

**PLANNING COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

Date: Monday 17<sup>th</sup> September 2018

Time: 10.00am – 5:02pm

Place: Council Chamber, Shire Hall, Cambridge

Present: Councillors A Bradnam, D Connor, I Gardener, L Harford, P Hudson, B Hunt, S Kindersley, and J Whitehead.

Also present: Councillor Ian Bates

Officers: David Atkinson – Development Management Officer (Strategic and Specialist Applications), Hannah Edwards – LGSS Law, Emma Fitch – Business Manager County Planning Minerals and Waste, Daniel Snowdon – Democratic Services Officer.

Specialists present: Nick Atkins (Environmental Health Officer, South Cambridgeshire District Council), Toby Lewis (Noise consultant for the County Council), Andrew Winter (South Cambridgeshire District Council planner), Penny Wilson (Air Quality consultant for the County Council), Graham Farrier (Landscape consultant for the County Council), Jon Finney (Highway Authority), Tam Parry (Transport Assessment Team for the County Council), Quinton Carroll (Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team), Liz Robin (Director of Cambridgeshire County Council Public Health), and Stuart Keeble (Cambridgeshire County Council Public Health)

**56. APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no apologies for absence.

Councillor Bradnam declared a non-statutory interest regarding the planning application being considered by the Committee. Councillor Bradnam advised that she was the County Councillor for the Waterbeach division, District Councillor for Milton and Waterbeach ward and a member of Milton Parish Council. Councillor Bradnam informed the Committee that since her election as a County Councillor, she had been a member of the Amey Liaison Forum, Chair of the South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) Waterbeach New Town Community Forum and a member of the Board of Trustees to the Waterbeach Internal Drainage Board, although as a new member has not yet sat on a meeting.

Councillor Bradnam advised that she was SCDC's nominated representative to the Board of Trustees of Denny Abbey and the Farmland Museum. The position was that of an observer and Councillor Bradnam had no voting rights.

Councillor Bradnam informed the Committee that as Local Member, she had assisted Waterbeach, Landbeach and Milton Parish Councils together with local residents in their consideration of the planning application. The assistance provided solely related to directing residents to Council Officers for information and at no time had Councillor Bradnam expressed personal opinions regarding the planning application and had

disassociated herself from the views expressed by her political party. Councillor Bradnam assured the Committee that she had carefully not expressed any personal opinions about the merits or otherwise of the application and viewed the application with an open mind.

Councillor Harford declared a non-statutory interest as a member of Sustainable Cottenham and informed the Committee that she had not spoken to any members of the group regarding the planning application.

In response to a Member question the Council's Legal Officer confirmed that advice from the Monitoring Officer had been sought regarding Councillor Bradnam's declaration of interest and she was satisfied that she could sit on the Committee.

**57. APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF A WASTE RECOVERY FACILITY (WATERBEACH WASTE RECOVERY FACILITY – WWRF) AT LEVITT'S FIELD, WATERBEACH WASTE MANAGEMENT PARK (WWMP), ELY ROAD, CAMBRIDGE COMPRISING THE ERECTION AND OPERATION OF AN ENERGY FROM WASTE FACILITY TO TREAT UP TO 250,000 TONNES OF RESIDUAL WASTE PER ANNUM, AIR COOLED CONDENSERS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE: INCLUDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTERNAL ACCESS ROAD; OFFICE/WELFARE ACCOMMODATION; WORKSHOP; CAR, CYCLE AND COACH PARKING; PERIMETER FENCING; ELECTRICITY SUB-STATIONS; WEIGHBRIDGES; WEIGHBRIDGE OFFICE; WATER TANK; SILOS; LIGHTING; HEAT OFF-TAKE PIPE; SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM; HARDSTANDING; EARTHWORKS; LANDSCAPING; AND BRIDGE CROSSINGS.**

**AT: LEVITT'S FIELD, WATERBEACH WASTE MANAGEMENT PARK, ELY ROAD, WATERBEACH, CAMBRIDGE, CB25 9PQ**

**APPLICANT: AMEYCESPA (EAST) LIMITED**

**APPLICATION NO: S/3372/17/CW**

The Chairman welcomed members of the public to the Committee and proposed that due to the number of people that had registered to speak on the application, normal speaking rights would be waived. All registered speakers would have 3 minutes in which to address the Committee, including Public Bodies. The applicant would be afforded the total amount of time allocated to the objectors in which to make their presentation. The proposal was seconded by the Vice-Chairman and agreed with the unanimous agreement of the Committee.

The Chairman informed the Committee that following a number of late representations received a Committee Report Update Sheet had been prepared by officers that addressed the points raised. Owing to the finalisation of the report after close of business on Friday, 14<sup>th</sup> September, the Chairman adjourned the meeting for 45 minutes in order for Members to consider the additional information, and requested everyone to return by 11:00am.

Meeting adjourned at 10:12am

Meeting reconvened 11:03am

Following the adjournment, the Chairman welcomed Members and the public back to the meeting and thanked them for their patience while the Committee was adjourned.

The Council's Legal Officer confirmed with Members that they had read the additional information provided that had not been included within the original report i.e. the 15 page Committee Report Update Sheet and the new information in Appendix 3 (the additional TLP report review of the CBWIN Landscape Report), Appendix 4 (the late representation from UKWIN) and Appendix 5 (the late representation from Lucy Frazer QC MP) – Members confirmed they had.

The Development Management Officer (Strategic and Specialist Applications) introduced himself and presented the application and began by confirming the planning application was for the erection and operation of an energy from waste facility and associated infrastructure that would treat up to 250,000 tonnes of residual waste per annum, which included reading out the full application description.

The presenting officer identified the location of the application site and the extent of land that formed the boundary of the planning application through presentation of maps and location plans, highlighting its relation to nearby settlements and transport infrastructure.

Attention was drawn to the site access from the A10 and routing arrangements for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) on the site, existing structures at the site and the location of the proposed buildings. Members noted the corridor of land from the site and along the A10 down to the roundabout near the research park that would be utilised for the heat uptake pipe.

The presenting officer highlighted the area of wetland reed bed, waste reception hall and the main structures of the proposed facility including the chimney stack location near Beach Ditch. Members noted that there were two proposed road crossings over Beach Ditch and the proposed site layout which would allow the HCV traffic to be separated from staff and visitor access.

Members noted the extent of the waste management park through aerial photographs that illustrated the main operational areas and existing structures of the site, including references to the type of recycling and treatment operations already in place, alongside the landfill which operated as the final disposal point for residual waste from the waste treatment processes.

Elevation drawings of the proposed facility were presented to the Committee, with attention drawn to the height and width of the structures including the 80m high chimney stack. Members were informed that some of the internal arrangements for the building were sunk below ground level in order that the facility be as low as possible and reduce the visual impact. The side of the building that faced the A10 was 11m tall at the start and rose to a maximum of 41m over the course of the roof profile.

Visualisations of the site were presented to the Committee and the main elements of the structure were highlighted, including reference to rapid closing doors on the waste reception hall. Members noted that the facility was no closer to the A10 than the current Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) plant. Further images that illustrated staff and visitor parking and the internal haulage road alongside the landfill site were shown along with a surface water drainage map, highlighting the alignment of Beach Ditch.

Members noted that in bringing forward the design, the applicant had taken account of the Council's design guide for waste management facilities supplementary planning guidance published in 2011, and officers were content that the design was appropriate for its setting within Waterbeach Waste Management Park, when taking account of its function.

The presenting officer informed Members that the proposed facility had been developed in response to the Government 'waste hierarchy' which was presented to the Committee. The hierarchy illustrated how waste should be handled, prioritising prevention, re-use of waste, recycling and other recovery and to consider disposal as a last option. The proposed development would move waste material up the waste hierarchy to the 'other recovery' category away from landfill.

The proposed energy from waste facility would, Members noted, result in benefits from the production of electricity and heat. The location of the likely underground connection to the National Grid was highlighted showing an approximate route to the Arbury substation along the Mere Way – although it was noted that this sat outside the remit of the planning application as it would be dealt with using permitted development rights. There was also a possibility that electricity could be used before reaching the grid e.g. at the potential Waterbeach Barracks development.

The planning application was to be determined through the process of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The process involved consultation with statutory and non-statutory bodies, interested parties and the general public. Responses to the two rounds of consultation carried out consultations were summarised in Section 5 of the officer's report. Members further noted that planning officers considered the land use planning aspects of the application and their views, findings and recommendation was also presented in the Committee Report.

Members were informed that following registration, the receipt of the applicant's Environmental Statement was notified in writing to the Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government. The Secretary of State subsequently asked to be made aware of the date of the Committee meeting and be provided with a copy of the Committee Report.

A copy of the Committee Report was sent to the Secretary of State, and he was aware of the officer recommendation. The Secretary of State responded and sought agreement of the Council that, in the event that the Planning Committee were minded to approve the planning application, then the decision notice would not be issued until such time as the Secretary of State had decided whether or not to call in the application for his own determination. Members noted that the Secretary of State intended to contact the Council to ascertain the planning committee's decision.

The presenting officer informed the Committee that national planning guidance required the starting point for decision making is the minerals and waste plan for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and that the site was allocated for the purpose intended within the current, up to date Development Plan. Waste would primarily be sourced from existing processes that took place at the Waste Management Park totalling 184,000 tonnes. In order for the proposed facility to operate at full capacity, a further 66,000 tonnes would be required to be provided through importation of waste to the site by road. Attention was drawn to the Cambridgeshire growth agenda which projections indicated that 90,000 tonnes of waste would be produced by the new residential developments and therefore could meet the current shortfall of local waste to be used in the proposed development. It was acknowledged however, that the new housing developments were phased over the coming 10 years.

The presenting officer informed the Committee of the representations received regarding the planning application from statutory consultees.

South Cambridgeshire District Council and East Cambridgeshire District Council had registered objections to the application due to the impact on Denny Abbey and the A10

and how any development may affect the upgrading of the A10. It was also acknowledged that South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Committee Members considered the development would result in 'substantial harm' to the setting of Denny Abbey which was contrary to Historic England's view.

The Environment Agency would be responsible for the environmental permitting of the site and supported the application in principle because of the proposed move away from landfill and the energy recovery elements to the application. The Environment Agency also supported the development of a visitor centre and educational facility.

Public Health England had no significant concerns regarding the impact of emissions from the facility on public health, providing the facility was operated in accordance with relevant technical guidance, industry best practise and takes all appropriate measures to prevent or control pollution. They would be an important consultee in the waste permitting regime.

The Highway Authority had raised no objections subject to the imposition of certain safeguarding conditions. The policy team confirmed that there were no implications from the proposed development to the high level study on the A10 at this stage and no comments had been received from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority regarding the matter.

Historic England raised objection to the development on the grounds that it would harm the setting and therefore the significance of the designated heritage assets at Denny Abbey. They confirmed that the level of harm would be "less than substantial" in national planning policy terms. If the development did not provide any wider public benefits that would outweigh the harm then planning permission should be refused. The presenting officer drew attention to the full text of the representation set out in the officer report (Appendix 1).

Owners of Denny Abbey, English Heritage Trust, had also been consulted Members noted. English Heritage fully endorsed the objections raised by Historic England. They were concerned that harm to the setting and significance of the Denny Abbey monument would have a negative impact on the visitor experience at Denny Abbey/Farmland Museum and its future viability and sustainability.

The Campaign to Protect Rural England objected to the proposed development on the grounds of the adverse visual impact on landscape character (both during daylight and night time) and the adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets at Denny Abbey.

Natural England raised no objection as the proposed development would not have significant adverse impacts on the integrity of the Fenland Special Area of Conservation including Wicken Fen Site of Special Scientific Interest and Ramsar site.

The Wildlife Trust for Cambridgeshire advised that whilst the proposed development was not likely to have significant impacts on statutory nature conservation there would be a direct impact on Beach Ditch and Engine Drain County Wildlife Site due to bridge works. Works should therefore be secured by condition to provide potential enhancements to this county wildlife site.

Cambridge Airport advised that they had no objections and that it would not be necessary to fit red obstruction warning lights for aircraft to the completed development.

The Fire Service advised that in principle the provision for emergency water supplies at the site was adequate.

The Old West Internal Drainage Board whom administered Beach Ditch raised no objections to the planning application.

Attention was drawn to the summary of views of the respective Parish Councils set out in paragraphs 5.53 - 5.70 & 5.72 of the Officer report. Six local Parish Councils had made representations on the proposed development and the presenting officer summarised their concerns, which covered a range of issues including:

- adverse impact on air quality in the event of failure due to poor monitoring and unclear responsibility;
- adverse visual impact, by day and night, of such a large plant on the character of the fen edge landscape and also the adverse impact on the setting of Denny Abbey;
- the benefits offered by the proposal did not outweigh the significant and ongoing visual harm its presence in the landscape and operational impacts would cause;
- additional HGV movements associated with the development would adversely impact on the flow of traffic along the A10 which was severely congested for long periods of the day;
- adverse impact on landscape character and heritage sites (Ely Cathedral and Denny Abbey);
- concerns regarding potential health impacts on existing residents and those that would move to Waterbeach New Town;
- noise and light emissions;
- concern over the potential requirement to import waste from outside the local area adding to traffic congestion and pollution;
- no construction should take place until the improvements to the A10 had been implemented;
- reliance on the stringent environmental monitoring to which the facility would be subject;
- concerns regarding pollutants which could impact on local wildlife sites;
- expect a “safety first” approach to be adopted in relation to health impacts of pollution from particulates;
- if planning permission is granted then planning conditions should require the establishment of air quality monitoring stations with the data published;
- a planning condition should be implemented restricting HCV movements on the A10 to off peak periods;
- the establishment of such a large intrusive building and chimney stack on flat terrain would have a detrimental effect on the landscape over a substantial area, being out of keeping with a rural setting; and

- potential significant health risks due to diminished air quality, in particular the impact of fine particulates.

The presenting officer drew attention to paragraph 5.71 of the officer report in which the Rt Hon Heidi Allen MP made a representation on behalf of her constituents. In summarising the contents of the objection the presenting officer informed the committee that whilst recognising the efforts that had been made by the applicant and independent consultants to try to allay local fears regarding the effect of the facility on human health, because of the questions still arising out of the impacts on human health (re monitoring of particulates) and the possibility of a waste incineration tax impacting on the viability of the facility, Ms Allen raised her objection to the proposals.

In addition to the many individual representations that had been received, a petition signed by 2230 signatories objecting to the development had been submitted by CBWIN. Attention was also drawn to two letters of support of the application that had been received.

The presenting officer summarised the main grounds of objection raised in local representations that encompassed:

- The health risks associated with a reduction in air quality, particularly smog from the burning of waste; the release of more harmful emissions during start up and close down of the facility; release of toxic fumes, dioxins and carcinogens, fine particulate matter and potential ingestion via crops
- The proposed facility was not the right waste management solution and was far too large
- The location was inappropriate for a plant of its nature as it was too close to existing and proposed homes and schools
- The increase in noise emissions
- The adverse visual impact of the proposed buildings and exhaust stack on Ely Cathedral and American Cemetery at Madingley
- The adverse impact on the setting of Denny Abbey heritage site and its viability
- The increase in traffic on the A10 and A14, both during construction and operation with importation of waste. Concern was also expressed regarding road safety and reductions in air quality
- The adverse impact on plants, wildlife and nature conservation sites from emissions
- The proposed facility would discourage recycling
- The risk of pollution to groundwater
- The risk of pollution to Beach Ditch
- The risk of soil contamination from emissions

- Concern regarding operator performance at the Waste Management Park.
- The flawed electricity calculations and carbon assessment
- The current Waste Plan being out of date
- Proposed landscape mitigation inadequate
- Concerns regarding the passage of lorries through local villages

A summary of all the issues raised in local representations received, Members noted were set out in paragraphs 6.2 to 6.6 of the officer report. Maps were also displayed which showed the geographical distribution of comments received during the first round of public consultation, before showing rounds 1 and 2 cumulatively.

The presenting officer informed Members that the planning application was technically complex. Planning policy supported waste moving up the waste hierarchy and currently residual waste was sent to landfill. The planned capacity of the facility was 250,000 tonnes and the growth agenda in Cambridgeshire suggested that the requirement for the importation of waste would diminish over time as new housing developments in Cambridgeshire were built. The ability to move waste up the hierarchy, generate electricity and therefore husband the landfill resource for the future was also acknowledged. The presenting officer also noted that the Development Plan has an approach to the proximity principle by seeking catchment restrictions and the officer report sets out how officers have addressed this. Furthermore, this is an allocated site for an energy from waste use that would complement the recycling activities already on the Waterbeach Waste Management Park. As such, it would not conflict with the Development Plan on demonstrated need.

Attention was drawn to paragraphs 8.1 – 8.36 of the officer report and the transport studies undertaken by the applicant. There was no evidence to suggest that there would be a significant impact on the highway and a condition regarding construction traffic had been included. A staff travel plan would also be required. Furthermore, there was no evidence to suggest that the use of the land would prejudice future development of the A10. As such, the presenting officer confirmed that the proposed development was not in conflict with the Development Plan in relation to transport matters.

The presenting officer addressed the visual impact of the proposed development and confirmed that a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) had been undertaken and that the Council had sought independent advice from The Landscape Partnership in respect of this. Details of the landscape character associated with the Fen Edge was also explained by the presenting officer, as it was noted that the land in question fell within a transition area between National Character Area 88 Bedfordshire and Cambridge Claylands and National Character Area 46 The Fens. Visualisations showing photomontages of the development were presented to the Committee with various views of the site from different locations, including Denny Abbey. Visual screening provided by the planting of trees would take time to establish and projections of what the site would look like over the course of 15 years were shown for illustrative purposes. Members acknowledged that the views from Denny Abbey were familiar from a recent site visit where the visualisations had been examined for accuracy.

The presenting officer noted that at the western side of the facility the completion of the landfill operation would result in a domed landfill that would be planted with a hedge at the top, providing some visual attenuation for views from Twentypence Road in Cottenham.



A wide vista from Aldreth was presented to Members, from which, when particular weather conditions occurred, the plume from the chimney stack may become visible and draw the eye to the stack.

Photographs of the current lighting arrangements on the A10 and Research Park together with the Waste Management Park were shown together with visualisations of the proposed lighting scheme for the development which would be low level. The presenting officer reminded Members that there was no requirement for a red warning beacon to be fitted to the chimney stack for aircraft movements.

Officers noted that the local landscape had seen change in the past with existing developments at the Waterbeach Waste Management Park and the Cambridge Research Park, and there was significant change planned for the future with the Waterbeach New Town development. Officers agreed with the judgements made by The Landscape Partnership (in line with the assessments provided by both the applicant and the one provided on behalf of CBWIN) that there would be significant adverse effects on landscape character and views. Attention was drawn to the submission from CBWIN regarding landscape and the presenting officer commented that differences in judgements could be expected due to the subjective nature of the assessments made. Furthermore, the presenting officer made reference to the additional report provided by The Landscape Partnership that was requested to consider the three professional assessments (their own, the applicant's, and the one submitted on behalf of CBWIN) to identify any differences between them, in order to be able to inform Members of where the professionals agreed and where differences existed what this meant.

Paragraphs 8.14 and 8.200 of the officer report considered the impact on heritage assets and it was accepted that the application would have an adverse impact upon them. On-site archaeological interest could be dealt with by planning condition. The proposed facility was a short distance from Denny Abbey which was a scheduled monument and a map showing the location and type of heritage assets in close proximity were also shown to Members to identify their relationship with the proposed development. Officers also noted that the development was within the setting of the Denny Abbey Complex (which included the Denny Abbey Scheduled Monument, the Grade II listed gate piers at the entrance off the A10 (the closest listed structure to the site); the Grade I listed Denny Abbey including the remains of the 12th Century Benedictine abbey church; the Grade I listed 14th Century Franciscan nunnery (refectory); and the Grade II listed 17th Century barn to the north of Denny Abbey (The Farmland Museum stone building)), before setting out the role of Historic England as the Government's statutory heritage advisor and noting that their views should be afforded significant weight. A summary of Historic England's main objections were covered by the presenting officer.

Paragraphs 8.201 to 8.212 of the officer report considered the impact on ecology and the presenting officer referenced Beach Ditch and Engine Drain County Wildlife Site which would be subject to bridge works on the proposed site. Reference was made to consultation responses from Natural England, the Council's ecologist and the Wildlife Trust, and in connection with Wicken Fen, specific reference to the comments made by Natural England were covered by the presenting officer.

[Note there was a short stop at this point at 12:04 by the presenting officer to allow a member of the public to leave to attend an appointment].

A diagram that set out the industrial energy from waste process at the proposed facility was presented to the Committee. The presenting officer explained that due to the velocity that treated emissions would be expelled from the chimney stack, the effective height of the chimney stack would be somewhat higher thus aiding dilution in air and dispersion

over a large area. Within the volume of product gas expelled from the chimney stack only a very small percentage required scrutiny and detailed consideration of impacts would be considered through the determination of the environmental permit application. Members were reminded of national planning policy that required no duplication of controls regarding emissions to air, their impact on the environment and monitoring. South Cambridgeshire District Council's Environmental Health Officer had suggested that monitoring and emissions data be publically available and the presenting officer confirmed that planning conditions had been included to ensure such data was published from treated exhaust gas monitoring.

Members were advised that noise emissions from the proposed development could be controlled by planning condition in the interests of residential amenity and that the site was not at risk of flooding and surface water drainage details could also be secured by planning condition. Cumulative impacts with other developments in the area, including the mineral extraction proposed at Mitchell Hill and development at Waterbeach Barracks, were also discussed by the presenting officer, which included assessments for traffic, air quality, landscape and noise.

In conclusion the presenting officer drew attention to the public benefits that officers had identified in paragraphs 8.293 to 8.309 of the officer report that should be given significant weight when determining the application. The public benefits encompassed, the use of an allocated site within the waste development plan for an identified waste management use, recognising that policy at national and international level aimed to move waste up the waste hierarchy and away from landfill, the facilities at the Waste Management Park were unique and well located in terms of growth and ease of access to major routes such as the A10 and A14. The co-location with the Waste Management Park would reduce the demand for landfill and produce heat and electricity for use off-site. There were carbon benefits when compared with disposal by landfill, that would be more dependable than wind and solar and would offer diversity to the alternatives for fossil fuels, with a really good opportunity to deliver both electricity and heat in support of new growth in the area. There were also significant socio-economic benefits that would arise from the proposed facility and increased biodiversity with the new wetlands.

The public benefits should be set carefully against the acknowledged harm on the visual amenity of the Denny Abbey heritage asset and the local landscape character, both of which had been accorded significant weight by officers in the report.

Having taken into account all relevant legislation, planning policy and consultation responses, officers considered there was justification to support the development of an energy from waste facility at the proposed site. Consequently the officer recommendation was for the approval of the planning application subject to the completion the Section 106 agreement and the planning conditions set out in the officer report.

Before officers took questions from Members on the committee presentation, the Council's Legal Officer clarified with Members that they needed to apply the heritage test in relation to harm to heritage assets in paragraph 196 of the NPPF (with the full text read out), which had been clearly set out in the officer report under paragraph 8.294 on page 149 and this needed to be noted.

In response to Member Questions officers:

- Confirmed that the proposal did not include landscape mitigation in the form of a living wall to the building structure adjacent to the A10. There was visual screening proposed within the application along the side of the waste reception building;

- Confirmed that the application did not include proposals for a planted roof for the building;
- Explained that following input from the Landscape Partnership there were options available with regard to choice of materials and colours used in construction and that a further opportunity for influencing this had been secured through a planning condition;
- Explained that the design of the plant was such that there should not be litter around the site, therefore a daily litter pick would not be required. Members were informed that litter pickers were employed by the operator at the Waste Management Park. The Council's Legal Officer reminded Members that the performance of the operator at the site was not a material planning consideration;
- Advised that whilst it was possible to plant larger trees as part of the visual mitigation for the site, the advice received from The Landscape Partnership recommended planting younger trees rather than mature trees as they were less likely to fail. The spacing of the trees and the species selected was of greater importance than the size of tree planted when creating visual screening;
- Confirmed that the species of trees planted as part of the visual mitigation was to be determined as part of a hard and soft landscaping scheme and was secured by planning condition;
- Explained that paragraph 6.3 of the officer report related to letters in support of the application that had been received and made reference to traffic on the A10 increasing if planning permission was refused once the landfill site was full, resulting in residual waste being transported elsewhere for disposal;
- Explained that the carbon report had been updated accounting for concerns raised by UK Without Incineration (UKWIN). Members noted that the assessment was based on a worst-case scenario and did not account for heat produced by the incinerator or additional carbon benefits;
- Clarified the arrangements that underpinned the proximity principle of waste management. Officers explained that there was a duty for Councils to co-operate at a national and regional level regarding waste management. Members noted that the principle was based on waste type and not location of the nearest disposal facility. Officers worked closely with colleagues from neighbouring counties to maximise net self-sufficiency;
- Confirmed that the forecast housing growth rate for Cambridgeshire would reduce the requirement for the importation of waste from other areas over time. The data included within the report did not account for a number of the windfall sites that had come forward due to the absence of South Cambridgeshire District Council's 5 year land supply and adopted Local Plan, with a further 500 homes included by the Inspector ahead of adoption; and
- In relation to references to EfW facilities in adjoining counties such as Bedfordshire and Essex and the impact this may have on the capacity of the facility and the viability of the proposals if these came on line, officers confirmed that national

guidance was clear that only existing capacity can be included in the assessment of need. Furthermore, as the majority of the waste proposed for the facility was already on the site, and taking account of the growth agenda in the area, this was unlikely to be a major problem. However, the question of viability and the company's business case in such an event was for the applicant to address rather than officers.

At the conclusion of Member questions the Chairman adjourned the meeting for lunch.

Meeting adjourned at 12:51pm

Meeting reconvened at 1:35pm

The Chairman invited the public bodies that had registered to speak on the planning application to address the Committee.

Speaking in objection to the application, Councillor Barbara Bull, Chairwoman of Waterbeach Parish Council addressed the Committee. In making her representation, Councillor Bull expressed concerns regarding the robustness of the data that underpinned the application. Data regarding noise had been underestimated and it therefore affected confidence in the other data. Councillor Bull highlighted the environmental impacts of the facility and highlighted the proximity of proposed nearby developments, acknowledging that the monitoring of emissions from the site would be undertaken by the Environment Agency. The visual impact and scale of the proposed facility was at odds with the surroundings and landscape, referencing the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy that sought to safeguard and enhance the landscape. The noise and light pollution that would be generated by the facility was also contrary to the aims of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS2.

Councillor Christine Ward, Cottenham Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. Councillor Ward emphasised the negative impacts upon the local environment, the visual impact of the site and the location of the chimney stack relative to Denny Abbey. Councillor Ward expressed concern regarding the volumes of traffic that would be generated as a result of the application with large amounts of waste being imported to the site and the routing arrangements for HGVs if the A10 was busy or blocked. Councillor Ward did not consider that there had been sufficient evidence presented to suggest there would be no negative health impacts arising from the facility. Local residents frequently experienced odour from the site and expressed concern that residents would be exposed to airborne pollutants that were odourless. Councillor Ward requested that if permission was granted consideration be given to four conditions: (1) limiting the volume of waste imported from outside of Cambridgeshire to 30%; (2) providing real time monitoring information of emissions; (3) routing and timing agreements enforced, particularly for Cottenham; and (4) that the liaison group at the site be strengthened and include external bodies.

A Member drew attention to the routing arrangements for HGVs set out within the draft conditions of the planning permission. A Member clarified the Parish Council's concern regarding the routing of HGVs exiting from the rear of the site onto a single track road. Councillor Ward confirmed it was a concern along with the routes HGVs would take if diverted due to congestion or accidents.

Councillor Margaret Starkie, speaking on behalf of Horningsea Parish Council in objection to the application addressed the Committee. The Parish Council discussed the application at its meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2018. The Parish Council agreed in principle with Energy from Waste however, objected to the application on the grounds of its

location and the height of the chimney stack. Councillor Starkie expressed concern regarding the traffic impact on the A10 and the re-routing of traffic along the B1047 through Horningsea when there were incidents on the A10. Councillor Starkie acknowledged the principles of the waste hierarchy and emphasised the importance of developing and using environmentally friendly packaging. The Parish Council appreciated that facilities of the one proposed were most effective when located close to the properties they supply with power, however the location was concerning due to its proximity to nearby schools. It was highlighted that the proposed buildings and chimney stack would be in stark contrast to the landscape, a view endorsed by the Cambridge Without Incineration (CBWIN) group and their landscape review, and suggested the repositioning of the facility. Councillor Starkie concluded by suggesting the application should be deferred pending the conclusion of the Cambridge to Ely Transport Study and the resultant recommended changes to the A10.

In response to a Member question, Councillor Starkie explained further the impacts of diverted traffic from the A10.

Speaking in objection to the application, Councillor Melanie Hale, Chair of Landbeach Parish Council addressed the Committee. Councillor Hale relayed the Parish Council's objection to the application on the grounds of its visual impact on the surrounding landscape. She expressed concern regarding the monitoring of the site and expressed no confidence in the current operator to manage the site safely. In the event of a catastrophic failure at the site particulates would be expelled across a vast area. Councillor Hale questioned the tonnage of waste that would be imported to the site and the routing arrangements of HGVs to and from the site. In conclusion, Councillor Hale emphasised the importance of recycling, stating that it should be the first priority rather than incineration, and questioned whether the plant was needed, also noting the likely incineration tax. Furthermore, Councillor Hale stated that it shouldn't be determined until the A10 was upgraded, and questioned whether it was appropriate for the County Council to make the decision given their Waste PFI contract.

A Member confirmed with Councillor Hale the impact of traffic on the area when there were issues on the A10.

Speaking in support of the application Rob Edmondson, Managing Director of Amey thanked the Committee and Chairman for their time and the officers for the work that had been undertaken regarding the planning application to reach their recommendation. He was grateful to officers for the work done and diligence given to the planning application. Mr Edmondson drew attention to the current operation at the site including the number of people employed, the tonnage of waste received, the education services provided by Amey and the amount of power that would be produced by the proposed facility, that he noted would be capable of providing electricity for all the homes in South Cambridgeshire.

Disposal of waste through landfill was unsustainable. The site would fill up and an alternative method of disposal would have to be found. The projected growth for housing in Cambridgeshire and the additional waste that growth would generate was taken into account for the development. Attention was also drawn to the fact that this was proven technology that was safe.

Mr David Adams of Axis on behalf of the applicant explained to Members that the application was for the right solution at the right site at the right time. The site was allocated for energy from waste. A Planning Inspector had looked into all aspects of the site and its surroundings and concluded that the site was appropriate for the use proposed. The planning application accorded with the policies of the development plan

when taken as a whole. Reference was made to over 450,000 tonnes of waste in Cambridgeshire that was suitable to go to an energy from waste facility instead of landfill, which increased to over 2 million tonnes in the surrounding counties; all of which was evidenced in the Environment Agency's Waste Interrogator. Mr Adams outlined the benefits of the proposed facility including the reduction in waste that would be sent to landfill and the production of energy. Government policy was clear to encourage a move away from fossil fuels and the proposed facility provided an opportunity for cost effective energy production. Mr Adams emphasised that the benefits of the energy from waste facility were clear and should therefore be provided significant weight in accordance with case law and statute when determining the application.

Mr Andy Russell of Axis on behalf of the applicant addressed the environmental issues that surrounded the planning application and referenced the scope of the Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement agreed with the Council in consultation with Historic England, Natural England, and the Highway Authority etc. Mr Russell drew attention to the fact that this early scoping exercise was in addition to the consultation process that had been undertaken during the planning application process. All consultants for the Council and consultees had responded commenting that there were no significant environmental impacts arising from the proposed facility and therefore no significant reasons for refusal. However, he acknowledged that there were significant challenges for the site regarding landscaping and the impact on heritage assets that the applicant had spent considerable time trying to address through the design of the facility. The applicant, members were informed, had a good relationship with heritage stakeholders, and a lot of work had gone into engaging with them early on in the process. A mitigation strategy through a Section 106 agreement was being finalised that would develop a long term sustainable tourist attraction. Mr Russell identified other clear benefits that included employment, investment, ecology and education, alongside waste being used as a resource, rather than sent to landfill, which would provide an opportunity of electricity for up to 63,000 homes that would help meet the UK energy challenges.

Mr Edmondson summarised the benefits of the scheme by making reference to the alignment to national policy, the waste hierarchy, climate change impacts and reducing carbon emissions, which were highlighted to Members, together with the benefits of the existing site in terms of infrastructure. There would be 200 short-term jobs created during the construction phase of the development with 35 long term jobs once the facility was fully operational. The company had worked hard to minimise the impacts in line with the concerns raised, and would support the officer recommendation to approve the development.

In response to Member questions, representatives of the applicant:

- Confirmed that it was expected that the landfill would reach capacity within 10-15 years based on current rates of input;
- Explained that currently some waste material was exported from the site to energy from waste facilities elsewhere in the country;
- Confirmed the component elements of the Section 106 agreement, including a conservation management plan, a landscape strategy and planting fund, a development strategy, an interpretation strategy and the provision of an alternative access road with car parking. The key elements had been agreed with English Heritage, Historic England, The Farmland Museum and the land owner;

- Explained that a seeded roof for the waste reception hall was considered but decided against due to the contrast that would arise against the sky and would increase the height of the building. Furthermore it was confirmed that there wasn't a living wall. Members noted that the precise colour scheme and materials to be used was to be determined (secured by condition) and representatives of the applicant noted Members concern;
- Assured Members that consideration had been given to the impact upon immediate neighbours, however no offer of compensation had been made. Further noise attenuation had been implemented including additional planting. The Council's Legal Officer reminded Members that loss of land value and compensation were not material planning considerations;
- Advised that an operations team at Waterbeach undertook regular litter collections and catch fencing had been installed to collect litter and prevent it being blown far from the site;
- Explained that the UKWIN carbon assessment was not consistent with how assessments had been undertaken over the last 5 years because the calculation of the benefits are complex and how carbon was stored in landfill was complex. The applicant was confident that the presented benefit of 38,000 tonnes per year of carbon savings was understating the benefits of the facility;
- Explained that regarding recycling and the concern that construction of the facility would provide a disincentive to recycling, further planned government legislation would enhance rather than discourage recycling. It was also acknowledged that even in countries with high recycling such as Germany they still need other waste management solutions; and
- Clarified that traffic movements to and from the site would peak around midday and would be of a minimal impact upon the A10 based on transport assessments. Additional movements during the construction phase would largely occur before 7am and would be managed through a Construction Environmental Management Plan that would be secured through a planning condition.

The Chairman thanked the applicant for their presentation and answers to the questions posed. He advised that objectors to the application would be invited to make their representations. Members noted that some residents that had registered to speak had to leave the meeting early and the clerk would read their comments to the Committee if they had been supplied.

The Clerk to the Committee read a statement that had been received from Mr Nigel Seamarks. Mr Seamarks' statement objected to the planning application for a number of reasons including the wider transport considerations. He felt the public engagement carried out was inadequate, inappropriately timed and failed to address the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 188 and 192. It also failed to consider an independent review of the data on creation of traffic considering the Ely to Cambridge Transport Study 2018. Local residents had raised £5,000 and commissioned an independent visual impact survey that highlighted the A10 had not been adequately considered including the impact on road users as they approach the proposed development from the north and south. The Parish Council requested an independent transport assessment be undertaken but it was not commissioned and the Council's

traffic consultants did not attend public meetings. Mr Seamarks in his statement questioned the data regarding the volumes of waste that would be imported to the site from elsewhere in the country and requested a limit be imposed of 66,000 tonnes per annum that could be imported. Attention was drawn to the safety of the A10 and the number of collisions and resultant injuries and fatalities for the period 2015-17, following a Freedom of Information Request (FOI) submitted to the Police. Attention was also drawn to inaccuracies in the transport calculations, the impact of construction vehicles on local roads and the lack of cycling provision.

Mrs Adele Gower, local resident who had to leave the meeting early had a statement read out on her behalf by Mrs Jane Coston. Mrs Gower who was a mother and health care professional objected to the application on grounds of pollution that would have to be lived with by local residents for years to come. The planning application did not represent a forward looking approach for a city that prided itself on scientific research.

Mr Cattermole, Head Teacher at Littleport Community Primary School and local resident spoke in objection to the planning application. Mr Cattermole drew attention to concerns regarding air quality and the track record of the operator. Mr Cattermole detailed a number of breaches that had occurred at the site and questioned the performance of the operator. He noted that many other head teachers were concerned about the proposal and Members should note that the Waterbeach Barracks development would come with 3 primary schools and 1 secondary school in close proximity. Upon the conclusion of Mr Cattermole's remarks the Council's Legal Officer reminded Members that the performance of the site operator was not a material planning consideration and should not form part of the decision making.

Mrs Williams, speaking in objection to the application on behalf of CBWIN, which was representing over 3,000 resident members, drew attention to the life shortening impact of air pollution and preventing air pollution prevented disease. Mrs Williams questioned what Public Health England's response of 'no significant health risk' really means? Attention was drawn to the landscape review undertaken by CBWIN and the conclusions it made, noting that landscape impacts conflicted with the adopted development plan. Reference to the building as an isolated structure was drawn to Members attention. If the application was approved it would damage the Council's reputation regarding heritage preservation. Mrs Williams emphasised that the majority of waste could be recycled and the proposed facility was the worst solution to waste disposal capacity issues and the visual impact on the rural character of the area would be significant. There was not a need for this facility and air pollution could not be accurately measured or monitored, so it could not be controlled.

Mrs Heather Macbeth-Hornett drew attention to the hazard posed by cadmium, causing renal failure and bone conditions. Cottenham was within the area that would be affected by emissions of cadmium from the proposed facility, including local farms in the area with Gravel Diggers Farm being the closest. There was a large primary school and village college that would be affected. The facility would also pollute Wicken Fen. The proposed facility did not represent renewable energy and would increase traffic and light pollution. The applicant had failed to consider the impact on public health.

In objecting to the application Mr Derek Douglas addressed concerns regarding local environment and landscape. The proposed development was significant and not in the best interests of the area. The planning application should not be harmful to the historic area as set out in paragraph 3.8 of the Council's Location and Design of Waste Management Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Mr Douglas drew attention to the size of the proposed structures at the site and made comparison to



their relative size to Ely Cathedral. No other structure of that scale was located in Cambridge or the wider area and urged the Committee to refuse planning permission.

The Chairman invited Mr Martin Rafal to address the Committee but he was not present and had not provided a statement to be relayed to the Committee.

Mrs Guinevere Glasford-Brown addressed the committee in objection to the application and drew attention to the evolving legislation regarding energy from waste facilities and air quality in South Cambridgeshire, with the potential for health impacts, including issues for pregnant woman. If the planning application was approved then it would saddle the Council with a polluting legacy and urged the Committee not to consider the application through the narrow comparison between landfill and incineration but to consider the wider implications including the impact on Denny Abbey and the Fenland landscape. When the A428 was constructed the sight lines from Madingley Cemetery to Ely Cathedral were preserved and the proposed development would affect that. It was paramount that the county's heritage be protected.

Reverend Norman Setchell addressed the Committee and expressed concern regarding the emissions from the site in particular, minute particles and nano-plastics and highlighted the proposed schools planned for the area. Particles remained in the environment for significant lengths of time and entered the food supply. Reverend Setchell shared the concerns regarding heritage however, in his view the health risks were most significant.

Mrs Jane Coston informed the Committee that she had visited a similar energy from waste facility to the one proposed in Suffolk and was concerned by the amount of dust on her clothes from that visit. She drew attention to the considerable concern of local residents regarding the long term affects and questioned the proposed location of the facility. Mrs Coston informed Members of the history of the waste management site and its incremental expansion which affects the local community. Mrs Coston questioned whether this was the right location for it geographically and using the Suffolk incinerator example not being viable for heat, that this element needed to be tied down, before urging the Members to refuse the planning application.

The Chairman invited Mr Aravind Partvathala to address the Committee but he was not present and had not provided a statement to be relayed to the Committee.

Mrs Sandra Archer speaking on behalf of the South Cambridgeshire Green Party wished to register her objection to the planning application with Members. The facility would produce a toxic fine product that would be sent to landfill. There was significant risk of pollution to air, water and soils. Further concern was expressed regarding the accumulation of pollution in the soil, which had the potential to pollute local watercourses, and the impact on HCV traffic in the area, wildlife and light pollution. The proposed development would create a demand for waste which was undesirable and it was questioned whether this had been adequately been taken into account from a climate change perspective. Mrs Archer criticised the public consultation and public engagement undertaken by the applicant as inadequate, highlighting that residents were only informed through the efforts of CBWIN.

Mr Colin Coe drew attention to the remaining capacity at the current landfill site and the issues relating to waste disposal globally. He was concerned that calling it an energy from waste proposal instead of an incinerator had created a smoke screen, so locals weren't informed. He questioned whether this was the right technology,

especially as the UK was due to leave Europe. Mr Coe urged the Committee to refuse planning permission.

The Chairman invited Anas Al Rawi to address the Committee but he was not present and had not provided a statement to be relayed to the Committee.

Speaking in objection to the application Ms Claire Cambridge informed Members that she owned the farm next to the applicant's site (Chestnut Farm – which was pointed out by officers) and expressed concern regarding the operator, Amey. Ms Cambridge drew attention to ongoing issues regarding litter, flies and the issues experienced by the Internal Drainage Board. In the event of a failure of the facility, particulates could be expelled into the air over a wide area. Ms Cambridge advised the Committee that she had attended a presentation regarding the new town at Waterbeach and enquired about the proposed energy from waste facility with developers and they were unaware of the proposals.

Miss Lauren Stabler drew attention to sustainable development and highlighted that the United Kingdom was over capacity with regard to energy from waste facilities. It was important to move further up the waste hierarchy in order to meet targets for recycling.

Mr Andy Whittaker informed the Committee that he was from Burwell and would be affected by the emissions from the facility and was a chartered engineer. Mr Whittaker expressed concern regarding the economic viability of the facility which could lead to underfunding for its maintenance. Mr Whittaker drew attention to the potential incineration tax and the Chief Scientist at the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) who called for a moratorium on the construction incinerators due to the impact upon recycling. Mr Whittaker highlighted other proposed energy from waste facilities in the region that would create demand for waste and raised an issue regarding the Local Plan for waste currently being updated that should be considered.

Mrs Barbara Bull speaking as a local resident of Waterbeach commented that not using the word incinerator was misleading. There had been inadequate information regarding the impacts upon human health, particularly the toxins on the food chain and local residents, and no confidence given by the Environment Agency. Mrs Bull expressed concern regarding the location of the proposed facility close to the new town of Waterbeach and proposed schools. Importation of waste would be carried out by road and HGVs were polluting. Mrs Bull asked Members whether they were convinced residents would not fall ill.

The Chairman invited Mr Thomas Vergunst to address the Committee but he was not present and had not provided a statement to be relayed to the Committee.

The Chairman invited Mr Charles Cook to address the Committee but he was not present and had not provided a statement to be relayed to the Committee.

Cambridge City Councillor Oscar Gillespie, representing himself expressed concern regarding the size of the proposed facility and its impact upon the landscape. Screening would not be effective and the public benefits of the facility were not enough. There was a need to move up the waste hierarchy and avoid the use of single-use plastics. The proposed facility would need to be a third of its proposed scale in order fit the setting of Denny Abbey and Councillor Gillespie expressed concern regarding the impact upon public health from air quality as he was not satisfied by the safeguards of the Environment Agency or Public Health England.

Mr John Buckley a Landbeach resident questioned whether the energy from waste facility was necessary and emphasised that alternative waste disposal methods were required. There should be a reduction in the use of plastic packaging and the development would discourage recycling. Referred to the National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) and a recent report that he urged Members to consider and respond to the changes in circumstances by rejecting this planning application.

The Chairman invited Mrs Jane Williams to address the Committee as a local resident, but she confirmed that her points had already been covered when she addressed the Committee on behalf of CBWIN.

The Chairman invited Ms Diane Stearn to address the Committee but she was not present and had not provided a statement to be relayed to the Committee.

Mr Ian Ralls, speaking in objection to the application on behalf of Cambridge Friends of the Earth drew attention to the chemicals that would be produced by the facility and his concerns surrounding air quality and pollution, with implications to health. Mr Ralls advised the Committee that Cambridgeshire is very low lying so climate change could provide a very unhappy combination. The technology of such facilities had improved, however not all material would be burnt at the optimum temperature and questioned how the optimum temperature would be maintained when cold waste was introduced. Metals would not be destroyed during the incineration process. Progress needed to be made towards zero waste rather than incineration.

The Clerk to the Committee read a statement submitted by Mr Matthew Seamarks to the Committee. In his representation Mr Seamarks drew attention to the lack of engagement with young people during the planning application process by the applicant. He highlighted that increased recycling and reductions in packaging would result in less waste to be processed at the site. Concern was expressed regarding the additional vehicular movements that would arise from the importation of waste to the site and this would affect people's ability to commute to work. Mr Seamarks expressed concern regarding the scale of the proposed facility, with a comparison made to the applicant's facility at Milton Keynes, and its impact upon the landscape and its relative position to Denny Abbey.

Mrs Jude Sutton who was unable to attend the meeting submitted an audio recording of her objection that was played to the Committee. Mrs Sutton and her daughter suffered from asthma and questioned whether the Committee were satisfied regarding the potential air pollution that would be produced by the facility. Mrs Sutton drew attention to the impact of air quality upon human health. The filters that would be installed would not remove all dust particles from the emissions and the cumulative effect of emissions were unknown. Heavy metals would be emitted and schools were located in close proximity to the site. Mrs Sutton drew attention to the clean air strategy and EU requirements of the Council to protect air quality, alongside a Public Health England report that was still expected shortly. She requested that Members use the precautionary principle.

Councillor Eileen Wilson, South Cambridgeshire District Council spoke in objection to the planning application as the Local Member for Cottenham. She confirmed that she was one of two district councillors for Cottenham, but she was speaking on behalf of both of them. The proposed facility was an imposing and intrusive structure particularly upon Denny Abbey. HGV routing agreements were often ignored and there should be stricter controls on HGV movements and the routes they took. Concerns about air quality and human health from local residents were noted,

including incomplete evidence on these matters. The location is a commercial one, but this needed to be balanced against residents' health. Reference was made to the Council's air quality consultant's report at paragraph 2.1 and base line information was needed ahead of a decision being made. Emissions monitoring information should be publically available.

The Council's Legal Officer advised Members that paragraphs 5.73 and 5.74 of the officer report addressed concerns that had been raised regarding the consultation process, which demonstrated that a Christmas consultation was not the case, and reminded Members that environmental issues, while important, were the remit of the Environment Agency.

The Chairman thanked all the speakers and adjourned the meeting for a short break.

Meeting adjourned at 3:52pm

Meeting reconvened at 4:08pm

The Chairman advised that the Committee would now debate the application. A Member suggested the Committee move straight to the proposal of a formal motion. The Council's Legal Officer requested that the motion was not formally made at that stage as other Members had shown a wish to speak. The Member agreed to this.

During the course of discussion:

- A Member thanked members of the public that had attended the meeting and those that had spoken and expressed their concerns regarding the planning application. The Member explained that much of what had been raised by local residents could not be taken into account when determining the planning application as this would be addressed by the Environment Agency through the permitting process, nor could the performance of the operator or economic viability of the proposal be taken into consideration. The Member confirmed that the committee could take into account the benefits of the proposal when weighing this against any harm of the development. In drawing attention to the setting of heritage assets the Member highlighted the importance of the continuation of the openness of the countryside that surrounded the asset. The Member considered that visual mitigation through the planting of trees was inappropriate as the view would remain obstructed. The proposed mitigation was not adequate to address the impact upon the heritage asset.
- A Member recognised the strength of opinion amongst residents and it demonstrated how important the proposed development was to local people. The Member commended officers for the comprehensive report and the patient and clear exposition. The Member expressed concern regarding the impact upon immediate domestic premises next to the site and commented that the impact of the facility on the landscape was so detrimental that planning permission could not be granted. The Denny Abbey Complex was of paramount historical importance and the facility would adversely affect it. There was a duty to future generations to manage waste effectively however, there was also a duty to past generations to preserve what they had left.

- A Member commented that damage to heritage assets should not be allowed when it was not outweighed by public benefits and therefore would not vote for planning permission to be granted.
- A Member recognised the potential benefits of reducing the amount of waste that was sent to landfill, the positive benefits of generating power and that while well argued, comments regarding pollution could not be considered. Transport concerns had somewhat been allayed however, concerns relating to landscape had not and would therefore not support approval of the planning application. The proposed development would damage historical assets and it would be irresponsible to allow that to happen.
- Attention was drawn by a Member to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that required Planning Authorities to consider and enhance the heritage setting. Harm should be weighed against the public benefits and was disappointed that Denny Abbey were likely to enter into a Section 106 agreement with the applicant.
- A Member commented that the Fenland landscape was flat and that any building was visible from a considerable distance. Having attended the Planning Committee site visit to Denny Abbey the Member found submissions disingenuous as the impact of the A10, the research park and the landfill site upon the heritage asset was ignored. The view was already compromised as a result. The level of particulates produced by the facility would be small and dwarfed by those produced by the A10 and the residents of Waterbeach themselves. Incinerators were not ideal however there was too much waste and a need for power. Until waste management became more effective then incineration played a part. The benefits of reducing waste sent to landfill outweighed the disadvantages.
- Members recognised that the site was an allocated waste site and landfill was not an infinite resource however, the impact upon heritage assets was so great that support for planning permission could not be given.

Upon conclusion of the debate Councillor Hunt, seconded by Councillor Hudson proposed that planning permission be refused on grounds of landscape (including amenity of closest residents) and heritage. The Chairman adjourned the meeting in order for officers to compile reasons for refusal.

Meeting adjourned at 4:33pm

Meeting reconvened at 4:59pm

The Chairman reconvened the meeting and the Council's Legal Officer addressed the Committee. Regarding Landscape, having applied their judgement to the impact of the proposal on the landscape, the local character and visual impact Members considered that there would be significant adverse effects which could not be resolved though the proposed mitigation. Consequently the development was contrary to Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy CS33 (protection of landscape character) and Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy CS34 (protecting surrounding uses). This also took into account the harm to the visual amenity of the nearest residents to the development.

Regarding heritage, Members having considered all of the information before them, considered that the harm to the setting of the Denny Abbey Complex heritage asset was not outweighed by the benefits of the proposals. Therefore the proposal was contrary to Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy CS36 (archaeology and the historical environment) and contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 196.

In response to a Member query the Council's Legal Officer confirmed that amenity had been stated as 'visual amenity' in the proposed reasons for refusal as officers had relied on the Members' statement that the 'large overbearing nature' of the building on the closest residents' was related to the visual amenity, particularly when it was noted that noise and odour were matters for the Environment Agency, that hadn't been referred to during the debate.

With the approval of Councillor Hunt that the reasons for refusal covered the points raised as part of his recommendation, the item was taken to the vote.

On being put to the vote it was resolved to refuse planning permission [7 in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions], for the reasons stated in these minutes.

Chairman