there could be harm to health. Cllr Graves was concerned that it was a case between two evils and there will be pressure for further landfill if the application wasn’t approved. There is already lots of pollution from the existing landfill. If the application was for a new site then it probably wouldn’t be granted in such a rural area. Noted that although the A14 is being widened the process has taken years plus when the road is built it will already be at capacity. Have noise issues been considered for Wicken Fen? We are already exposed to pollution every day. Concerns raised regarding whether the EA can monitor properly and if Amey could run the facility efficiently. Need to ensure that if approved that it will be well monitored. Given issues with odours already at the site there are doubts as to Amey’s capability. Standing Orders suspended 8.46pm to allow Emma Fitch to speak. The key thing is that there are a lot of technological documents which is why County have employed experts. Key statutory consultees have responded. Waste won’t be transported 24/7 and the busiest periods will be outside of peak hours. Standing Orders reinstated 8.51pm. Recorded vote. CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED** (Cllrs Collinson, Mudd, Nicholas & Young – refused, Cllr Morris – approved, Cllr Graves – abstained). Reasons for refusal: application in the open countryside, bulk/mass/scale of the building, impact of the chimney on a listing building, traffic – road capacity can’t cope, technology being proposed not up to date, possible health effects, noise/light pollution, not the least polluting option due to increase of traffic in a rural area and is the site in the right part of the country. Point of clarification that Amey will self-regulate with regular monitoring. Cllr Morris suggested that, should the application be permitted, a tighter, more transparent monitoring regime was required. Standing Orders suspended 9.03pm. Amey will take daily snapshots but only if there is a deviation from the figures will it be checked by the EA. Standing Orders reinstated 9.05pm. Standing Orders suspended 9.06pm. Resident suggested that Cllr Morris wasn’t the best person to be the Amey Liaison Group representative. Clerk confirmed that the matter would be discussed internally by the Council. Cllr Graves asked if the drainage board was represented. Emma Fitch confirmed that they were but not always available to attend. 24 members of public left the meeting at 9.10pm

- **S/1495/18/FL** - Conversion of barn to dwelling and erection of detached garage, Church Lane Farm, Church Lane, Cottenham. Applicant ran through the rationale and core principals of the design and how it aligned with the NPPF and Cottenham Village Design Guide. Standing Orders reinstated 9.14pm. SCDC Cllrs Gough & Wilson and Asst Clerk left the meeting at 9.16pm. Noted that the barn is in the open countryside but the barn already exists. Need to weigh up being outside the village framework vs eco credentials. Noted that it is within the curtilage of an existing building. Standing Orders suspended 9.22pm. Applicant ran through the eco credentials of the barn and how they were looking to make with low carbon impact, working with companies that use recycled materials etc. There will either be a ground or air heat recovery system and solar panels. They have done considerable research over the past 2 years into the technologies available. Church Lane has some distinctive buildings and they are looking to do something similar. Standing Orders reinstated 9.27pm. CPC recommends approval subject to further details on the eco credentials. **APPROVED**. Cllr Young left the meeting at 9.33pm. Under Standing Order 1z it was agreed to continue the meeting.
- **S/0713/18/LB** – Retrospective planning permission for minor repair/reinstatement of larder ceiling, The Old Rectory, 2 High Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/1553/18/FL** - Two storey side extension, 31 Histon Road, Cottenham. Concerns regarding the bulk/scale compared to the existing building. CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**.
- **S/1606/18/FL** - proposed replacement window to front elevation, 205-207 High Street, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S/4548/17/OL** - Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 23 residential units, including affordable housing provision, public open space and associated access, infrastructure and landscaping with all matters reserved except for access, (AMENDED) - Revised site edged red plans, ownership certificates and dimensions of access, Land at Oakington Road, Cottenham. **No further comment**.
- **S/1752/18/FL** – Proposed change of use from B1(c) light industrial to B8 storage and distribution, Unit B, Broad Lane Industrial Estate, Broad Lane, Cottenham. CPC recommends approval. **APPROVED**.
- **S0637/18/FL** - Two storey extension with a new side entrance and entrance lobby, 358, High Street, Cottenham (AMENDMENT). CPC recommends refusal. **REFUSED**.

#### SCDC Decisions:

##### Approval

- **S/0784/18/FL** – Single Storey Rear Extension & Internal Alterations, 21 Crowlands, Cottenham
- **S/0891/18/FL** - Erection of single dwelling house incorporating previously approved highway alterations, Land to the rear of No 316 High Street, Cottenham

##### Refusal

- **S/0913/18/OL** - Outline planning permission for proposed new dwelling including layout and access, land adjacent to 236 Histon Road, Cottenham
- **S/0912/18/OL** - Outline Planning Permission for 2 no. dwellings including access and layout, Land east of 19, Church Lane, Cottenham

##### Tree Orders

- **S/1531/18/TC** - Willow Tree - Fell because tree has dropped a large limb which has unbalanced the tree and is still too large for its surroundings, front of 15 and SE of 13 Church Lane, Cottenham. Approved subject to Trees Officer comments.
- **S/1587/18/TC** - Robinia (T1) - fell due to large size and excessive shading. Eucalyptus (T2) - reduce height by lopping top, 10a Telegraph Street, Cottenham. Approved subject to Trees Officer comments.
- **S/1670/18/TC** - Walnut ~ Reduce crown by up to 2.0 metres and raise crown by 2.5 metres; remove major deadwood, 7 Cundell Drive, Cottenham. Approved subject to Trees Officer comments. Cllr Nicholas left the room at 9.51pm.

- 18P/090. Enforcement** – consider updates from Enforcement Officers and additional items for enforcement. Clerk to forward update on case 5/17.
- 18P/091. Date of next meeting** – 7<sup>th</sup> June 2018. Cllr Nicholas returned to the room 9.53pm.
- 18P/092. Close of meeting** – 9.53pm.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Chair) Date \_\_\_\_\_