

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

Date: Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> July 2016

Time: 10.00am – 12.45pm

Place: Kreis Viersen Room, Shire Hall, Cambridge

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

### **191. APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no apologies received.

Councillor Mason declared a non-statutory interest regarding Nationwide Recycling because he was a former customer of the site.

The Chairman affirmed that although he owned a scrap metal business he has had no dealings with the firm.

### **192. MINUTES – 16<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2016**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman reminded Members of the importance of listening to all of the debate that took place concerning the applications before them and should only vote on an application if they had been present through the entire debate. The meeting would be adjourned if Members required a break and that during such an adjournment Members should refrain from discussing the applications on the agenda or engaging with any member of the public in the gallery.

### **193. LAND AT: NATIONWIDE RECYCLING LTD, BARNWELL JUNCTION, SWANN ROAD, CAMBRIDGE, CB5 8JZ**

**FOR: ERECTION OF 48 METRE LENGTH OF 5 METRE HIGH FENCE AND 42 METRE LENGTH OF 5.1 METRE HIGH STACKED SHIPPING CONTAINERS TO PROVIDE NOISE ATTENUATION AND VISUAL SCREENING (RETROSPECTIVE)**

**LPA REF: C/5010/10/CW**

The Committee received a report regarding a retrospective planning application for the erection of a 48 metre length of 5 metre high fence and 42 metre length, 5.1 metre high stacked shipping containers that provided noise attenuation and visual screening.

Officers introduced Fiona Quinn, Environmental Health Officer from Cambridge City Council who had assisted officers regarding the noise pollution elements of the application.

Officers informed Members that, noise from the site had historically resulted in nearby residents lodging complaints. Following monitoring, recorded noise was found to be at a level above that at which complaints were likely. An interim injunction was then applied for

by the residents to restrain the alleged noise nuisance from the metal recycling activities. Following the erection of the barriers in early 2010 an application for retrospective planning permission was submitted. It was not presented to the Committee owing to ongoing action being taken by local residents thereby avoiding legal challenge and associated costs for the Local Authority.

Members' attention was drawn to the location of the fence and shipping containers in relation to the objectors' properties. Officers explained that it was difficult to see them from the properties given the level of foliage and the visual impact was not inappropriate for the setting.

A Member questioned whether Network Rail had requested conditions be imposed given the proximity of the site to the rail line. Officers confirmed that Network rail had been re-consulted and that no further comments had been received.

During discussion:

- A Member commented that the screening provided by deciduous trees would provide no noise attenuation therefore could not support the application. Officers explained that trees provided no significant noise attenuation and the trees did not form part of the planning application.
- Members noted that the use of the site as a scrap metal recycling facility had been long established and the proximity of the railway lines would also create noise.

It was resolved to approve the application.

**194. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND 3, 14 METRE HIGH CHIMNEYS;  
ERECTION OF A PYROLYSIS PLANT BUILDING CONNECTED TO A WASTE  
RECEPTION BUILDING; ERECTION OF A 25 METRE HIGH CHIMNEY; 2 CONTAINERS  
FOR GAS ENGINES; ELECTRICITY SUBSTATION; UPGRADING AND EXTENSION OF  
INTERNAL ACCESS TRACK AROUND PERIMETER OF THE MEMORIAL GARDEN**

**AT: NOVUS ENVIRONMENTAL, NOVUS HOUSE, THRILOW, SG8 7RR**

**APPLICANT: PAUL BOURCHIER, VETSPEED**

**LPA NO: S/0008/15/CW**

The Committee received an application that had been previously presented and deferred F/YR15/0985/F at the May 2016 Planning Committee regarding a proposed pyrolysis plant building connected to a waste reception building, the erection of a 25 metre high chimney, 2 containers for gas engines, an electricity substation, the upgrading and extension of an internal access track and the demolition of existing buildings and 3, 14 metre high chimneys.

Officers explained the purpose of the proposed plant. Members were informed that the pyrolysis process was preferable to disposal by landfill or incineration without energy recovery. This was consistent with national waste management policy. The site was recognised in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy as making a significant contribution to managing hazardous waste streams. With regard to the environmental impact of the development of the proposed site Members noted that there was no increase to flood potential and the existing sustainable drainage system would be employed. The site was not deemed to be ecologically significant. With regard to noise; the gas engines would be

contained within structures that would provide noise attenuation and Environmental Health Officers had confirmed that that there would be no significant impact in relation to noise pollution. Emissions from the chimneys would be subjected to regulation and permitting from the Environment Agency; the monitoring and enforcement of the permits, it was explained, was the remit of the Environment Agency and not a matter for consideration by the Planning Committee. There would be no significant increase to vehicular movements to and from the site and officers introduced the Council's Highway Engineer, Dr Jon Finney who would be able to answer any highway related questions from Members.

Imperial War Museum (IWM) Duxford, officers explained, had raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposed chimneys on the vista from the airfield. The buildings and chimney were larger than those to be demolished and would therefore make the site more prominent. Attention was drawn to the location of the site in relation to the nearest settlements including the development at Healthfield. Conservation areas at Thriplow and Duxford were drawn to Members' attention.

However, the site was remote enough for the visual impact to be insignificant from local villages and South Cambridgeshire District Council's Conservation Officer had concluded that because the distance involved (over 1km) the impact on the Duxford Conservation Area would be minimal. In respect of paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework it was considered that the minimal harm on a designated heritage asset was outweighed by the benefit of managing hazardous waste streams and generating energy.

Officers highlighted the principal objection of IWM Duxford regarding the impact of the proposed chimney on air safety. Following information presented regarding the safety zone map, Members were informed that the applicant had commissioned its own specialist advice regarding air safety and due to aircraft safety being outside the expertise of the Council, officers had also commissioned independent specialist advice. Peter Forbes of Alan Stratford and Associates Ltd and Nils Jamieson, a pilot with experience of flying vintage aircraft were introduced to Members and were available to answer any questions.

Members were reminded that when the application was previously considered at the May meeting of the Committee the decision was deferred to allow IWM to compile a technical air safety report, for the applicant to discuss the proposed height of chimney with the Environment Agency and for a meeting to take place between IWM Duxford and the applicant in order to establish whether a compromise could be reached.

The applicant, Members were informed considered the report presented by IWM Duxford to be largely anecdotal rather than a full technical assessment of the potential impact to air safety and Alan Stratford and Associates concluded the same.

In response to Members' questions:

- Further information was presented regarding the location of the grass runway at IWM Duxford.
- Confirmation was given that the proposed chimney would emit exhaust gasses from the new gas engines.
- Confirmation was provided that that the height of the chimney was critical to the escape of emissions from the site and any change to the height would affect the plume and where it landed.

- Peter Forbes and Nils Jamieson presented the conclusions of the technical report commissioned by the Local Authority. The chimney was below the obstacle clearance limits set by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). IWM Duxford maintained that vintage aircraft were exceptional and the height of the chimney posed a significant threat to air safety. Mr Forbes explained that the CAA had been contacted and had advised that if IWM Duxford believed that there should be no development greater than a specific height due to the type of aircraft flown from the airfield then the CAA should have been informed during the licensing process. Mr Forbes explained further that all aviation activity posed a level of risk but that vintage aircraft were quite maneuverable and could undertake a 5<sup>o</sup> turn that would avoid the site. There were also many fields and open spaces where an emergency landing could take place if necessary. Aircraft landing posed less risk as the landing slope would mean that aircraft were well above the proposed chimney and a curved approach could be adopted. The emissions from the chimney were not deemed to pose a significant risk to aircraft, even if the aircraft had an open cockpit and any smoke plume would not impede any navigation due to its small size and the relatively short timescale the pilot would be going through it. The plume was also not considered to be a temperature risk to the pilots or aircraft.
- Nils Jamieson, commented further, noting that any chimney was a hazard to aircraft but the question was how big a risk and how significant. It would take relatively small manoeuvres at that stage of flight to avoid the proposed chimney. Mr Jamieson went on to explain a “bow-tie” risk analysis of the take off and the controls in place to mitigate the risk posed. The aircraft flown from IWM Duxford were some of the best maintained aircraft in the world and all would have sufficient performance to clear the obstacle. Aircraft were flown in good weather conditions and in daylight hours. Following assessment of the risk and the controls in place Mr Jamieson determined that the risk posed was small.
- Mr Jamieson confirmed that vintage aircraft took off into the prevailing wind and that vintage aircraft were more sensitive to wind than modern aircraft and explained further the approaches aircraft could take to the airfield.
- It was explained that regulation CAP 168 provided a level of safety regarding obstacle free zones around an airfield and that it was the licensed airfield that was obliged to contact the CAA if a greater margin of safety was required than set out in CAP 168.
- Members noted that if the chimney was painted in bright colours then it could aid visibility but lighting of the chimney was not required due to the airfield’s hours of operation.
- It was explained that paragraph 2.7 of the officer’s report was taken from the applicant’s technical assessment and not the Local Authority’s.

Mrs Barbara Pointon on behalf of Thriplow Parish Council addressed the Committee. Mrs Pointon drew Members’ attention to the Heathfield site. Heathfield was the nearest settlement and was expanding. Mrs Pointon referred to the concerns she raised when the application was presented at the May meeting of the Committee and requested a more thorough and robust assessment of the impact on health and the environment. The current assessments had failed to take into account the prevailing winds and there had been no assessment of the impact on farmers, pedestrians and how the emissions would affect local

organic farmers. Mrs Pointon welcomed the proposed conditions regarding groundwater pollution but expressed disappointment that noise pollution had largely been ignored.

In response to Members questions:

- Mrs Pointon explained that although the Member could not see anything in the officers' report that suggested noise from the site would increase, the prevailing wind would carry noise to Heathfield and that noise can exacerbate health conditions and risk of stroke.
- Officers confirmed that the assessments carried out on health and air quality were of a sufficient standard and that following the submission of a Health Impact Assessment the Environmental Health Officer confirmed that that it was satisfactory.

Speaking on behalf of the applicant, Mr Matthew Day informed Members that during the application great care had been taken to ensure that neighbours and stakeholders were consulted on the proposals. Following extensions of time to allow them to provide a technical report, IWM Duxford's submission had not demonstrated that the erection of a 25 metre high chimney posed a significant hazard to aircraft flown from the airfield. Mr Day informed Members that the Environment Agency had been approached with regard to the height of the chimney following the request of Members at the May meeting of the Committee, but the Environment Agency were unable to comment on amending the height of the chimney at this stage.

Mr Day informed Members that the plant would have advanced technology involved to recover energy from the incineration of waste and the plant would be self-sufficient in terms of energy usage and would return electricity to the national grid. Mr Day highlighted that the policies within the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy supported the proposal and the regional importance of the site in terms of waste management.

Mr Day drew attention to the independent experts hired by the Council and agreed with their findings; the risks should be deemed acceptable. Concerns regarding air safety appeared to be unfounded and therefore requested that Members approve the application.

In response to a Member question Mr Day confirmed that technical assurance had been provided in terms of a geotechnical report and was confident that the proposed conditions regarding groundwater could be met.

Speaking against the application, Mr Graeme Etheridge and Mr Mark Miller on behalf of IWM Duxford informed Members that Mr Etheridge was the accountable manager of the airfield and registered with the CAA. Mr Etheridge emphasised the independence of Air Commodore Rick Peacock-Edwards who had compiled the technical report on behalf of IWM Duxford. The erection of the chimney would constitute a hazard and pose most risk during take-off and landing. Mr Etheridge informed Members that Vetspeed operated 2 other sites that could manage the type of operation proposed within the planning application.

Attention was drawn by Mr Etheridge to the officer presentation and that the proposed chimney height had not been overlaid onto the photographs shown to Members and that it would have a significant impact on the vista from the airfield. Mr Etheridge explained that further representation had not been made to the CAA in relation to CAP 168 because they had not perceived a development such as the one proposed would take place and that if they had known such a development was being planned then they would have applied for further restrictions to be imposed.

In response to Members questions Mr Etheridge and Mr Miller:

- Explained that a pilot on take-off would not see the chimney because of the angle of climb and the lack of visibility and would therefore need to know that obstacles were not a significant height. Aircraft were often tested at IWM Duxford and that increased the risk posed by the proposed chimney.
- Confirmed that if the planning application was granted then charts and information supplied to pilots would be amended to include the chimney but warned that further flying restrictions would be imposed by IWM Duxford if risk assessments determined that the risk was too high and eventually result in flying ceasing from the airfield.
- Apologised for the lack of technical data within the report submitted by IWM Duxford. The report had been written so as not to confuse Members with jargon.
- Confirmed that the proposed chimney posed a significant risk to the operation of the airfield.

A Member challenged Mr Etheridge on the technical report submitted stating that the case for the chimney posing a significant risk to aircraft had not been made and that it would be highly unlikely that an aircraft would collide with the chimney before hitting the ground. Mr Etheridge and Mr Miller explained that there was a lack of performance data regarding vintage aircraft and it was therefore difficult to model how an aircraft would perform. Following this the Member asked whether the diagram showed on page 162 was indeed accurate in their opinion, which Mr Miller confirmed it was.

The Local Member for Duxford, Peter Topping addressed the Committee. Councillor Topping drew attention to the extensive consultation undertaken by the applicant and the technical principles behind the pyrolysis process that were in line with national guidance. The issue for local residents, particularly for the Heathfield development was that they remained concerned about the emissions from the plant. It was therefore a matter for the Committee to determine, guided by experts whether those concerns were unfounded. Local residents asked that Novus Environmental carried out the proposed experimental work elsewhere.

Councillor Topping drew attention to the concept of risk in the field of civil aviation and highlighted that IWM Duxford had reasonably demonstrated that the proposed development would impact on their operation of the airfield and, although not a consideration for the Planning Committee, could result in the cessation of flying from IWM Duxford in the future. Councillor Topping expressed disappointment that there had been no compromise reached between the 2 parties. In closing, Councillor Topping concluded that there was a requirement to protect a site of national heritage and science from development.

In response to Member Questions Councillor Topping:

- Drew attention to the reliance of public sector organisations on income streams and visitors would be less inclined to visit IWM Duxford if flying ceased from the airfield.
- Noted that the recommendation was for approval because there were no material planning grounds for refusal, but as the Local Member it was his role to raise the concern of local people and request that all the evidence presented be properly weighed.

During discussion of report:

- Members confirmed that if the application was approved then 3 of the existing chimneys would be demolished and that the new chimney would require a permit from the Environment Agency. Emissions limits would be applied which would likely be higher than existing standards that apply to the old chimneys.
- Members clarified that IWM Duxford should have contacted the CAA with regard to CAP168 irrespective of any planned developments if they required greater development restrictions due to the nature of flying from the airfield.
- A Member noted the value of IWM Duxford and its importance for the Cambridgeshire area, but drew attention to the lack of technical evidence produced by IWM Duxford as to why the application should not be approved. There was however, good technical advice that informed Members that the application did not pose a significant risk to aircraft.
- A Member noted comments on planning regulation and law but emphasised the importance of common sense and the need to secure a national asset for the future. There was a responsibility to ensure the safety of all those who watched airshows and the residents at Healthfield.
- Attention was drawn by a Member to the potential environmental benefits of a taller chimney and the technology replacing outdated machinery that could potentially reduce emissions and the site represented significant financial investment in the area.
- The Council's Legal Officer explained that whilst a holding direction had been placed on this decision by the Secretary of State he could not confirm whether it would be called in or not. Therefore a responsible decision needed to be reached during the meeting.
- A Member was minded to agree with the submission from IWM Duxford and would therefore vote for permission to be refused.
- The natural instinct, a Member commented, was to support IWM Duxford but there had been no grounds for refusal that had been offered so far that would stand up at appeal. Every opportunity had been afforded to IWM Duxford to provide technical reasons as to why the application should be refused but none had been presented. It was therefore imperative that reasons for refusal were clear and were not emotional regarding potential loss of life in the future; they had to be material planning considerations.
- A Member shared concerns of local residents and IWM Duxford but accepted there were no grounds for refusal of the application and therefore would abstain from the vote.
- When the application was presented to the Committee in May, a Member reminded the Committee, it was deferred in order for further reports and negotiations to be conducted. The deferral had not resulted in any change to the position and would therefore be voting for approval of the application.

Councillor Hunt, seconded by Councillor Loynes proposed that planning permission be refused on grounds that it would damage a conservation area; damage a heritage asset; pose a danger to pilots and passengers in aircraft; pose a risk to the safety of public attending airshows and viewing in the vicinity of the airfield; financial damage to the local

community; and loss of residential amenity in terms of noise for residents at Healthfield in relation to the prevailing wind.

In response to the proposal a Member, while respecting the proposal made, highlighted that the application was not in a conservation area, it did not impact upon a heritage asset, the safety risks had not been demonstrated, there appeared to be no evidence to support any potential financial damage and there would be no more noise emitted from the site than currently.

The Council's Legal Officer advised Members of the potential cost implications of resolving to refuse the application and emphasised the requirement for clear evidence for reasons for refusal.

On being put to the vote the proposal was lost 6 votes in favour to 4 against with 1 abstention.

It was therefore proposed that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the vote it was resolved, 6 votes in favour to 4 against with 1 abstention, that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in appendix A of these minutes.

Officers reminded Members that a holding direction had been issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to enable him to decide whether to determine the application himself or refer it back to the Council as a local decision. Until a response had been received from the Secretary of State permission could not be granted. Officers would update Members once they knew more and would discuss the implications of this with the applicant's agent in the interim period.

#### **195. SUMMARY OF DECISIONS MADE UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

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

#### **196. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: THURSDAY 1<sup>ST</sup> SEPTEMBER 2016**

Chairman



## **Appendix A**

1. The development hereby permitted shall have begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. Written notification of the date of the commencement of the development shall be sent to the Waste Planning Authority within 7 days of such commencement.

*Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004*

2. The development hereby permitted shall not proceed except in accordance with the details set out in the submitted application and supporting documents and the following drawings, except as otherwise required by any of the conditions set out in this permission:

- Fig 1 Rev c Location Plan dated April 2016
- Fig 5 Rev e Proposed Site Plan dated April 2016
- Fig 6 Proposed Building Plan dated June 2015
- Fig 7 Proposed Roof Plan dated June 2015
- Fig ES 1 Plant Layout (undated – received 30 June 2015)
- Fig 8 rev b Proposed Building Elevations dated 03.16 – Colours amended
- Fig 9 rev a Proposed Building Elevations dated December 2015
- JEC/407/01 Rev B Planting Proposals dated April 2016
- Specification for Soft Landscape Works dated December 2015

*Reason: To define the permission and to protect the character and appearance of the locality in accordance with policies CS33 & CS34 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/1(p), DP/2(a), DP/3(m), GB/3 and NE/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)*

3. External cladding shall not be attached to the fuel storage building or pyrolysis plant building until details of coloured panels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out except in accordance with the approved details.

*Reason: To break up the visual form of the buildings in accordance with policies CS33 & CS34 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/1(p), DP/2(a), DP/3(m), GB/3 and NE/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)*

4. No demolition or construction shall take place until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The approved plan shall be complied with in full during all demolition and construction work.

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy CS32 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policy DP/3(b) of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)*

5. The area shown for HGV turning on Fig 5 Rev C Proposed Site Plan dated August 2015 shall be provided and retained and kept free from any obstruction at all times.

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy CS32 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policy DP/3(b) of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)*

6. The fuel storage building and pyrolysis plant building shall not be erected until a timetable for the phased implementation of the landscaping scheme shown on drawing no JEC/407/01 Rev B *Planting Proposals* dated April 2016 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The approved timetable shall be complied with in full.

*Reason: To mitigate the visual impact of the buildings in accordance with policies CS33 & CS34 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/1(p), DP/2(a) & (j), DP/3(m), GB/3 and NE/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)*

7. No removal of hedgerows or trees shall take place between 1 March and 31 August inclusive unless a competent ecologist has undertaken:

- a detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before vegetation is cleared; and
- provided written confirmation to the Waste Planning Authority prior to the removal of any vegetation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site.

*Reason: (i) In the interests of the biodiversity of the site in accordance with policy CS35 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/1(o), DP/3(o) and NE/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)*

8. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub, or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, becomes in the opinion of the Waste Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree or shrub of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the same place, unless the Waste Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

*Reason: To mitigate the visual impact of the buildings in accordance with policies CS33 & CS34 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/1(p), DP/2(a) & (j), DP/3(m), GB/3 and NE/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)*

9. No development shall take place until a remediation strategy that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority:

1. A Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) including a Conceptual Site Model (CSM) of the site indicating potential sources, pathways and receptors, including those off site.

2. The results of a site investigation based on (1) and a detailed risk assessment, including a revised CSM.

3. Based on the risk assessment in (2) an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they will be undertaken. The strategy shall include a plan providing details of how the remediation works shall be judged to be complete and arrangements for contingency actions.

No occupation of any part of the permitted development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of works set out in the remediation strategy required by 9. (3) above has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority.

*Reason: To protect and prevent the pollution of controlled waters from potential pollutants associated with current and previous land uses in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 109, 120, 121, Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3), policy CS39 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/1(l), DP/3(r) and NE/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007). Remediation measures may be needed as part of the construction phase so must be in place before development starts.*

10. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present no further development shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination shall be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The approved remediation strategy shall be implemented in full.

*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 paragraphs 109, 120, 121, Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3), policy CS39 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/1(l), DP/3(r) and NE/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007).*

11. No development shall commence until a scheme for surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. Infiltration systems shall only be used where it can be demonstrated that they will not pose a risk to groundwater quality. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented in full.

*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 paragraphs 109, 120, 121, Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3), policy CS39 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/1(l), DP/3(r) and NE/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007). Elements of the surface water disposal arrangements may be need to be installed in an early part of the construction phase so the scheme must be in place before development starts.*

12. No development shall commence until a detailed foundation design demonstrating how the foundation solution will integrate with the on-site capping layer and a foundation works risk assessment which shall demonstrate that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the approved scheme has been implemented in full.

*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 paragraphs 109, 120, 121, Environment Agency Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3), policy CS39 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/1(l), DP/3(r) and NE/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007). The foundation design will need to demonstrate that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater before development starts.*

13. During the period of demolition and construction no power operated machinery shall be operated before 0800 hours on weekdays and 0800 hours on Saturdays or after 1800 hours on weekdays and after 1300 hours on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Bank or Public Holidays.

*Reason: In the interests of the amenity of local residents in accordance with policy CS34 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/3(n) and NE/15 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007).*

14. No development shall commence until a programme of measures to minimise the spread of airborne dust (including the consideration of wheel washing and dust suppression provisions) from the site during the demolition and construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented in full for the duration of the demolition and construction phases.

*Reason: In the interests of the amenity of local residents in accordance with policy CS34 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/3(n) and NE/16 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007). This relates to the demolition and construction phases of the development so needs to be in place before development starts.*

15. No external lighting shall be installed except in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority.

*Reason: In the interests of the amenity of local residents in accordance with policy CS34 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/3(n) and NE/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007).*

16. No part of the access track shown on Fig 5 Rev e dated April 2016 shall be constructed until details of its construction and surfacing have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The access track shall not be constructed except in accordance with the approved details.

*Reason: To ensure that the access track is permeable and there is no increase in the impermeable area of the site in accordance with policies DP/1(i) and DP/3(p) of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007).*

17. No waste shall be stored outside the building.

*Reason: To protect the visual appearance of the area in accordance with policies CS33 & CS34 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July*

2011) and policies DP/1(p), DP/2(a), DP/3(m), GB/3 and NE/4 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)

18. The amount of waste received for treatment by the pyrolysis plant in any one calendar year shall not exceed 30,000 tonnes excluding residual waste from the adjacent autoclave process.

*Reason: The development has been assessed on this level of vehicle movements. In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy CS32 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policy DP/3(b) of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)*

19. The Great Crested Newt watching brief set out in the AWS Ecology letter dated 21/03/2016 shall be implemented in full for the duration of the construction of the internal access road. If Great Crested Newt are found, construction work shall stop and not recommence until a mitigation strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Waste Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved mitigation strategy.

*Reason: (i) In the interests of the biodiversity of the site in accordance with policy CS35 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Minerals & Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) and policies DP/1(o), DP/3(o) and NE/6 of the South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policies DPD (adopted July 2007)*