

PLANNING COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Thursday 16th February 2017

Time: 10.00am – 13:40pm

Place: Council Chamber, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillors B Ashwood, D Connor (Chairman), A Dent, L Harford, B Hunt, S Kindersley, M Loynes, M Mason, J Scutt and M Smith (Vice Chairwoman)

224. APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ashcroft (Councillor Dent substituting) and Lay.

The Chairman disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda items 4 and 5 in that he knew both the applicant and the objector and therefore would withdraw from the meeting while the items were being determined.

The Vice-Chairwoman declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 6 in that she was Chairwoman of a Member led review into completed cycling projects. She also informed the Committee that when the item was presented to the Economy and Environment Committee she observed the meeting as a member of the public.

Councillors Harford and Mason informed the Committee that when the item was discussed at the meeting of the Economy and Environment Committee on 16 December 2016 they left the meeting while the item was discussed.

Councillor Scutt informed the Committee that she was a lapsed member of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign and did not actively participate in activities.

225. MINUTES – 19TH JANUARY 2017

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 19th January 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman exercised his discretion and amended the order in which the agenda items were heard, moving the application for the new pedestrian and cycle bridge across the River Cam ahead of the applications submitted by Datashredders Ltd and Recyplas. The Chairman also informed Members that due to the considerable public interest in the Bridge application and the number of speakers that had registered to speak to the application, each registered speaker would be afforded 5 minutes to address the Committee.

The Chairman reminded Members of the importance of being present through the entire presentation and debate on the applications and that if comfort breaks were required Members should indicate clearly to the Chairman. The Chairman emphasised that Members were not to engage with any parties associated with the applications during an adjournment.

226. NEW PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIVER CAM, INCLUDING ACCESS RAMPS, LIGHTING, STEPS, PATHS TO THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY, LANDSCAPING, REPLACEMENT OF THE JETTY, AND FLOOD COMPENSATION AREAS.

AT: LAND BETWEEN DITTON WALK AND FEN ROAD ACROSS DITTON MEADOWS AND THE RIVER CAM, CAMBRIDGE.

APPLICANT: CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

LPA REF: C/5005/16/CC

Prior to hearing the application, the Chairman noted the amendment sheet that had been circulated to members of the Planning Committee in advance of the meeting with amendments sought by the Wildlife Trust. Members were also asked to note the late submission item from Mr Chris Smith that was circulated at the start of the meeting with additional concerns raised in relation to ecology matters. Members acknowledged these points.

The Committee considered an application for a new pedestrian and cycle bridge across the River Cam between Ditton Walk and Fen Road. Members were informed that officers from Ecology, Flood and Water and Highways / Transport Assessment teams were available to answer any technical questions. Members noted the advice of the Council's Legal Officer that the Bridge and the Chisholm Trail were separate planning applications and the Bridge was a standalone project that could proceed regardless of whether planning permission was granted for the Trail.

Members clarified the consultation response of the Wildlife Trust. Officers explained that the Wildlife Trust's objection remained in place based on the overall net loss in biodiversity for both the Bridge and the Trail. However, the Trust considered that the Bridge application represented a small net gain in biodiversity owing to enhancements of habitat area proposed as part of the application. Members noted that it was only the application for the Bridge that was being considered and that comments regarding the trail would not be taken into account.

The presenting officer highlighted the application area on a site map, drawing attention to the locations of the Green Dragon Bridge to the west, the nearest crossing to the east and areas of Green Belt. The Green Belt was extensive and the Bridge had been located near the existing railway bridge to mitigate its impact on the area. The City's Central Conservation Area and Fen Ditton Conservation Area were highlighted along with City and County Wildlife Sites and the closest listed buildings. Some of the key views from these areas were shown in photographs as part of the officer's presentation. It was noted that landscape and habitat improvements would be implemented through planning conditions in order to mitigate the impact of the application together with flood compensation areas that mitigated the impact of the hardstanding materials. Officers acknowledged that the haul road alignment for the Bridge would be used for the Chisholm Trail route if permission was granted. However, for the purposes of the Bridge application the haul road and its removal would be considered separately from the wider scheme.

Officers also highlighted the locations from where representations (those in support, objection and comments only) had been received, this had been produced based on where postcodes had been provided.

Improvements to the towpath would be made, including the jetty which was currently too narrow and hazardous. In response to a query, officers confirmed that the jetty formed part of the Bridge planning application. Access ramps and stairs to the bridge were highlighted to Members along with elevation drawings of the bridge. The colour of the Bridge would be Cambridge Blue, chosen to complement the existing railway bridge and surroundings and to minimise its visual impact, seen in the context of the sky. However, the exact specification would be secured through condition. The lattice design of the Bridge provided windows through which the river and meadow could be viewed. Members were shown visualisations provided by the applicant to help demonstrate these points. The Bridge would be fully wheelchair accessible and the gradient adhered to Sustrans guidance as highlighted in Paragraph 9.32 of the report. The lighting scheme for the Bridge was proposed to consist of way finding and safety lighting rather than illuminating the entire bridge and would be secured through condition that could include motion sensors or timers so that the Bridge was only lit when being used. Officers reiterated that the precise lighting would be controlled by condition so the illustrations shown were only examples.

Proposed new landscaping was highlighted to Members that was designed to mitigate the loss of wildlife habitat and condition 26 regarding the translocation of grassland survey and scheme. The precise details would be secured by planning conditions. Members were shown the proposed loss of trees and new planting through visualisations of the existing situation, in year 1 and in year 15.

A Member clarified areas of land that were under the ownership of Network Rail and officers confirmed that separate consent would have to be obtained by the applicant for work to take place on those areas under Network Rail ownership.

Members noted the contents of the amendment sheet that had been circulated previously and published on the Council's website.

Councillor Jennie Conroy speaking in objection on behalf of Fen Ditton Parish Council addressed the Committee. Councillor Conroy explained that there had been many suggestions and objections that had not been accounted for within the scheme and requested that Members address all the points raised.

Councillor Conroy drew attention to and raised concern regarding the process of the original feasibility study that did not consider a location further to the west of the current proposal (the former Pike and Eel area) that would have been preferable as there would have been no requirement for ramps. The supporting documentation to the planning application was found to be lacking and the absence of a revised environmental master plan was considered unsatisfactory. Attention was also drawn to the concerns raised by the Wildlife Trust. The traffic modelling was also flawed with less public benefit than originally forecast as the route to and from the Bridge was convoluted and therefore it was likely that traffic would continue to use the Green Dragon Bridge. The link between the Bridge and the Chisholm Trail was emphasised by the Councillor as one was dependant on the other.

Concern was expressed that the conservation area of Fen Ditton had been overlooked and omitted from the report as had been highlighted by Heritage England; Ditton Meadows was the equivalent of Grantchester Meadows in its importance with a vital conservation and wildlife role. Councillor Conroy considered the Bridge to be contrary to planning policy and the development of the Bridge would have a negative impact on Ditton Meadows, one third of which is in the Fen Ditton Conservation Area, which was not considered in any of the supporting documents. The policy on the setting of, into and out

of the Conservation Area has also not be taken into account. The Bridge would also be vulnerable to graffiti and litter as a result of the additional traffic.

Councillor Conroy requested conditions be attached to the planning permission to ensure the long term maintenance of the plan e.g. cleaning and litter management of the Bridge; use of historic colours and not Cambridge Blue; the removal of seating; a commitment not to approve standard lighting on columns; and sought an undertaking to mitigate car parking issues that would arise from the Bridge such as free parking on Newmarket Road Park and Ride Site.

A Member clarified that the Fen Ditton Conservation Area had been extensively covered within the officer's report. Officers confirmed that the Fen Ditton Conservation Area had been given full consideration, but acknowledged that Fen Ditton Parish Council's concerns were more aimed at the applicant's submission documents. An explanation was provided on the difference between the applicant's documentation and the officers' consideration of the information, as set out in the case officer's report.

Mike Davies, Team Leader, Cycling Projects, Cambridgeshire County Council addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant. Mr Davies drew attention to the strategic and policy basis for the new bridge, in particular the new Cambridge North Station that was due to open on 21 May 2017, and the Cambridge Northern Fringe North East Development Area that was planned on 34 acres of brownfield land (CB4 development) to provide between 11,000 and 21,000 new jobs. It was therefore crucial that people had attractive non car options in accordance with the adopted Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Mr Davies drew attention to the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) in terms of public health, highlighting that the Bridge would be located in within the least active Wards within Cambridge and would therefore encourage greater exercise by providing a safe and enjoyable route.

Mr Davies informed the Committee that the project team had engaged widely, and had adjusted the proposals in response to comments made by the local community and interest groups drawing attention to in particular, moving the location of the bridge to be much closer to the new railway station, the original "off the shelf" design of the bridge was dropped and architects appointed to re-design the Bridge and improvements included within the application for the jetty. Three bridge designs had been developed and the popular aspects of two had been combined into the final design. The applicant also acknowledged the concerns about construction on the meadows, so they looked into launching the Bridge from the Chesterton side to minimise impacts as far as possible.

In conclusion Mr Davies informed Members that the Bridge would provide an essential link to the new station and expanding employment site. It was in accordance with the Transport Strategy, Local Plans and the JSNA and the scheme had been amended in response to local concerns.

Mr Jim Chisholm addressed the Committee in support of the application. He informed the Committee that before coming to Cambridge he was a volunteer helping to restore the Basingstoke Canal and during that project some members of the public thought that the restoration project would destroy a wildlife haven. Since the completion of the project the canal was now a 20 mile linear park, through Surrey and Hampshire and had been awarded Site of Special Scientific Importance (SSSI) status since 1995 for significant stretches. Mr Chisholm considered the Chisholm Trail not as a way of delivering existing cycle trips in a shorter time, but as a way of encouraging more to cycle and walk in the urban environment and to connect valuable green spaces. There was also an opportunity to improve habitat and create pocket parks along the rail corridor.

There would, Mr Chisholm informed Members, be small pieces of low level habitat that would be damaged by the application although the more valuable rough grassland would remain relatively untouched. The habitat would recover and there were significant opportunities, not just for mitigation of the ecological impact but also for significant enhancement such as that of Barnwell Woods as a wildlife area. The route would be a benefit to all, including car drivers who would benefit from reduced congestion.

Mr Chisholm relayed a quote from Mrs Heather Coleman who commuted regularly from Milton to Addenbrooke's Hospital. She had chosen to cycle along the river despite it being slower than the road, as she found the daily change to see wildlife and the changing seasons a pleasure and was looking forward to the development of the new bridge that had been sensitively done. The improvement of paths for those who walk or cycle would not harm nature but give more people the chance to encounter nature and become passionate about protecting it.

Mr Al Storer speaking in support of the application on behalf of Camcycle (noting they have around 1,200 members in support of this application) addressed Members. Mr Storer welcomed the detailed report and that it addressed the substantive objections noting that the project officers had worked hard to ensure that the impact upon the Meadows was minimised by ensuring that the Bridge was located as close to the existing railway bridge as possible. The project would improve accessibility for residents of Fen Ditton and Abbey to the new railway station, taking a mile off the journey and avoiding the steep and narrow Green Dragon Bridge which was difficult for disabled users.

Mr Storer concluded by reading a short statement from Dr Willa McDonald, a GP working in central Cambridge. Dr McDonald requested that Members consider the health benefits that cycling brought to society. Cycling was a way of exercising, staying healthy and reducing disease impact that is available to almost everyone. Breathing in particulates from diesel fumes were now a risk to long term cardio-vascular and respiratory health and the public were starting to request solutions to the issues faced. There were also increasing incidences of type 2 diabetes and rising rates of obesity in children and adults. NHS England recommended 150 minutes of exercise per week taken in more than 10 minute blocks. Cycling was the perfect way to achieve that goal. Mr Storer concluded by saying that Camcycle had been asking for this proposal for a long time and therefore they supported the recommendation for approval.

Mr Rob King on behalf of Outspoken (as a local business owner, cyclist and father) addressed the Committee in support of the application. Mr King emphasised the ecological value of the area and for that reason supported the development of the Bridge in order that new people could use the Bridge and see the wildlife and enjoy the meadows. The Bridge, sited on the edge of the meadows would enhance the local area and the meadows.

As a business owner, Mr King informed Members that the Bridge would ensure that more people could commute to work with greater ease and reduce the need for car parking. Mr King's courier business used cargo bikes and zero emissions vehicles to move goods around the City. The Bridge would therefore allow easier access into the City and reduced the reliance on vans. The Bridge would also provide a safe urban corridor for everyone.

Mr King expressed disappointment as a parent governor at his child's local school that Fen Ditton Parish Council had not consulted the school on its views. Therefore the Parish Council's response in objection was considered not to represent the School or all residents' views on this proposal in his opinion.

Mr Ian Litterick, a local resident addressed Members. Mr Litterick drew attention to residents and businesses that resided on the other side of the railway crossing at Fen Road noting that the waiting times at the crossing were considerable and the crossing was also dangerous, although improvements were currently being proposed by Network Rail. Mr Litterick requested that access to the Bridge be improved for cyclists and pedestrians through the provision of a pathway to allow people from Fen Road easier access to the Bridge through a condition attached to the planning permission.

The Council's Legal Officer confirmed that it was not possible to achieve a further access route through condition and that the application had to be considered in its current form. Officers confirmed that it was their understanding that such an access had been discussed as part of the development site for the 14 new flats, but to their knowledge the developer did not want this. As part of this discussion, officers asked the Chairman if it was possible to ask the applicant for their view on this to ensure that the matter was fully noted. The Chairman agreed to this and the applicant informed the Committee that land the Council had control over did not extend as far as Fen Road and it was unlikely that the landowner would provide access rights.

Speaking against the application Dr Tim Reed, chartered biologist, addressed the Committee. Dr Reed emphasised the importance of publically available data that was able to be scrutinised thoroughly and verified independently. Following detailed examination there were duplicated statements and material missing from the ecological consultant's report. This was important because the advice of the consultants had determined the outcome of the officer's report. Dr Reed drew attention to paragraph 9.84 of the officer's report and informed Members that the statement had been made in the absence of the necessary data, adding that there were also gaps in the analysis regarding voles. The consultant's report was contradictory and exposed the Council to challenge. In his opinion the second ecology note was just a cut and paste from the Chisholm Trail application and things like dates were wrong, with supporting data and maps missing. Dr Reed concluded by requesting that in the absence of clear data and analysis of the ecology of the application area, which in his professional view made them incorrect, unsafe, and flawed in protecting protected species, the decision should be deferred to allow the submission of proper information in line with planning policy.

Mrs Sophie Hyde addressed Members in objection to the application on behalf of the Friends of Ditton Meadows. Mrs Hyde drew attention to the separation of the planning applications for the Bridge and the Trail and questioned the logic of granting planning permission for the Bridge without the Trail to connect it. At present the Bridge did not connect to the Millennium Cycleway without the Trail and would therefore end in a flooded field if the Trail was not granted planning permission.

Mrs Hyde drew attention to the large number of documents that were available to the public for viewing and explained that there were discrepancies between them which made detailed critique difficult. The result of the separation of the planning applications for the Bridge and the Trail had resulted in the public being excluded from the process as it was too complex and had caused confusion.

There had been no consideration, Mrs Hyde informed the Committee, of the cheaper alternative to the Bridge and drew attention to members of the Local Liaison Forum that were also members of the Cambridge Cycling Campaign that suggested a lack of impartiality. There had been a lack of transparency in the overall process leaving the Council open to legal challenge and the only way that information had been obtained was through Freedom of Information (FOI) requests.

Mrs Hyde drew attention to the petition signatures that had not been included within the Summary of Responses published on the planning application website and had concerns over the size of the bridge and the potential use of it in the future as a busway etc. In conclusion Mrs Hyde requested that the decision be deferred while due consideration was given to alternative routes and while other issues were ironed out.

Mrs Lisa Bucholz speaking in objection to the application as a resident of East Chesterton addressed Members. Mrs Bucholz emphasised the importance of the irreplaceable resource that Ditton Meadows represented and the proposed Bridge would permanently change and damage that resource. The green spaces in Cambridge defined it as a city from elsewhere and they were of huge importance. The Bridge would represent a huge intrusion onto the Meadow, in particular the large concrete ramps leading to and from the Bridge, noting it was about 120 tonnes in weight to be placed on the meadows. The urbanisation of the Meadow brought an increased risk of litter and graffiti and would lead to nothing if the Chisholm Trail was not brought forward. Mrs Bucholz showed an image of the area to show its true beauty, which was proposed to be tarmacked over. Mrs Bucholz played two videos that had been filmed at the Green Dragon Bridge at peak times of the day which she advised the Committee demonstrated the current route was not saturated. In conclusion, Mrs Bucholz drew attention to the habitat the Meadows provided to animals and plants and members should not be misled by transport benefits, so requested that alternatives to the Bridge be considered as we need to conserve the benefits of the enhanced value landscape. Therefore Mrs Bucholz requested that Members deferred or refuse the planning application.

Mr Ray Smith speaking in objection to the application focussed on the projected use of the Bridge once constructed, having provided a handout to all members for their consideration in relation to this matter. Mr Smith challenged the view that the existing Green Dragon Bridge was congested and questioned whether the proposed bridge would reduce usage of the Green Dragon Bridge. Mr Smith considered that cyclists that travelled from Fen Road would continue to use the Green Dragon Bridge because it was a shorter journey and the route to the proposed Bridge was difficult, consisting of a number of sharp turns, hairpin bends and a poorly maintained footpath. In conclusion Mr Smith drew attention to the cost benefit analysis of the Bridge that had recently been released following an FOI request that appeared to have significant shortcomings. In his opinion, even with distorted figures, the bridge had not been justified and there was no demonstrable need for the new bridge. Mr Smith therefore requested as a minimum that the application at least be deferred.

A Member confirmed that when approaching the Green Dragon Bridge, cyclists had to dismount and push their cycles across.

The presenting officer clarified the access arrangements to the proposed bridge as they had been incorrectly referred to during Mr Smith's submission.

The Chairman relayed the comments of the Member for East Chesterton, Councillor Ian Manning to the Committee. Councillor Manning fully supported the vital application and hoped the Committee approved it. He had followed the project closely from its conception, through Committee approval and as Vice Chair of the City Deal Local Liaison forum for it and the trail. Through that process a very high level of resident participation had been achieved and necessary concessions had been made which had allowed the vast majority of people to feel they could support the project.

During the course of discussion Members:

- noted that the Bridge was separate from the Chisholm Trail and they had to deal with the proposal in front of them in line with the steer provided by legal officers.
- commented that the concerns raised by Fen Ditton Parish Council in relation to their understandable concerns that the village would be opened up to parking pressures with people parking and then cycling into the City, would have to be separately managed.
- commented that the officer's report had received criticism regarding biodiversity and ecology with the implication that the data set out in the report was contradictory and inaccurate and sought reassurance from officers that the report was as accurate as possible and based on information provided and consultation responses received.
- noted that the conditions set out in the officer's report addressed comprehensively all issues regarding ecology and biodiversity, and drew attention to the net gain of biodiversity that would result from the construction of the Bridge.
- highlighted the benefits of the Bridge to the wider community by providing a key route that many thousands of people would utilise.
- confirmed that pedestrians were able to use the access ramp to the Bridge.
- expressed concern at the criticisms made of the application by Dr Reed in his submission to the Committee and sought assurance that Members were sufficiently informed regarding the ecology and biodiversity impacts and whether there was a risk of judicial review if the concerns had not been properly addressed. Officers explained that Cambridge City Council, the County Ecology Officer and The Wildlife Trust agreed that although there was a small loss of habitat area, there would be an overall net gain in biodiversity resulting from the construction of the Bridge, because of the enhancements made to existing habitats. The Ecological Design Strategy and the Landscaping Plan had been secured by condition within the application, in order to secure this. Officers acknowledged that the information submitted with the planning application in relation to ecology had been contradictory and of a poor quality which was highlighted in the report by early objections from statutory consultees. However, officers stressed that it was all the additional work that City and County officers had done, which included site visits challenging the information provided, that led officers to consider that the details were now sufficient, particularly with the mitigation sought through planning conditions, to meet planning policy and allow a decision to be made. It was also acknowledged that officers from the Wildlife Trust had also undertaken additional work to ensure that the information submitted had been challenged and considered all ecological matters.
- questioned whether, if a decision on the application was deferred there was further material that could be presented to the Committee. Officers informed Members that the remaining ecological work for the Bridge related to translocation scheme and that was to be secured through condition. There had been considerable consultation during the application process and the ecological assessment was as accurate as possible, noting the additional work undertaken by officers.

- noted that the Wildlife Trust were objecting to the application until the further ecological information for the Chisholm Trail application had been submitted, as they wanted members to consider the overall information on the trail to be taken into account cumulatively. Officer's confirmed that any additional material presented as part of the Chisholm Trail application would not be relevant to the Bridge as a standalone project and therefore would be outside the scope of this application.
- noted the costs and the benefits of the application and recognised the need to balance the importance of the Bridge with the ecology and wildlife / biodiversity of the area, noting the wildlife and biodiversity issues and comments brought forward by Dr Reed. There was a clear public benefit to all residents across the county. Attention was drawn to the new railway station and the Bridge would form part of the wider project to deliver improved infrastructure across the City. The importance of reducing reliance on cars was emphasised and the Bridge would assist in facilitating that.
- noted and welcomed the comments of the Local Member, Councillor Manning.
- noted the extensive amount of consideration over many years.
- welcomed the design of the bridge that was designed to blend with the landscaped and praised the planners and designers involved in the design.
- expressed disappointment that Cambridgeshire County Council's Rights of Way team had no specific comments to make on the application and confirmed that the Conservators of the River Cam had been involved in discussions with the applicant.
- noted that the jetty could not be extended into the River Cam area, which took account of discussions with the Conservators of the River Cam.
- queried the height of the Bridge, confirming that it was the same clearance height as the railway bridge, which was of sufficient height for boats to successfully navigate underneath it.
- noted that current bridges across the River Cam had been surveyed as part of the transport assessment and as part of that assessment had noted indicative projected use of the proposed Bridge through census data that identified routes through Cambridge, that were likely to transfer to this route.
- commented that the Green Dragon Bridge was narrow and difficult to pass when cycles were pushed over. The Bridge would provide a link to new developments within Cambridge and reduce traffic and pollution.
- sought assurance that procedural fairness had been carried out following the doubts cast by Dr Reed on the ecology assessment. Officers explained that the report and recommendation were the result of extensive consultation and that the Wildlife Trust's objection related to the Chisholm Trail and was therefore outside of the Bridge application.

It was resolved unanimously to grant planning permission subject to the conditions attached at Appendix A to these minutes.

Councillor Kindersley left the meeting at 12:05pm and did not return.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10pm for 10 minutes to allow members of the public to leave the Council Chamber.

227. SECTION 73A PLANNING APPLICATION TO DEVELOP LAND IN RELATION TO UNIT 2 (PART OF THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION SITE) WITHOUT COMPLYING WITH CONDITION 8 (RESTRICTING STORAGE TO INSIDE THE BUILDING ONLY) OF PLANNING PERMISSION F/2019/02/CW (PROPOSED ERECTION OF TWO INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS FOR THE GRANULATION AND BAILING OF WASTE PLASTICS FOR RECYCLING).

AT: DATA SHREDDERS LIMITED, EASTWOOD INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, EASTWOOD END, WIMBLINGTON, PE15 0QH.

APPLICANT: DATASHREDDERS LIMITED

LPA REF: F/2004/16/CW

The meeting recommenced at 12:20 following a short 10 minute adjournment. Councillor Connor, following his declaration of interest, left the meeting and took no part in the decision. In the absence of the Chairman, Councillor Smith chaired the meeting.

The Committee received an application to develop land in relation to Unit 2 of the original application site without complying with condition 8 of planning permission F/2019/02/CW.

Prior to the presentation by the planning officer, the Council's legal officer informed Members of a slight variation to the usual procedure in relation to agenda items 4 and 5. The two applications, from Datashredders Ltd and Recyplas were both in the form of section 73A applications to amend condition 8 of the original permission which was granted in 2002 and covered the whole planning unit. Due to the two units having been operated separately for some time and each operator having submitted separate applications, the applications needed to be considered separately. However because the applications were intrinsically linked by the original permission the vote would not be taken until both applications had been presented and debated upon. For the purpose of the minutes the debates and comments would be separated to their respective planning applications.

Councillor Harford left the meeting at 12:25pm and did not return.

The presenting officer provided an overview of the site and how the applications related to one another; drawing particular attention to the respective locations of the sites, before moving onto the specifics of Unit 2, which included noting that the land shown in blue was a separate Datashredders site to the one being considered by this planning application. Condition 8 which the application sought to vary related to environmental protection, specifically the prohibition of the processing or storage of waste unless within the confines of the approved buildings. The variation of the condition sought to allow the storage of material outside of the approved building together with the imposition of further conditions that would determine where material was stored outside. Members were informed that material would be bailed and a litter catch fence installed that would catch any material blown by the wind that would form part of the overall litter management plan secured by condition. It was confirmed that overall vehicular movements to and from the site would not alter as a result of the application.

Officers confirmed that there was no weighbridge located on the Unit 2 site.

Speaking in support of the application Chris Walford, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee; he advised members that his comments were relevant to both applications. Mr Walford informed the Committee that the two operators at the site were currently complying with all conditions apart from condition 8. The sites current permission was originally written for a previous company called Plasgran and was specific to that operation, therefore variation to the condition was required in order to make it relevant to the current operators. Mr Walford highlighted to Members that the applicant had stored material outside in breach of condition 8 of the original application for a number of years but this had only become an issue recently. Compliance with condition 8 would mean that the site would have to be fully enclosed which posed a greater risk of fire. In conclusion Mr Walford drew attention to the work that had taken place with planning officers regarding the litter management policies.

In response to Members' questions Mr Walford confirmed that the companies he represents would gladly meet with local residents to discuss any issues that may arise in the form of a Liaison Forum. He also explained that it was likely that the condition was originally imposed to avoid impact to visual amenity from the erection of large warehouse structures.

Speaking in objection to the application Mrs Angela Johnson a local resident highlighted the location of her Grade II listed property in relation to the site, highlighting the locations of nearby facilities that contained potentially flammable materials that could be at risk together with her thatched cottage if a fire were to break out and the material not enclosed. Mrs Johnson explained the issue of thatched roofs not catching fire immediately and that it can instead smoulder for some time. If material was stored in a building, in the event of a fire, the burning items wouldn't be blown around. Mrs Johnson informed Members that the Fire Service had requested in 2016 for a fire hydrant to be installed and this had not yet been completed. The proposed location of the fire hydrant was also inappropriate as in the event of a fire vehicles would not be able to access the site and cause queues. Mrs Johnson highlighted the number of complaints that had been made to the operators regarding litter in particular along Woodman's Way and Eastwood End.

Mrs Johnson explained that discussions had taken place with the applicant but little had changed as a result and that the outside storage had been a problem for some time, unlike the agent had suggested in his speech. She therefore asked that condition 8 not be removed.

The Local Member for Forty Foot, Councillor David Connor confirmed that he would assist in facilitating discussions between the applicant and local residents.

During the course of discussion Members:

- expressed concern regarding non-compliance with planning conditions and the length of time in which they had not been complied with. Members noted the advice of the Council's legal officer with regard to past non-compliance issues in that they could not be considered when determining the application.
- welcomed the involvement of the Local Member in working to resolve the issues regarding the site and the prospect of a Liaison Forum. Members noted that the litter

management plan required clear signage to be erected informing people of who to contact if there was issues regarding litter.

- noted the importance of the conditions attached to the application and their enforcement and questioned whether a time limit could be applied to the installation of the fire hydrant. Officers explained that there was already one fire hydrant in place and the second would have to be installed within three months to be then adopted by the Fire Service. It had been ensured that adequate protection had been agreed regarding the conditions and their enforceability in order they were as robust as possible.
- drew attention to thatched houses that were located in relatively close proximity to the site and the amount of litter that was visible at the site when Members conducted a visit to the site. The Council's legal officer reminded Members that previous breaches of conditions could not be considered when determining the application.

Councillor Dent left the meeting at 13:30 and did not return. He therefore took no part in any votes on the applications.

It was proposed by Councillor Scutt and seconded by Councillor Hunt with the agreement of the Committee to add an informative to the planning permission regarding the provision of a Local Liaison Forum to be arranged by the applicant.

It was resolved to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in Appendix B to these minutes and the addition of an informative to the planning permission regarding the provision of a Local Liaison Forum.

228. SECTION 73A PLANNING APPLICATION TO DEVELOP LAND IN RELATION TO UNIT 1 (PART OF THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION SITE) WITHOUT COMPLYING WITH CONDITION 8 (WHICH RESTRICTS STORAGE TO INSIDE THE BUILDING ONLY) OF PLANNING PERMISSION F/2019/02/CW (PROPOSED ERECTION OF TWO INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS FOR THE GRANULATION AND BAILING OF WASTE PLASTICS FOR RECYCLING).

AT: RECYPLAS, UNIT 1, EASTWOOD END INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, EASTWOOD END, WIMBLINGTON, PE15 0QN.

APPLICANT: RECYPLAS

LPA REF: F/2010/16/CW

The Committee received a Section 73A application to develop land without complying with condition 8 of planning permission F/2019/02/CW. The presenting officer drew attention to the site area in particular a grass area that remained clear of development due to archaeological remains found.

Chris Walford on behalf of the applicant informed Members that the location of the proposed fire hydrant had been determined by Anglian Water and the Fire Service. Advice had been received that stated the risk of fire to material stored outside was lower than when stored inside where heat sources (such as the granulation process for Recyplas) were also located.

Mrs Johnson speaking in objection stated that the stored material should be covered though not necessarily with the processing equipment. Mrs Johnson emphasised the history of non-compliance with planning conditions, and explained that some of the confusion between the sites was more to do with conditions being removed rather than the location of the units. As such she asked members not to remove conditions 8, 21 and 22.

Officers clarified that the supporting statement for Unit 1 (Recyplas) referred to parking conditions (21 & 22) and that these were due to remain and only condition 8 (as noted in the description of the development) was being considered as part of this planning application.

During discussion of the report Members:

- questioned whether the amount of material stored outside could be reduced. It was confirmed that it was operationally necessary for material to be stored on site in order that it can be processed. Conditions were in place that secured the amount of material that could be stored on site.
- checked that the planning conditions proposed were capable of being enforced with officers and where necessary that clear timescales were provided. Officers confirmed that the fire hydrant and litter catch fencing were to be delivered in 3 months. Also that monitoring and enforcement colleagues had visited Units 1 and 2 in January of this year, and therefore checks are already being undertaken when in the area to monitor compliance with conditions.
- questioned whether it was possible to grant a short term permission for one year and then review the matter. Officers explained that temporary permission could be granted however, the applicant had requested permanent permission and there were costs to the applicant associated to the application such as the installation of an additional fire hydrant and it would therefore not then be reasonable for the applicant to incur considerable costs for the permission to be possibly refused after a year.
- questioned whether it was possible to enforce the setting up of a liaison forum through condition clearly defining the number of meetings and timings for the meetings etc. and who incurred costs for monitoring / enforcement visits. Officers explained that it was not possible for a condition to be placed on the permission but an informative could be included and recorded in the minutes. Officers recommended the informative not be prescriptive based on previous experience and needed to be linked with the needs of the local community rather than set in stone. In relation to monitoring compliance with planning conditions, officers confirmed that the Council is unable to charge for monitoring visits to mineral and waste sites apart from when visiting landfill and quarry sites, therefore monitoring non-chargeable visits to other types of waste sites are usually grouped together in order to minimise costs incurred by the Council.

It was proposed by Councillor Scutt and seconded by Councillor Hunt with the agreement of the Committee to add an informative to the planning permission regarding the provision of a Local Liaison Forum to be arranged by the applicant.

It was resolved to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in Appendix C to these minutes and the addition of an informative to the planning permission regarding the provision of a Local Liaison Forum.

**229. UPDATE ON HORSEY TOLL PLANNING APPLICATION, STANGROUND
PETERBOROUGH, F/2000/16/CW**

Councillor Connor following his withdrawal from the meeting during the previous agenda item returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair.

Members received an update regarding the planning application for a new anaerobic digestion plant at Horsey Toll near Peterborough. The application was in the process of being determined by Peterborough City Council following the delegation of its determination by Cambridgeshire County Council under S101 (1) of the Local Government Act 1972.

A member asked if any future updates on this planning application could include a map and officers confirmed that this would be possible.

It was resolved unanimously to note the content of the update and agree the approach agreed by officers set out in paragraph 4.1 of the report.

230. BLACK FEN ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

An update regarding enforcement action that had taken place at Black Fen was presented to the Committee. A Member welcomed this update, but questioned whether further updates could be provided in private session owing to the nature of the dispute and the conduct of the applicant. Officers confirmed that this could be something that could be considered. However, they would need to check with Legal and Democratic Services colleagues whether the member request met the rules for such a closed private item or not.

It was resolved to note the contents of the report.

231. SUMMARY OF DECISIONS MADE UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

It was resolved to note the decisions made under delegated powers.

232. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – 16th MARCH 2017

Chairman

Appendix A

1. Commencement

The development hereby permitted shall be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission. Within 14 days of the commencement of the development the County Planning Authority shall be notified in writing of the date at which the development commenced.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Opening

Within one month of the Bridge first being brought into public use the County Planning Authority shall be notified in writing of the date at which the Bridge was first opened to the public.

Reason: In order to be able to establish the timescales for the approval of details reserved by conditions and to enable monitoring of the development.

3. Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the application form dated 10/06/2016 and the following information and plans (received 14/06/2016, unless otherwise stated), except as otherwise required by any of the conditions set out in this permission:

- Red Line Drawing, prepared by Cambridgeshire Highways, drwg no.: 5040126/HW/LP/001, rev: B, dated: 6/16 (received: 16/06/2016);
- Site Plan, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/101, rev: A, dated: 06/07/2016 (received: 06/07/2016);
- GA Plan, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/102, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);
- East & West Elevations, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/201, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);
- Longitudinal and Transverse Sections, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/202, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);
- Section B-B & C-C, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/301, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);
- North Abutments Details, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/303, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);
- Detail A – Parapet, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/401, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);
- View from Ditton meadows, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/501, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);
- View from north bank towpath, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/502, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);

- Deck view, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/503, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);
- Distant view from East, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/504, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);
- Lighting visualisations, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/505, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016);
- Chesterton Bridge Ecological Impact Assessment November 2016, prepared by Atkins, Job No.: 5124710.044, Rev 5.0, dated: 04/11/2016 (received: 07/11/2016);
- Ecology Technical Note, prepared by Atkins, reference: 5124710.44, rev: 01, dated: 19th January 2017 (received: 19/01/2017);
- Ecology Technical Note, prepared by Atkins, reference: 5124710.50, rev: 01, dated: 30th January 2017 (received: 30/01/2017);
- Abbey/Chesterton Foot and Cycle Bridge Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment November 2016, prepared by Atkins, Job No. 5138404, rev: 6, dated: November 2016 (received: 09/11/2016);
- Chesterton Footbridge, Chesterton, Cambridge, Arboricultural Impact Assessment November 2016, prepared by Atkins, Job No. 5138408, rev: P2, dated: 08.11.16 (received: 08/11/2016);
- Tree Protection Plan Sheet 1, prepared by Atkins, drwg no.: 5138404-COL-ARB001, rev: -, dated: 26/04/16 (received: 07/11/2016);
- Tree Protection Plan Sheet 2, prepared by Atkins, drwg no.: 5138404-COL-ARB002, rev: A, dated: 10/06/16 (received: 07/11/2016);
- Tree Protection Plan Sheet 3, prepared by Atkins, drwg no.: 5138404-COL-ARB003, rev: A, dated: 10/06/16 (received: 07/11/2016);
- Tree Protection Plan Sheet 4, prepared by Atkins, drwg no.: 5138404-COL-ARB004, rev: A, dated: 10/06/16 (received: 07/11/2016);
- Chesterton Bridge Land Contamination Desk Study October 2015, prepared by Atkins, Job No. 5142643, Rev: 1.0, dated: October 2015;
- Chesterton Foot/Cycle Bridge Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by Atkins, Job No. 5124710, Rev: 3.0, dated: 31/10/2016 (received: 07/11/2016);
- Chesterton Bridge Preliminary WFD Compliance Assessment, prepared by Atkins, Job No. 5138404, Version: 1.0, dated: 11 April 2016;
- New Abbey – Chesterton Bridge Drainage Layout, prepared by Cambridgeshire Highways, drwg no.: 5040126/BR/DR/501, Rev: C, dated: 10/16 (received: 12/10/2016);
- Chesterton Bridge Demand Forecasting, prepared by Atkins, Job No. 5143000, Rev: 4.0, dated: 02/09/16 (received: 29/09/2016);
- Chesterton Bridge Transport Assessment, prepared by Atkins, Job No. 5143000, Rev: 2.0, dated: 22/09/2016 (received: 26/09/2016);
- Fen Road, Cambridge [Visibility Splay Diagram 1], prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council, drwg no.: 1 (received: 08/08/2016);
- Fen Road, Cambridge [Visibility Splay Diagram 2], prepared by Cambridgeshire County Council, drwg no.: 2 (received: 08/08/2016);
- Abbey – Chesterton Bridge [ECI Presentation] February 2016, prepared by Osborne, (received: 08/11/2016).

Reason: To define the site and protect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policy 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

4. Schedule of Materials

No development shall commence until full details including colour samples (with RAL numbers) of all the materials to be used in the construction of the development, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the Bridge is appropriate in accordance with policies 3/4 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The colour and detail of the materials, including how porous they are, is required prior to the construction phase so must be agreed before development starts.

5. Detailed path drawings

No development shall commence until detailed engineers drawings for the development, including detailed dimensions, levels and specifications of the bridge and surrounding paths and ramps, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the paths and Bridge are accurately constructed on site to a high standard in accordance with policy 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The detailed information in relation to the paths are required prior to the construction phase so must be agreed before development commences.

6. Jetty Specification

No development shall commence until detailed drawings, for the construction of the replacement jetty, as shown on 'GA Plan, prepared by Skanska, drwg no.: KA082/TPA/102, rev: O, dated: 10/06/2016 (received: 16/06/2016)', have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with such approved details and shall be retained on site thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the details of the jetty are to a high standard and agreed prior to construction and in accordance with policy 3/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The detailed information for the jetty specification are required prior to the construction phase so must be agreed before development commences.

7. Lighting Specification

Prior to the installation of any lighting, a lighting scheme and specification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

- a) specifications for any artificial lighting of the site, including lighting on the Bridge and the paths, and way-finding lights at ground level;
- b) a lighting impact assessment with predicted lighting levels at proposed and existing residential properties, sensitive receptors, and the boundary of the site;

- c) details the hours that the lights will be illuminated; and
- d) details of motion detection sensors and how they will be used.

No lighting shall be installed except in accordance with such approved details and shall be retained on site thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that light pollution is prevented in this sensitive location in accordance with policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

8. Signage/Markings Specification

Prior to the bridge first being brought into public use a scheme for signage and path markings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The signage/markings scheme shall include, but not be limited to:

- a) Detailed design of all signage and path markings within the application site; and
- b) Detailed design of the signage and path/road markings:
 - i) At the junction of Wadloes Road and Newmarket Road;
 - ii) From Water Street and Fen Road;
 - iii) From the Cambridge North (Science Park) railway station;

The signage/path markings scheme shall be carried out in full in accordance with such approved details, shall be put in place prior to the Bridge first being brought into public use and shall be retained on site thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the paths are marked for wayfinding and safety purposes and in accordance with policy 8/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

9. Improvements to Barnwell Road

Prior to the Bridge first being brought into public use, (and unless the Chisholm Trail Phase 1, planning application reference: C/5007/16/CC, has been granted planning permission and constructed and brought into first public use), a scheme for cycling/pedestrian improvements to Barnwell Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include, but not be limited to:

- a) Details of upgrading the existing crossing on Barnwell Road to a toucan crossing; and
- b) Details of upgrading the existing footway to a shared pedestrian/cycle path along the eastern side of Barnwell Road.

The scheme shall be implemented in full in accordance with such approved details and the works to be carried out pursuant to the scheme shall be available for use prior to the Bridge first being brought into public use.

Reason: In the interests of highways safety and in accordance with policy 8/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

10. Construction Management Plan

No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, details of:

- a) construction methods;
- b) existing path closures and maintenance of safe access;
- c) construction vehicle movements, numbers and routes;
- d) site protective fencing;
- e) site compound layout; and
- f) a plan for the removal/reinstatement of the site compound following completion of the development.

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties in accordance with policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The Construction Management Plan relates to the construction phase so must be in place before development starts.

11. Construction Environmental Management Plan

No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The plan shall include:

- a) A Precautionary Method of Working (PMW) in respect of bats, reptiles, nesting birds and hedgerow;
- b) Full details for the protection of water voles during any culverting works;
- c) Provision for and confirmation that an Ecological Clerk of Works must oversee all site clearance works and monitor the PMW;
- d) Pollution controls;
- e) Invasive plant species controls; and
- f) That construction activities should be restricted to within normal daytime working hours, so that no additional lighting is used on the construction site overnight.

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: To ensure the environmental impact of the construction of the development is adequately mitigated and in the interests of the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers in accordance with policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The Construction Environmental Management Plan relates to the construction phase so must be in place before development starts.

12. Haul Road Details and Reinstatement

No development shall commence until details of the haul road(s) including routes; turnaround areas; construction; and method and timetable for removal and re-instatement have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

The haul road(s) described above shall be removed and the land reinstated in accordance with the above scheme, unless planning permission for the Chisholm Trail Phase 1, planning application reference: C/5007/16/CC, has been granted and implemented requiring such haul road to remain in place, whereby the net

loss of reinstatement will have been taken into account in accordance with planning permission C/5007/16/CC to ensure no net loss in biodiversity.

Reason: In order to ensure no net loss of biodiversity as a result of this application in accordance with policy 4/6, 4/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). Details of the haul road, including the method of construction and re-instatement of the area, is required ahead of the construction phase so must be approved before development starts.

13. Materials Management Plan

No development shall commence until a Materials Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The plan shall include:

- a) an inspection and sampling strategy for the testing of excavation formations;
- b) a procedure for screening contamination discovered in the development phase to be screened against criteria outlined in the Contamination Remediation Strategy;
- c) a stockpile validation strategy;
- d) detailed material re-use criteria;
- e) details of arisings processing;
- f) a verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in a) to e) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action;
- g) details of the volumes and types of material proposed to be imported or reused on site;
- h) details of the proposed source(s) of the imported or reused materials;
- i) details of the chemical testing for ALL material to be undertaken before placement onto the site;
- j) the results of the chemical testing which must show the material is suitable for use on the development; and
- k) confirmation of the chain of evidence to be kept during the materials movement, including material importation, reuse placement and removal from and to the development.

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of materials is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The detailed material information, including the methodology linked to testing for contaminated land related issues etc. is required ahead of the construction phase so must be in place before development starts.

14. Permitted Construction Hours

No development shall take place other than between the following hours: 0800 hours and 1800 hours on Monday to Friday, 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturday and at no time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties in accordance with policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

15. Permitted Construction Delivery Hours

No deliveries to, or removal of waste or materials from, the site shall take place except between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Monday to Friday, 0800 and 1300 on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays, bank or public holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the adjoining properties in accordance with policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

16. Construction Methods/Groundwater Pollution

Prior to any piling or any other foundation designs and investigation boreholes using penetrative methods, a report demonstrating that there will be no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3).

17. Earthworks

No development shall commence until full details of earthworks have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

These details shall include the existing land levels of the red line site area as a baseline for the scheme, alongside methods of soil stripping, handling and storage, ground protection during construction, ground re-instatement, the proposed grading and mounding of land areas including the levels and contours to be formed, and the effect of the proposed mounding on existing vegetation and surrounding landform.

The development shall only be carried out in full in accordance with such approved details, and shall be completed prior to the Bridge first being brought into public use.

Reason: To ensure that the details of the earthworks are acceptable in accordance with policies 3/4, 3/11 and 3/12 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The baseline land levels data and details of the earthworks proposed are required ahead of the construction phase so must be in place before development starts.

18. Contamination Preliminary Study

No development shall commence until a preliminary contamination study has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The study shall include:

- a) Desk study to include:
 - i. Detailed history of the site uses and surrounding area (including any use of radioactive material);
 - ii. General environmental setting;
 - iii. Site investigation strategy based on the information identified in the desk study.
- b) A report setting out what works/clearance of the site (if any) is required in order to effectively carry out site investigations;

- c) A Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) including a Conceptual Site Model (CSM) of the site indicating potential sources, pathways and receptors, including those off site; and
- d) The results of a site investigation based on (c) and a detailed risk assessment, including a revised CSM.

Reason: To adequately categorise the site prior to the design of an appropriate investigation strategy in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The contaminated land issue relates to the land ahead of the construction phase and remediation measures may be needed as part of the construction phase so must be in place before development starts.

19. Contamination Remediation Strategy

No development shall commence until a contamination remediation strategy has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The strategy shall include:

- a) A site investigation report detailing all works that have been undertaken to determine the nature and extent of any contamination, including the results of the soil, gas and/ or water analysis and subsequent risk assessment to any receptors;
- b) A proposed remediation strategy detailing works required in order to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters. The strategy shall include a schedule of the proposed remedial works setting out a timetable for all remedial measures that will be implemented; and
- c) The strategy shall include a plan providing details of how the remediation works shall be judged to be complete and arrangements for contingency actions. The plan shall also detail a long term monitoring and maintenance plan as necessary.

The approved remediation strategy shall be implemented in full and shall be completed prior to the Bridge first being brought into public use.

Reason: To ensure that any contamination of the site is identified and appropriate remediation measures agreed in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The contaminated land issue relates to the land ahead of the construction phase and remediation measures may be needed as part of the construction phase so must be in place before development starts.

20. Contamination Remediation Strategy – unexpected contamination

If, during the construction of the development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the County Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

The approved remediation strategy shall be implemented in full.

Reason: To ensure that any unexpected contamination is rendered harmless in the interests of environmental and public safety in accordance with policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

21. Contamination Completion/Verification Report

Prior to the Bridge first being brought into public use, a Contamination Completion Report shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The report shall include:

- a) A completion report demonstrating that the approved remediation scheme as required by conditions 19 and 20 has been undertaken and that the land has been remediated to a standard appropriate for the end use; and
- b) Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis (as defined in the approved Material Management Plan) which shall be included in the completion report along with all information concerning materials brought onto, used, and removed from the development. The information provided must demonstrate that the site has met the required clean up criteria.

Upon completion of any works pursuant to the Contamination Remediation Strategy, no works shall take place within the site such as to prejudice the effectiveness of the approved scheme of remediation.

Reason: To demonstrate the site is suitable for approved use in the interest of environmental and public safety in accordance with policy 4/13 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

22. Programme of Archaeological Works

No development shall commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The agreed WSI shall include:

- a) The statement of significance and research objectives;
- b) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
- c) The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI; and
- d) The timetable for the investigation.

The development shall only be carried out in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: To protect any underlying archaeology in the area in accordance with policy 4/9 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). To ensure that the underlying archaeology is protected the Programme of Archaeological Works needs to be agreed ahead of the construction phase so must be in place before development starts.

23. Drainage Scheme

No development shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme based on the agreed 'New Abbey – Chesterton Bridge Drainage Layout, prepared by Cambridgeshire Highways, drwg no.: 5040126/BR/DR/501, Rev: C, dated: 10/16

(received: 12/10/2016)' has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

- a) A plan clearly detailing the levels of the bridge to demonstrate that there is a 2.5% cross fall as detailed on the agreed drawing;
- b) An agreed drainage plan that shall detail how surface water draining from the Bridge Deck will be managed with the associated hydraulic calculations;
- c) A clearly labelled drainage layout plan showing pipe networks and any attenuation ponds and drainage storage tanks. This plan should show any pipe 'node numbers' that have been referred to in network calculations and it should also show invert and cover levels of manholes;
- d) Confirmation of the critical storm duration;
- e) Calculations showing the volume of the attenuation ponds or tanks where on site attenuation is achieved through this method;
- f) Where an outfall discharge control device is to be used such as a hydrobrake or twin orifice, this should be shown on a plan with the rate of discharge stated;
- g) Calculations to demonstrate how the system operates during a 1 in 100 annual probability critical duration storm event, including an allowance for climate change in line with the National Planning Policy Framework Technical Guidance. If overland flooding occurs in this event, a plan should also be submitted detailing the location of overland flow paths and the extent and depth of ponding;
- h) Details showing that Infiltration systems will only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality;
- i) Details confirming that the drainage scheme has been designed for the benefit of Water Voles and other aquatic species; and
- j) Full details of any proposed culverting works.

The drainage scheme shall be carried out in full in accordance with such approved details, and shall be completed prior to the Bridge first being brought into public use and retained on site thereafter in accordance with the scheme.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and to ensure that the drainage and flood risk implications of developments are mitigated in accordance with policies 4/6 and 4/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). Elements of the surface water drainage arrangements may need to be installed in an early part of the construction phase so the scheme must be in place before development starts.

24. Flood Compensation

The flood compensation areas as described in Appendix D of the approved 'Chesterton Foot/Cycle Bridge Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by Atkins, Job No. 5124710, Rev: 3.0, dated: 31/10/2016 (received: 07/11/2016)' and shown on 'Red Line Drawing, prepared by Cambridgeshire Highways, drwg no.: 5040126/HW/LP/001, rev: B, dated: 6/16 (received: 16/06/2016)' shall be completed prior to the Bridge first being brought into public use and retained on site thereafter.

Reason: To prevent flooding elsewhere by ensuring that compensatory storage of flood water is provided in accordance with policy 4/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

25. Drainage Long-term Maintenance Plan

Prior to the installation of the surface water drainage scheme approved in condition 23 above, details for the long term maintenance arrangements for any parts of the surface water drainage system which are not to be adopted (including all Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) features) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority.

The submitted details should identify runoff sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. The plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes.

The maintenance scheme shall be carried out in full in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of unadopted drainage systems in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 103 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy 4/16 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

26. Grassland Translocation

No development shall commence within the area shown as green on plan CCC1, attached to this decision notice, until a Grassland Translocation Survey and Scheme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

- a) detailed botanical surveys;
- b) a detailed scheme for the storage of ballast/soils, vegetation and important plant species; and
- c) a detailed scheme for the reinstatement of quality grassland & ballast to the area shown as green on plan CCC1.

The scheme, once approved in writing by the County Planning Authority, shall be implemented in full and completed prior to the Bridge first being brought into public use, or in the first planting season following the Bridge first being brought into public use.

Reason: To ensure the protection of existing species and the ecological and biodiversity value of the area shown in plan CCC1 in accordance with policies 4/2, 4/3 and 4/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

27. Ecological Design Strategy

No development shall commence until an Ecological Design Strategy (EDS) addressing conservation of biodiversity features of the application site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The EDS shall include the following:

- a) Detailed mitigation and enhancement measures for protected species and other species / habitats of conservation interest (including, but not limited to, water vole, reptiles, bats, breeding fish, aquatic invertebrates and City Wildlife Site habitats);

- b) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed works;
- c) Review of site potential and constraints;
- d) Detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) to achieve stated objectives;
- e) Extent and location/area of proposed works on appropriate scale maps and plans;
- f) Type and source of materials to be used where appropriate, e.g. native species of local provenance;
- g) Timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development;
- h) Persons responsible for implementing the works;
- i) Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance;
- j) Details for monitoring and remedial measures; and
- k) Details for disposal of any wastes arising from works.

The EDS shall be implemented in accordance with such approved details and all features shall be retained in accordance with the details approved thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the protection of existing species and the ecological and biodiversity value of the area in accordance with policies 4/2, 4/3 and 4/8 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The Ecology Design Strategy detail will need to be agreed ahead of the construction phase so the scheme must be in place before development starts.

28. Tree Protection

No development, including the bringing of any equipment, machinery or materials onto the site for the purpose of the development, shall commence until a phased Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP), in accordance with BS5837 2012, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The AMS and TPP shall include:

- a) Consideration of all phases of construction, in a logical sequence, in relation to the potential impact on trees;
- b) Details of the specification and position of protection barriers and ground protection; and
- c) all measures to be taken for the protection of any trees from damage during the course of any activity related to the development, including demolition, foundation design, storage of materials, ground works, installation of services, erection of scaffolding and landscaping.

Prior to the commencement of site clearance a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the site manager, the arboricultural consultant and Local Planning Authority's Tree Officer to discuss details of the approved AMS. This meeting will be to discuss the implementation of the approved AMS. The minutes of this meeting shall be submitted in writing to the County Planning Authority, within 14 days of the meeting.

The development shall be carried out in full in accordance with the approved AMS and TPP throughout the duration of the development. The agreed means of protection shall be retained on site until the development has been completed and all equipment, and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area protected in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, in line with the baseline ground levels agreed under condition 17, nor shall any excavation take place.

Reason: To safeguard existing trees on the site and to ensure that suitable replacement trees and planting are provided to mitigate the impact of the development in accordance with policy 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The detail related to tree protection and an Arboricultural Method Statement will need to be agreed ahead of the construction phase so the scheme must be in place before development starts.

29. Landscape Scheme

No development shall commence until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority.

These details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure or fencing (location, type and detail); hard surfacing materials, proposed and existing functional services above and below ground, e.g. power cables, retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans at an appropriate scale; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); planting details of specific ecological mitigation areas schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate and an implementation programme.

The landscape scheme shall be carried out in full in accordance with such approved details, and completed prior to the Bridge first being brought into public use, or in accordance with the implementation programme agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that suitable hard and soft landscape is provided as part of the development in accordance with policies 3/4 and 3/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The detail related to the landscape scheme will need to be agreed ahead of the construction phase so the scheme must be in place before development starts.

30. Landscape Ecological Management Plan

No development shall commence until a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. It shall include:

- a) A ditch management plan;
- b) Measures to ensure no impact on the River Cam County Wildlife Site (CWS);
- c) A mitigation strategy for Water Vole, including details of translocation exercise;
- d) Mitigation measures for habitat loss within City Wildlife Sites and Stourbridge Common Local Nature Reserve (LNR);
- e) Mitigation measures to control spread of invasive non-native species (inc. Floating Pennywort & Parrot's Feather);
- f) A detailed planting scheme, including species list, for ecological mitigation areas (brook and grassland);
- g) Details of plant establishment for a period of 5 years;
- h) Long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas;

- i) A scheme detailing how the new habitat will be established, managed and maintained for a period of 25 years; and
- j) A scheme for the provision of annual reports, to be submitted to the County Planning Authority, to report on the ongoing habitat management, as agreed in part i) above, for a period of 25 years.

The approved plan shall be implemented in full for a minimum of 25 years from the date that the bridge is first brought into public use.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure that landscaping becomes appropriately established on site in accordance with policies 4/3, 4/4 and 4/7 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006). The detail related to the Landscape Ecological Management Plan will need to be agreed ahead of the construction phase so the scheme must be in place before development starts.

31. 5-Year Landscape Establishment

Any trees or plants provided as part of the landscape scheme as detailed in condition 29 which, within a period of 5 years from the planting date, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species as those originally planted.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and safeguarding trees that are worthy of retention in accordance with policies 4/3 and 4/4 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

32. Transport Monitoring

Prior to the Bridge being first brought into public use, a scheme for the monitoring of the use of the Bridge shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the County Planning Authority. The scheme shall include, but not be limited to:

- a) How the monitoring data will be collected to take account of stakeholders;
- b) The methodology for categorising the data by user type e.g. cyclist, pedestrian, resident; and person type e.g. elderly, wheelchair user, partially sighted, in order to assess how the needs of all user groups are accommodated;
- c) How actions will be agreed as a result of the monitoring e.g. additional signage or changes in dimensions of the segregated sections;
- d) The timescale of the monitoring, which shall be no less than 5 years from the date the Bridge is first brought into public use;
- e) Who will be responsible for undertaking the monitoring and the frequency the results shall be published;
- f) Evidence of early engagement with the Highway Authority to ensure design, monitoring methodology and equipment e.g. automatic permanent counters etc. are compatible.

The approved scheme shall be implemented in full.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and assessing the impact of the bridge on modal shift in accordance with 8/2 of the Cambridge Local Plan (adopted July 2006).

Informatives

Lead Local Flood Authority - Ordinary Watercourse Consent

Constructions or alterations within an ordinary watercourse (temporary or permanent) require consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority under the Land Drainage Act 1991. Ordinary watercourses include every river, drain, stream, ditch, dyke, sewer (other than public sewer) and passage through which water flows that do not form part of Main Rivers (Main Rivers are regulated by the Environment Agency). The applicant should refer to Cambridge County Council's Culvert Policy for further guidance:

http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/info/20099/planning_and_development/49/water_minerals_and_waste/4

Lead Local Flood Authority – Drainage Scheme guidance to meet part a) of condition 23

The cross section on the Drainage Layout currently shows that the bridge will be of a convex shape which suggests that surface water will drain to either side of the bridge. The submitted plans should be in line with the calculations, hence if surface water drains to either side of the bridge then this should be reflected in the submitted calculations to demonstrate that surface water can be managed on site for rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 annual probability rainfall event (including an appropriate allowance for climate change)

Environment Agency

Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Anglian Region byelaws, an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank/foreshore of the River Cam designated a 'main river'.

Public Rights of Way

If any Public Right of Way is required to be temporary closed then the applicant will be required to secure prior arrangement via the County Council's Street Works department. Applications for a 'Temporary Traffic Regulation Order' should be received no later than 12 weeks prior to the proposed closure

National Grid – Intermediate Pressure Gas Pipeline

There is an Intermediate Pressure Gas Pipeline located inside the application area. The development will necessitate crossing the pipeline, therefore National Grid will expect full engagement from the contractor carrying out the construction works to ensure that their work methods statement and risk assessments (RAMS) are agreed by National Grid prior to works commencing. This is to ensure the safety of the pipeline is not at risk from any construction activities.

Network Rail – Asset Protection

Given the location of the proposed development Network Rail require the applicant to liaise with their Asset Protection Team at

AssetProtectionAnglia@networkrail.co.uk and agree to an Asset Protection Agreement prior to the commencement of any works taking place on site.

1. Implementation

This permission comes into effect on the date of this consent, upon which planning permissions F/2019/02/CW and F/2015/05/CW shall cease to have effect.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, to set out the implementation of the consent in a given timescale taking account of the retrospective elements approved.

2. Site Area and conditions related to Unit 2

This set of conditions for Unit 2 shall only relate to the land edged green on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)'.

Reason: To define the site and to define the conditions of this permission to the Unit 2 site.

3. Approved Plans for Unit 2

The development hereby permitted for Unit 2 shall be carried out in accordance with the application form dated 07/04/2016 and the following information and plans (received 08/04/2016, unless otherwise stated):

- Supporting Statement by Peter Humphrey Associates Ltd, rev A, (received 26/04/2016);
- Datashredders Company Fire Policy;
- Fire Prevention Plan by Peter Humphrey Associates Ltd (received 23/01/2017);
- Location Plan, drwg no. 5269/02B, dated March 2015 (received: 06/06/2016);
- Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015 (received 23/01/2017).

Reason: To define the site and protect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

4. Fire Safety

Within three months of the date of this decision notice the fire hydrants shown on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' shall be installed and maintained on site thereafter to the satisfaction of the Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service.

Reason: To ensure that adequate fire safety mitigation measures are in place to reduce the fire risk from the approved uses and reduce the impact on the environment in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011).

5. Construction Materials

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order then in force, the building labelled Unit 2 on plan 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' shall

remain on site constructed in metal cladding Goosewing Grey BS10AOS, and trims and guttering in Mint Green BS14C37, unless prior written agreement of the Waste Planning Authority has been provided.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not adversely affect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policy CS33 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011).

6. Archaeology

This condition relates to land on the Unit 1 part of the site and is therefore not relevant to Unit 2.

7. Hours of Operation

No operations of machinery, including the vehicular delivery and removal of material, shall take place outside the hours of 0730 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays, and 0730 to 1300 on Saturdays. No operations, including the delivery and removal of materials, shall be undertaken on Sundays or Bank and Public Holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of surrounding and local residents in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

8. Environmental Protection

No processing of waste shall be permitted outside of the building labelled Unit 2 on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)'.

Reason: To ensure that noisy activities are confined to the building, to reduce problems of wind blown litter; and to protect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

9. Noise Insulation

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order then in force, the building labelled Unit 2 on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' shall remain on site constructed with 180mm composite insulation board for noise mitigation purposes as approved by the Waste Planning Authority by letter dated 10 November 2003.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the occupiers of nearby properties and avoiding any change to the noise insulation of Unit 2 in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

10. Silencers

All plant and machinery shall operate only in the permitted hours for Unit 2 as set out in condition 7, and shall be silenced at all times and such systems maintained in accordance with the manufacturers' recommendations.

Reason: To minimise disturbance to neighbours and the surrounding area in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals &

Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

11. Reversing Vehicles

All plant at the site shall be fitted with smart or broadband reversing alarms to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: To minimise the adverse effects of noise from the site on the occupiers of nearby properties in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

12. Dust

Dust shall be suppressed at the Unit 2 site in accordance with the details approved by the Waste Planning Authority by letter dated 10 November 2003, including the installation of the water bowser. The suppression equipment shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and available for use at all times.

Reason: In the interest of residential and local amenity in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

13. Lighting

No lighting shall be installed at the site except in accordance with 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)'.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the amenity of nearby residents in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

14. Drainage and Pollution Control

Surface water at the site shall be discharged into the adjoining riparian drain and into March East Internal Drainage Board and not soakaways in accordance with the approval from the Waste Planning Authority dated 30 July 2009.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory drainage of the site, to protect the groundwater and minimise the risk to flooding in accordance with policy CS39 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP14 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

15. Building Ventilation

The building labelled Unit 2 on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' shall be ventilated via the main doors as approved by the Waste Planning Authority by letter dated 10 November 2003.

Reason: To control emissions from the development in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

16. Incineration

No burning of waste shall be undertaken on the Site.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of the area and to avoid a potential fire risk in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

17. Boundary Treatment

- a) Within three months of the date of this decision notice a 2.4 metre high litter-catch fence shall be installed in accordance with 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' around the boundary of the site shown in purple. The fence shall be maintained on site thereafter.
- b) The 2.4 metre palisade fence as shown on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' which borders the site and separates it from Unit 1 shall be retained on site for the duration of the development and maintained to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority.
- c) Within three months of the date of this decision notice the 2.4 metre solid fence shown to the west of the loose material storage area on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' shall be installed on site and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and reduction of wind-blown litter in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014) and to help define the boundary between Units 1 and 2.

18. Landscaping

The landscaping shown on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' shall be maintained on site for the duration of the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

19. Landscaping Implementation

The approved landscaping scheme has been implemented on site for over 5 years and therefore this condition is no longer required.

20. Importation of Waste

This condition relates to land on the Unit 1 part of the site and is therefore not relevant to Unit 2.

21. Onsite Loading-Unloading

The permanent space to be reserved on the Site to be able to:

- enter and leave in forward gear
- park clear of the public highway
- load and unload clear of the public highway

as shown on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' shall be used for no other purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy CS32 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011).

22. Onsite Parking Unit 1

This condition relates to land on the Unit 1 part of the site and is therefore not relevant to Unit 2.

23. Onsite Parking Unit 2

The permanent space to be reserved on the Site for:

- turning
- parking
- loading and unloading

as shown on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' shall be used for no other purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy CS32 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011).

24. Storage of Material outside Unit 2

- a) The waste paper / cardboard material and associated plastic materials permitted to be stored outside of Unit 2 shall only be in bale form in the areas shown as storage areas, referred to as 'Store area for bailed material waiting to be processed' on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)'.
- b) The area shown as 'Processed bail store (waiting collection)' on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)', is the only area outside of Unit 2 that processed material can be stored and the material shall only be in bale form.
- c) The permitted paper / cardboard and associated plastic materials shall be baled in plastic cover at a maximum height of 76 cm per bale. Bales shall only be stored up to a maximum height of 2.3 metres or 3 bales high, whichever is the lower.
- d) Loose paper / cardboard and associated plastic materials shall only be stored in the area referred to as 'Store area for loose material waiting to be processed' on 'Site Plan, drwg no. 5269/01E, dated March 2015, (received: 23/01/2017)' up to a height of 2.3 metres.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to restrict the location of outside storage for fire mitigation and safety reasons in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

25. Litter Management Policy

The 'Litter Management Policy by datashredders dated 09/11/2016 (received 02/12/2016)' shall be adhered to in full and maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted. Records related to this policy shall be provided to the Waste Planning Authority within 10 days of a written request.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

Permitted waste streams for Unit 2

26. Nothing other than waste paper / cardboard and associated plastic materials shall be brought on to the site or treated within Unit 2.

Reason: To enable the Waste Planning Authority to retain control over the waste streams being processed in Unit 2 in line with the tonnages in condition 27 and in accordance with policy CS29; and to minimise the risk of pollution in accordance with policies CS34 and CS39 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policies LP14 and LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

27. Annual Throughput and waste storage limit for Unit 2

The waste throughput for the permitted waste paper / cardboard stream for Unit 2 identified in condition 26 shall not exceed 156,000 tonnes per calendar year (or 3,000 tonnes over any 7-day period). The waste storage limit for the Unit 2 site shall not exceed 15,000 tonnes at any one time. Records showing the waste paper throughput and storage limits for any specified period shall be kept on site and provided to the Waste Planning Authority within 10 days of a written request.

Reason: To enable the Waste Planning Authority to retain control over the future development of Unit 2 in accordance with policy CS29; to ensure that the vehicle movements that have been considered for Unit 2 are controlled to protect highway safety in accordance with policy CS32; and to protect residential amenity by controlling the amount of waste at the site in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011).

28. Waste Catchment Restriction for Unit 2

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Waste Planning Authority, the owner/operator of the development permitted by this planning permission will endeavour to procure not less than 30% of the waste imported to the site from a catchment area which shall comprise a radius of 45 km from the site or within the administrative areas of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough as shown on "Plan CCC1 – Waste Catchment Area of Unit 2". For the purpose of clarity waste being collected from any waste transfer station within the defined catchment area shown on "Plan CCC1 – Waste Catchment Area of Unit 2" shall be regarded as arising from within the catchment area.

Reason: To ensure that the facility is managing a large percentage of local waste arisings, in accordance with Policy CS29 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and that the situation is kept under review to help meet the monitoring requirement of the Plan.

1. Implementation

This permission comes into effect on the date of this consent, upon which planning permissions F/2019/02/CW and F/2015/05/CW shall cease to have effect.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, to set out the implementation of the consent in a given timescale taking account of the retrospective elements approved.

2. Site Area and conditions related to Unit 1

This set of conditions for Unit 1 shall only relate to the land edged green on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013, (received: 02/02/2017)'.

Reason: To define the site and to define the conditions of this permission to the Unit 1 site.

3. Approved Plans

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the application form dated 14/06/2016 and the following information and plans (received 15/06/2016, unless otherwise stated):

- Supporting Statement by Peter Humphrey Associates Ltd;
- RECYplas Fire Policy (received: 19/08/2016);
- Fire Prevention Plan by Peter Humphrey Associates Ltd (received 23/01/2017);
- Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017);
- Existing Layouts, drwg no. 4482/EX01, dated November 2009 (received 02/12/2009) [relating to approved landscaping scheme].

Reason: To define the site and protect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

4. Fire Safety

Within three months of the date of this decision notice the fire hydrants shown on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)' shall be installed and maintained on site thereafter to the satisfaction of the Cambridgeshire Fire & Rescue Service.

Reason: To ensure that adequate fire safety mitigation measures are in place to reduce the fire risk from the approved uses and reduce the impact on the environment in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011).

5. Construction Materials

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order then in force, the building labelled Unit 1 on

'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)' shall remain on site constructed in metal cladding Goosewing Grey BS10AOS, and trims and guttering in Mint Green BS14C37, unless prior written agreement of the Waste Planning Authority has been provided.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not adversely affect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policy CS33 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011).

6. Archaeology

The area shown as 'Grass' on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)' shall remain free from development. It shall also not be disturbed by any heavy machinery or vehicles, development or storage.

Reason: To ensure that the development avoids an area of the site known to contain archaeological remains in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP18 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

7. Hours of Operation for Unit 1

No operations of machinery, including the vehicular delivery and removal of material, shall take place outside the hours of 0730 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays, and 0730 to 1300 on Saturdays. No operations, including the delivery and removal of materials, shall be undertaken on Sundays or Bank and Public Holidays.

Between the hours of 0600 and 0730 and 1800 and 2200 Mondays to Fridays and between 0600 and 0730 on Saturdays, only manual sorting and manual baling of waste plastic material within the confines of building labelled Unit 1 on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)', and the arrival and departure of personal staff vehicles shall be permitted.

Reason: To protect the amenity of surrounding and local residents in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

8. Environmental Protection

No processing of waste shall be permitted outside of the building labelled Unit 1 on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)'.

Reason: To ensure that noisy activities are confined to the building, to reduce problems of wind blown litter; and to protect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

9. Noise Insulation

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order then in force, the building labelled Unit 1 on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013

(received: 02/02/2017)' shall remain on site constructed with 180mm composite insulation board for noise mitigation purposes as approved by the Waste Planning Authority by letter dated 10 November 2003.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the occupiers of nearby properties and avoiding any change to the noise insulation of Unit 1 in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

10. Silencers

All plant and machinery shall operate only in the permitted hours for Unit 1 as set out in condition 7, and shall be silenced at all times and such systems maintained in accordance with the manufacturers' recommendations.

Reason: To minimise disturbance to neighbours and the surrounding area in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

11. Reversing Vehicles

All plant at the site shall be fitted with smart or broadband reversing alarms to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: To minimise the adverse effects of noise from the site on the occupiers of nearby properties in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

12. Dust

Dust shall be suppressed at the Unit 1 site in accordance with the details approved by the Waste Planning Authority by letter dated 10 November 2003, including the installation of the water bowser. The suppression equipment shall be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and available for use at all times.

Reason: In the interest of residential and local amenity in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

13. Lighting

No lighting shall be installed at the site except in accordance with 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)'.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the amenity of nearby residents in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

14. Drainage and Pollution Control

Surface water at the site shall be discharged into the adjoining riparian drain and into March East Internal Drainage Board, and not soakaways in accordance with the approval from the Waste Planning Authority dated 30 July 2009.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory drainage of the site, to protect the groundwater and minimise the risk to flooding in accordance with policy CS39 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP14 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

15. Building Ventilation

The building labelled Unit 1 on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)' shall be ventilated via the main doors as approved by the Waste Planning Authority by letter dated 10 November 2003.

Reason: To control emissions from the development in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

16. Incineration

No burning of waste shall be undertaken on the Site.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of the area and to avoid a potential fire risk in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

17. Boundary Treatment

a) Within three months of the date of this decision notice a 2.4 metre high litter-catch fence shall be installed in accordance with 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)' around the boundary of the site. The litter-catch fence shall be maintained on site thereafter to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority.

b) The 2.4 metre palisade fence as shown on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)' which borders the site and separates it from Unit 2 shall be retained on site for the duration of the development and maintained to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and reduction of wind-blown litter in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014) and to help define the boundary between Units 1 and 2.

18. Landscaping

The landscaping shown on 'Existing Layouts, drwg no. 4482/EX01, dated November 2009 (received 02/12/2009)' approved by letter dated 3 December 2009 shall be maintained on site for the duration of the development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

19. Landscaping Implementation

The approved landscaping scheme has been implemented on site for over 5 years and therefore this condition is no longer required.

20. Importation of Waste

The approved landscaping bunds have been implemented on site for over 5 years and therefore this condition is no longer required.

21. Onsite Loading-Unloading

The permanent space to be reserved on the Site to be able to:

- enter and leave in forward gear
- park clear of the public highway
- load and unload clear of the public highway

as shown on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)' shall be used for no other purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy CS32 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011).

22. Onsite Parking Unit 1

The permanent space to be reserved on the Site for:

- turning
- parking
- loading and unloading

as shown on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)' shall be retained on site and thereafter used for no other purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy CS32 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011).

23. Onsite Parking Unit 2

This condition relates to land on the Unit 2 part of the site and is therefore not relevant to Unit 1.

24. Storage of Material outside Unit 1

- a) The area shown as 'Raw material (Bail form)' on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017), is the only area outside of Unit 1 that raw material can be stored and the material shall only be in bale form.
- b) The permitted raw plastic waste material shall be baled in a plastic cover at a maximum height of 76 cm per bale. Bales shall only be stored up to a maximum height of 2.3 metres or 3 bales high, whichever is the lower.
- c) Wooden pallets shall only be stored in the area referred to as 'Pallet Store' on 'Proposed [Site Plan and Location Plan], drwg no. 4963/01E, dated May 2013 (received: 02/02/2017)' up to a height of 2.3 metres.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to restrict the location of outside storage for fire mitigation and safety reasons in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

25. Litter Management Policy

The 'Litter Management Policy by RECYplas Limited dated 19.01.17 (received: 23/01/2017)' shall be adhered to in full and maintained for the duration of the development hereby permitted. Records related to this policy shall be provided to the Waste Planning Authority within 10 days of a written request.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policy LP16 of Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

Permitted waste streams for Unit 1

26. Nothing other than waste plastics shall be brought on to the site or treated within Unit 1.

Reason: To enable the Waste Planning Authority to retain control over the waste streams being processed in Unit 1 in line with the tonnages in condition 27 and in accordance with policy CS29; and to minimise the risk of pollution in accordance with policies CS34 and CS39 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and policies LP14 and LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (May 2014).

27. Annual Throughput and waste storage limit for Unit 1

The waste throughput for the permitted waste plastic stream for Unit 1 identified in condition 26 shall not exceed the limits as follows:

- 5,200 tonnes per calendar year (or 100 tonnes per week) for heat treatment of relevant plastic wastes;
- 15,600 tonnes per calendar year (or 300 tonnes over any 7-day period) for cleaning, washing, spraying, or coating treatment of relevant plastic wastes;
- 3,000 tonnes indoors over any 7-day period for baling, sorting, or shredding of relevant plastic wastes.

The waste storage limit for the Unit 1 site shall not exceed 500 tonnes over a 12-month period. Records showing waste plastic throughput and storage limits for any specified period shall be kept on site and provided to the Waste Planning Authority within 10 days of a written request.

Reason: To enable the Waste Planning Authority to retain control over the future development of Unit 1 in accordance with policy CS29; to ensure that the vehicle movements that have been considered for Unit 1 are controlled to protect highway safety in accordance with policy CS32; and to protect residential amenity by controlling the amount of waste at the site in accordance with policy CS34 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011).

28. Waste Catchment Restriction for Unit 1

Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Waste Planning Authority, the owner/operator of the development permitted by this planning permission will endeavour to procure not less than 30% of the waste imported to the site from a catchment area which shall comprise a radius of 45 km from the site or within the administrative areas of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough as shown on "Plan CCC1 – Waste Catchment Area of Unit 1". For the purpose of clarity waste being collected from any waste transfer station within the defined catchment area shown

on “Plan CCC1 – Waste Catchment Area of Unit 1” shall be regarded as arising from within the catchment area.

Reason: To ensure that the facility is managing a large percentage of local waste arisings, in accordance with Policy CS29 of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (July 2011) and that the situation is kept under review to help meet the monitoring requirement of the Plan.