

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee of St Ives Town Council
held in the Corn Exchange on Wednesday 23 March 2022**

Present:

Chairman: Councillor N Dibben

Councillors: S Mokbul, J Tiddy, J Kerr, N Wells, C Smith

Absent: D Rowe, T Drye

In attendance:

Deputy Clerk: Christine Allison

PL104.00 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors P Hussain (Personal).

PL105.00 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Application 22/80075/COND – Councillor Mokbul – non pecuniary interest as an acquaintance of the applicant.

PL106.00 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A maximum of 15 minutes is permitted for members of the public to address the Committee in accordance with the Town Council's approved Public Participation Policy.

Many members of the public were present at the meeting, so the 15 minute slot was extended to 45 minutes enabling all those wishing to speak to do so.

Concerns were raised in regards to application **CCC/21/088/FUL**

- Little action had been taken to respond to the original objections
- There was a lack of trust in the documents being provided
- The data had been based on modelling scenarios, not real life e.g. fruit growing, egg production etc. and distribution of produce within the local community e.g. shops and farmers markets. The egg farm shop sold 3500 eggs to local people in a typical weekend and the fruit shop over 50 tones per year. Effects on local businesses not addressed
- The air quality report had only considered the incinerator, not the combined effect of existing sources which may take it over the limit
- Out of hours noise and light pollution
- Output - no proposal for the safe disposal of the bottom ash and heavy metals
- Inadequate provision and discrepancies in figures for chemical and offensive waste
- Transport – Envars traffic survey does not allow for time spent on site
- 40% of waste will be from adjoining counties or further afield
- Effects on health of dioxins, furins, cadmium, bioaerosols and airborne ash. Ingestion and inhalation.
- Build up in soil and effects on soil microbes
- Already being bothered by plagues of flies in area
- Type of burner not specified
- The studies have not considered the latest lower maximum levels for emissions
- Landscape and visual impact – visible plumes
- Invisible haze – can enter lungs etc unknowingly
- Distances given to adjacent buildings are incorrect

Chairman's
Initials

- Security concerns given types of waste that may be disposed e.g. proceeds of crime. Gate have been left open.
- Addenbrookes is only operation at 56% capacity. No incinerators in the country working at full capacity. Plant is not needed.

The Civic Society of St Ives made the following comments:

22/00614/FUL - 12 Meadow How - The Society's one concern with this application is that the side passage, between the front extension and the boundary fence should be a minimum of 0.7m wide, to allow refuse bins to be stored in the back garden.

Examination of the drawing shows the existing passage is 0.8m wide, the projection of the proposed extension is drawn to indicate a much narrower width than the 0.7m dimension. A sensible solution would be to make the front extension the same width as the existing room. In addition a condition should require refuse bins to be stored in the rear garden.

Disposal of Land - 2 Hawthorn Way - The applicant states there is no current use of the land. This is incorrect. The land is an area of open grass landscaping for the enjoyment of the residents of the area. Land on the three adjacent road junctions are similarly owned and maintained by HDC. Sale of the land should not be approved

PL107.00

APPLICATION CCC/21/088/FUL – ENVAR COMPOSTING LIMITED

Consideration was given to the application.

RESOLVED: that a recommendation that the application be refused be sent to the County Council on the basis that the committee considers that the application is incomplete and has not provided justification for this scheme as required by Policy 4 of the CCC M&W plan.

That the following reasons be given in support of the refusal
Previous concerns that were raised and still go unaddressed:

Need for the scheme

Policy 4 of the CCC Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021 requires any new hazardous waste facility to be justified. The information provided in the application does not indicate any increase in demand that would justify a new installation. The benefits of the scheme in co-location and moving waste up the waste hierarchy are noted.

Additional response: The new data indicated that the majority of incoming material for the incinerator will come from outside of Cambridgeshire. This is counter to the aims of the CCC Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021 which sets out to reduce imported waste and to ensure that each waste authority is self-contained in its capacity.

Operation of the incinerator

CCC guidance on the commenting on the operation of the plant is noted. The review by the Environment Agency must consider if there are additional risks to people associated by the nearby Raptor Centre, egg farms and local fruit and vegetable farms that supply residents with regular products over many years.

Additional response: Local farmers have indicated that they sell 3500 eggs to residents each weekend and around 50 tons of fruit and vegetables each year. The claim in the reports that “only a few residents” could be subject to frequent intake of local products is untrue and the risk must be re-assessed. In addition many local workers are operating outside for long periods of time also increasing the risk.

It is noted that the exposure limits for some substances are exceeded on the site itself – raising concerns on how the material is handled and the effectiveness of the flue to disperse potentially harmful material. The Town Council has been advised that new lower maximum exposure limits are now in force and that the studies have not considered these.

Previous comments by the Environment Agency indicates that plume displacement modelling be carried out to support the flue height. This has not been done.

The method of disposal of any ash produced by the incinerator is not detailed.

It is not clear if existing contamination levels in the local soil have been included in any analysis.

Consideration will also need to be given to the safe operation and storage of the existing operation as some existing buildings are to be demolished.

Traffic

The application does not indicate that all HGV vehicles that use the site will have GPS to ensure compliance with the use of CCC approved lorry routes. The existing traffic agreement under application H/5005/17/CW restricts deliveries between 05.00 to 22.00. This condition would allow HGV vehicles to pass through St Ives around 04.30 in the morning. The time should be later, say 07.00 especially running along the A1123 through St Ives with many adjacent residential properties.

Delivery routes and times for construction traffic vehicles have not been defined. A construction delivery plan is required. Vehicles on the A1123 through St Ives during school arrival and departure times must be avoided. This restriction was applied to a recent housing development in St Ives on the former golf course.

The transport study assumes that all workers will arrive on site by car as single occupiers. This is not in keeping with local transport plans to support active travel and minimise car use.

Additional response: The new data has not addressed these issues.

Road Safety

The road junction adjacent to the site is an accident blackspot. Proposals by CCC to improve the junction, agreed on the 7th September 2021, are noted.

Chairman's Initials

Envar should be required to keep the verge and hedgerow clear on their site to maintain visibility along the road under their existing agreements. The applicant should be asked for a contribution towards the junction improvements.

Additional response: The new data has not addressed these issues.

Building Design

The application has not provided the detailed information required in the check list contained in the CCC Design Guide for waste facilities.

Additional response: The new data has not addressed these issues.

Lighting

The application does not include details of any proposed external lighting. Light fittings should have zero upward lighting component. Any building mounted lights should be located as low as possible to reduce the impact of lighting the upper walls of the building that would be visible from the surrounding area.

Additional response: The new data has not addressed these issues.

Biodiversity

It is noted that some of the landscaping proposals are carried over from the application approved in 2017. The proposal does not indicate the required biodiversity improvements.

The new development should deliver an additional 20% improvement in biodiversity on top of that agreed in 2017 application. This requirement would be consistent with CCC submitted comments on the proposed Cambridge South station development.

Additional response: The new data has not addressed these issues.

Liaison

The lack of local consultation with local residents is disappointing. CCC need to improve their process to improve this aspect for future applications.

PL108.00 MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the Planning Committee held on 9 March 2022 are confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PL109.00 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Consideration was given to the following applications:

PL109.01 21/02791/FUL

To replace the existing air extract system with a new air extract system in a different location at the side of the building

**13 Kings Hedges
St Ives**

RECOMMENDATION:

Approval

No adverse impact on the street scene.

Chairman's
Initials

PL109.02 **22/00218/TREE**
 T30 Cherry too close to plot 8, T31 (already removed), T142 Lawson cypress too close to plot 18, T185 Hazel too close to plot 16, T283 and T284 yews not present- (removed for site entrance), T286- Yew- too close to gate house, T569- Hawthorns to be replaced T568 to be replaced, T415, T444, T446, T447 yews- remove, G4 Leyland cypresses- remove along the western boundary. Reduction of the height of G12- leyland cypress to 6 metre

The How
Houghton Road
St Ives

RECOMMENDATION: **Approval**
 Replacement trees to be provided for any removed

PL109.03 **22/00502/FUL**
 Single and two storey side extensions following demolition of existing detached garage

3 Abbots Crescent
St Ives

RECOMMENDATION: **Refusal**
 Overdevelopment of extensions. Large proportion of existing building
 Overlooking adjacent properties and potential loss of light

PL109.04 **22/00456/FUL**
 Proposed two storey extension to the rear of the property

43 Fairfields
St Ives

RECOMMENDATION: **Refusal**
 Similar in size to previous application refused by HDC

PL109.05 **22/00587/TREE**
 T1 Oak: reduce new growth laterally and garden to rear by 2-3 metres. G1 3x Silver Birch: reduce by 1.5m. T2 Willow: re-pollard at approx. 6 metres. T3: Willow: fell due to extensive Honey Fungus infection. G2: 4 x Lombardy Poplar: re-pollard at approx. 6 metres. T4 Willow: re-pollard at approx. 9 metres. T5 Sycamore: fell to ground level as leaning into pub car park

Green End Barns
St Ives

RECOMMENDATION: **Approval**
 Replacement trees to be provided for any removed

- PL109.06** **22/00614/FUL**
 To construct a single flat roof extension at the front and rear of the property
12 Meadow How
St Ives
RECOMMENDATION: **Approval**
 Suitable provision for bin storage to be provided
- PL109.07** **22/80075/COND**
 Conditional Information for 20/02118/FUL - condition discharge application for
 conditions 4 (Hard and Soft Landscaping) & 7 (Cycle Store).
24A All Saints Green
St Ives

RECOMMENDATION: No further comment on this application.
- PL109.08** **22/00616/TREE**
 T1 Horsechestnut reduce the lowest limb over footpath/road by 3-4 metres back
 to a suitable growth point. Group of dead elms x6 fell to ground level.
2 Bury Close
St Ives

RECOMMENDATION: **Approval**
 Extent of works to be agreed with Tree Officer
- PL110.00** **SMALL LAND DISPOSALS – 2 HAWTHORN WAY, ST IVES**
 To consider application for small land disposal at 2 Hawthorn Way

RECOMMENDATION: **Refusal**
 It is part of a green space that should be protected
 for the local community

PL111.00 **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

No Report Received.

Chairman:

Dated: 13 April 2022

Chairman's
Initials

**THIS PAGE
HAS BEEN
INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK**