

PETERBOROUGH



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MEETING**

**HELD AT 1:30PM, ON
TUESDAY, 24 APRIL 2018
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

Committee Members Present: (Chairman) Harper, (Vice-Chair) Casey, Councillors Ash, Bull, Brown, Clark, Martin, and Hiller, Stokes

Officers Present: Lee Collins, Development Management Manager
Louise Simmonds, Senior Development Management Officer
Karen Dunleavy, Democratic Services Officer
Stephen Turnbull, Planning Solicitor
Simon Ireland, Head of PCC Highways

73. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Serluca. Councillor Brown attended as substitute.

74. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Stokes, declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 as she was a member of the North Level Internal Drainage Board.

Councillor Hiller, declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 as he was a member of the North Level Internal Drainage Board.

Councillor Brown, declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 as he was a member of the North Level Internal Drainage Board.

**75. MEMBERS' DECLARATION OF INTENTION TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS AS
WARD COUNCILLOR**

None were received.

**76. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 3 APRIL 2018**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 April 2018 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

**77.1 17/02443/REM - TRANCHE TC23, EAGLE WAY, HAMPTON CENTRE,
PETERBOROUGH**

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to Reserved matters approval relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for the construction of 75 apartments and retail units (A3/A4 restaurant, cafe and public house) with associated parking, manoeuvring and landscaped areas, pursuant to 91/P0556

The Head of Planning introduced the report and update report. There was a letter of objection included in the update report in relation to accessibility and construction activity and the matters raised had been addressed within the report.

Parish Councillor Deardon, Hampton Parish Council and Jodie Aston, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Parking was insufficient for Hampton residents and the issues had been identified by Peterborough City Council as higher than average.
- There were outstanding issues of privacy raised by some residents at St Edmonds Court. Some residents with disabilities had raised issues regarding closing windows themselves.
- The drainage review had not appeared to have been updated since the original application was submitted.
- The transport review had mentioned off-street parking bays around the site, however the survey had not taken into account the impact of nearby sites such as the Co-operative premises.
- Path access between Lake View Way and Bramian Road had not been built wide enough to walk to Four Chimneys Crescent. In addition there had been solid parking on one side of the road and only one lane available for moving traffic.
- There appeared to be no progress from the developer regarding the purchase of the parcel of land between Bramier Road and Bovis to allow a path along the front.
- All parking spaces including restaurant and dwelling minimums amounted to 159 with 109 identified within the plans. There had been no space allocated for 50 parking spaces.
- There was a planning application 18-5004-FUL for a day nursery, which had been refused on the grounds of limited parking spaces available.
- The available parking spaces within the previous planning application had been raised and the allocated parking spaces had been reduced, which had caused concerns for residents. Parking in Hampton was already difficult for residents and if the application was approved, it would make the situation worse. The significant issue for residents was with the one bedroom flats as it would be likely that two people would reside in the property and own two cars.
- Additional basement parking spaces in the scheme had appeared to only show one space however, Members advised that there would be one to thirteen spaces as highlighted on page 20 of the report.

Mr Dadge addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The application was the resubmission of an almost identical application. The only change to the resubmission was the number of units.
- The mix of units had been changed to reflect the demand for one bedroom accommodation availability within Peterborough. The car parking had been recalculated based on current standards, which had resulted in increased car parking spaces. Therefore, proposal was entirely policy compliant.
- An issue about privacy had been raised by some residents. As a result, the building remained in the same position. Because of some comments that had been made by residents about potential disturbance, the developer decided to reduce the number of balconies on the side of the building facing St Edmonds Court. For the same reason, the roof garden had been removed

from the proposal and replaced with a green roof. This provided another potential source of noise activity being eliminated.

- The disabled access would be compliant. Level access would be available on the West side of the site. Disabled access between the roadside and the decked area would be gained by a lift located on the East side of the site.
- The officer report had been identified as comprehensive and addressed all policy requirements.
- Any noise implication would be addressed within a Construction Management Plan to be agreed with planning officers.

The Planning Committee and Environmental Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Concerns were raised over whether provision for a pavement crossing had been made to address the increase in traffic that had been highlighted on page 21, bullet point nine of the report. No allocated crossing points had been included in the application. However, there would be footways and uncontrolled crossing points such as dropped kerbs in the surrounding area.
- Parking arrangements would be compliant with current standards. One space had been allocated to one bed and two spaces to two bed units. Nine spaces had been allocated to the Commercial Unit based on location and surrounding on street parking. The only requirement for the Commercial Unit had been set at a maximum 47 spaces, with no minimum standards required.
- Accessibility to the apartments and Commercial Unit would be provided by a lift in line with building regulations and these were addressed on page 27 of the report.
- Although the drainage review had been identified as out of date, the drainage system had been confirmed as valid because Hampton would have a unique drainage strategy similar to Hempsted where the lake design would take on drainage water.
- It had been highlighted that current parking regulations had been better as opposed to when Hampton was built. The main difference would be the change from residential maximum standards to minimum standards.
- The development had been identified as compliant with current policy.
- The scheme had been identified as acceptable and Members felt that it was in line with planning guidelines, despite the increase of one bed flats.
- There had been no objections from statutory consultees nor from ward councillors. The plan would result in the design of the building almost identical to the one included in a permission that had already been granted.
- The parking would meet the Council's standards and would be compliant with the current policy.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- The site lay within the Hampton Development area where outline planning permission had been granted for the township development and a Development Brief had been approved.
- This was a revised scheme to that previously approved. The principle of development was therefore acceptable.
- The proposal would provide a modern, attractive landmark development which would respect the surrounding character.
- The proposal would not unduly impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and measures would be agreed with the developer to minimise any noise implications resulting from the construction.
- The proposal would provide a satisfactory level of accommodation for the further occupiers of the development.
- The proposal would provide appropriate parking provision for residents and staff and it was not considered that the proposal would result in an adverse impact on the adjacent highway.
- The development would be assessable.
- The proposal would not impact on the biodiversity of the lake and the landscaping would enhance the visual amenity of the area.
- The proposal would not result in flood risk outside of the site or for the future occupants of the development.

Hence the proposal accords with policies PP1, PP2, PP3, PP4, PP12, PP13, PP16 and PP19 of the Adopted Peterborough Planning Policies DPD, policies CS1 CS2, CS14, CS16, CS21 and CS22 of the Adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD, policy SA1 of the Adopted Peterborough Site Allocations DPD and sections 6, 7 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework

77.2 17/01448/OUT - Land To The West Of 85, West Street, Helpston, Peterborough

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to an application to seek outline planning permission for the erection of up to 45 dwellings along with associated infrastructure including roads, parking and public open space.

At this time, all matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) were reserved for future applications and consideration. Therefore, Members were being asked to consider only the principle of the proposed development.

It should be noted that the scheme had been revised from that which was originally submitted to reduce the number of proposed dwellings from up to 60 (reduced by 15no.)

The Head of Planning introduced the report and update report. The applicant had submitted a further revised flood risk assessment and drainage strategy.

Mr Nicholls, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The submission had been put together rapidly based on the Barnack submission.

- The residents who objected to the proposal were 2% of the total population of the area.
- Part of the site had been identified as natural infill, however that section of the plan had not been accepted because it had been submitted after the cutoff time.
- Another plan that was previously accepted had been highlighted in the application.
- The site would have access off the main road.
- The plan had been based on the delivery of more houses in a sustainable location and Helpston had been classified as a sustainable location.
- Much of the site had been proposed to be allocated in the emerging Local Plan in line with the Council's preference in favour of the village growth. Therefore, it had been felt that weight should be given when making a decision.
- The density of dwellings included in the plan could be reduced in line with officers recommendations.
- The application would be compliant with affordable housing and open spaces.
- Flooding issues had been dealt with by the drainage board and the local engineer.
- Flooding pictures provided in the report had shown that the drain had not been well maintained. The flooding had occurred one field away from the proposed site.
- Contributions to schools, play areas, would be complied with.
- The needs of the Authority would be complied with in regards to the type of accommodation required in the area of Helpston village.
- It had been suggested that the number of units would be reduced in response to recommendations from the drainage board and drainage engineer. With no time to redesign the scheme for the meeting, the proposal to reduce the number of units had not been included in the plan.
- Part of the site had a larger easement than predicted with an impact on the site density that could be developed.
- It had been questioned why the plan would be justified despite the fact that Local Plan would not allow developments in the countryside and that other local plans had been rejected for the same reason. The land had been identified as mainly manmade by developers. Part of the application had been recognised as natural infill. The application had been developed as part of the emerging Local Plan that had developed slow and had caused the application to result in a premature application. Despite this, the application contained some achievable aspect.
- The client would accept a reduction in density and would agree to 12 homes instead of 45.
- The application had disregarded the boundaries of the village envelope. Sometimes policies related to village envelopes would not develop as fast as other policies. In some cases emerging the Local Plan had supported developments outside the village envelope where there was an envelope. In this instance, the client had been attracted by the natural infill of the site.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- The application had been submitted the previous year for 60 dwellings, reduced to 45 on this application and then to 12 during the meeting. Since the current application had been submitted for 45 dwellings, a new application for 12 dwellings would need re-submitting.

- The application had been identified as unacceptable because in the open countryside and was contrary to the current Local Plan. It would require inspection and consultation as per the Planning process.
- The application had been developed outside the village envelope and was outside the emerging Local Plan. The local objection from villagers had also been highlighted.
- The application had been considered a speculative application.
- Some members felt that the the application should be refused.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **REFUSE** the application as per Officers recommendation. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **REFUSE** the planning permission as per the officers recommendations.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

The proposal was unacceptable having been assessed in light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and for the specific reasons given below:

- The application site was located outside the identified settlement boundary of the Limited Growth Village of Helpston, and was therefore within the open countryside. The proposal sought up to 45 number open market dwellings with only the policy requirement level of affordable housing provision as set out in Policy CS8 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011). The proposal would therefore fail to meet with the exception provisions contained within Policy CS1 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), which strictly controlled development within the open countryside, and was unacceptable in principle.
- The proposal would represent a form of development which was considerably denser than the established built form of the surrounding area and wider village. Furthermore, the submission failed to adequately consider the space required for the necessary public open space and drainage infrastructure, as well as considering the required ecology, tree and open countryside buffers which were essential. Accordingly, the proposal would result in a form of development which appeared wholly at odds, incongruous and unduly dominant to its surroundings and which caused unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and setting of the locality, contrary to Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).
- The proposal failed to demonstrate that surface water run-off arising from the development could be adequately managed so as to not pose an unacceptable risk of flooding either on the site or elsewhere. Furthermore, the proposal failed to take account of historic incidents of flooding within the immediate locality and demonstrate that the proposal would not worsen such flood risks. On this basis, the proposal was contrary to Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), paragraph 103 of the National

Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the Peterborough Flood Water Management SPD (2012).

- The application proposal failed to make provision for additional infrastructure and community facilities in terms of securing affordable housing, off-site highway works and public open space, which were necessary as a direct consequence of development. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policies CS12 and CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD (2010) and emerging Policy LP14 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version).

77.3 17/02464/FUL - Land At, Guilsborough Road, Eye Green, Peterborough

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to Construction of 67 dwellings including access, open space and associated infrastructure

The Head of Planning introduced the report and update report. No new matters were raised in the residents letter that had not already been included. There had been an additional condition required by the Fire Authority

Councillor Allen, addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- The need to listen to residents of rural wards was emphasized.
- Twelve additional dwellings had been identified as the main reason for concerns for residents.
- In 2014, the original application had been refused on the basis of its effects on the environment.
- The application would be detrimental to the habitat and the biodiversity of the site.
- The plan would bring the development into an area that had been identified as an open mosaic habitat area and therefore contrary to the Peterborough core strategy.
- Additional vehicle movements would result from the implementation of the application.
- Possible future dualling of the A47 should be considered if this application was approved.
- The noise pollution from A47 would be abutting the properties in the application.
- Road improvements would be needed as well as an increased number of schools and doctors. Concerns had been raised that the village of Eye would keep getting this type of development without gaining anything from their construction.
- It had been suggested to maintain 55 dwellings as per permission already in place and not to add a further 12 dwellings.
- Two national authorities, Historic England and Natural England, had no objections to the application in relation to the 12 additional dwellings. The appeal for 55 dwellings had been won in 2015.
- The PCC landscape technician had concerns in regards to the creation of a LEAP without any equipment. The result would be an extension of an application too far.
- It had been suggested that the validity of the application should have been considered in line with the legal aspects. The inspectors report had shown no concerns on the environmental impact.

- Although external bodies had shown no concerns on the plan, the residents had shown wide concerns in regard to its implementation.
- It had been reported that the villagers had reluctantly accepted the plan for 55 dwellings.
- The reasons that had been provided by the Planning and Environmental Protection Committee in regards to refuse the original application of 55 dwellings had been rejected by the planning inspector.
- It was indicated that out of 60 letters, ten were returned noting objection. The development with 55 dwellings had been already accepted. However, there had been a prevailing feeling about what impact the 12 additional dwellings would have on the village.

Mr Hardwick, agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- While the application was for a total of 67 dwellings, only the additional 12 dwellings would be considered as the key matter for consideration.
- The scheme would include 21 affordable homes. There would be a mix of starter units and family dwellings.
- The development would be more dense to the West end side of the site.
- Contributions would be set in accordance with Council's adopted Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
- Additional land would be donated to the Council for extension of a nature reserve.
- Revised plans had been submitted following comments raised by the Cycle forum in regards to a layby provision in conjunction with the Council
- There had been no technical objections to the development.
- Specialist consultation had concluded that the design and layout would be acceptable.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- The dualling of the A47 could not be considered the reason for rejection of the application as there had been no policy within Cambridge or locally that would support the implementation of the dualling alluded to. The dualling would remain a possibility not a certain fact.
- The Council landscape technician had raised objection as the LEAP would not be equipped. However, the 55 dwellings had been already approved without a LEAP. 12 additional dwellings would not trigger the need for a fully equipped LEAP for residents.
- It had been questioned whether parking bay for six would be acceptable. The risk of crime and antisocial behaviour related to car parks would overpower the benefits of the car park. Due to the constraints of the layby that would be adopted by the Local Highway Authority, the number of spaces in the plan had been established as the maximum number the Local Authority could fit within the development. Although not many of the parking spaces provided had been considered an improvement to the current situation.
- A car park would have to be adopted privately.
- No concerns should be made about the A47 as Highways England would not review the need to widen the area until 2022.
- Only 12 objections had been received. On that basis, it had been suggested to support the officer's recommendations.
- Permission for 55 dwellings had been already granted. The new layout had been considered quite nice, with a good mix of houses. It had been pointed out that only 10 objections were received, not 12.

- The development would be on the other side of the A47.
- The development would be close to Eye and allow people to walk to the village. It had been identified as a pretty desolate site with a mix of affordable houses.
- The inspector's report had not raised any issues for the additional 12 houses. There had been not strong enough reasons to go against the officer's recommendations.
- The opportunistic reason could not be considered to refuse the proposal and all issues raised had been dealt with in the officer's report.
- The cycle forum comments had been taken on board.
- Concerns about the extra 12 dwellings had been raised, however sufficient reasons had not been given to go against the recommendations.
- Although concerns for the additional 12 dwellings had been taken into consideration, no sufficient reasons had been given in support of a rejection.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (8 For, 1 Against) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

Subject to the imposition of the attached conditions, the proposal was acceptable having been assessed in the light of all material considerations, including weighing against relevant policies of the development plan and specifically:

- the principle of residential development on the application site had already been established through the existing and emerging allocations within the Local Plan, and the granting of outline planning permission under application reference 14/00857/R4OUT, in accordance with Policy SA5.4 of the Peterborough Site Allocations DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP39.3 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-136 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;
- the layout, density and design of the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the character, appearance or visual amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP2 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP16 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-136 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;
- the biodiversity interests in and near to the site can be adequately conserved, mitigation or compensated for, in accordance with Policy CS21 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and emerging Policy LP28 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time;
- the proposal would provide adequate parking provision, safe access/connectivity and would not result in undue harm to the surrounding public highway network, in accordance with Policy CS14 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP12 and PP13 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP13 of the Peterborough

Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded some weight at this time;

- the proposed layout would not give rise to unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupants and would provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants, in accordance with Policy CS16 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policies PP3 and PP4 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP17 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time;
- adequate management of surface and foul water would be secured to ensure no increased flood risk either on the site or elsewhere, in accordance with Policy CS22 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and emerging Policy LP32 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded limited weight at this time;
- the proposal would ensure that no undue harm results to potential undiscovered buried heritage assets, in accordance with Policy CS17 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011), Policy PP17 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012), paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and emerging Policy LP19 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded limited weight at this time;
- financial and other contributions towards the infrastructure demands arising from the proposed development were to be secured, in accordance with Policy CS13 of the Peterborough Core Strategy DPD (2011) and emerging Policy LP14 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-2036 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time; and
- any contaminants present within the site can be adequately remediated to ensure that no undue risk was posed to human health or controlled waters, in accordance with Policy PP20 of the Peterborough Planning Policies DPD (2012) and emerging Policy LP33 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2016-136 (Submission Version) which may be afforded weight at this time.

At this points the Committee took a 15 minute break.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee agreed that agenda item 5.5 17/01707/WCMM - Pode Hole Quarry, The Causeway, Thorney, Peterborough would be discussed next.

77.4 17/01707/WCMM - Pode Hole Quarry, The Causeway, Thorney, Peterborough

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to Variation to Condition 1 of Planning Permission 12/01899/WCMM, regarding changes to phasing and restoration.

Officer updated Committee in regards to an amendment to the original report recommendation to **GRANT** subject to signing of a Legal Agreement and relevant conditions.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

- The NPPF stated that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development - in terms of decision taking this meant approving development proposals that accorded with the development plan without delay. The principle of development had already been established and the proposed amendments were in accordance with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies CS24, CS25, CS33 and CS35.
- The update to the Environmental Statement accompanying the application was considered to be comprehensive and met the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning Environmental Impact Regulations 2017. Detailed topic areas had been assessed / considered and the proposal would not advance mineral operations closer to any residential properties or other sensitive receptors than currently approved. There would be no additional land take, and thus no additional disturbance to habitats, vegetation or archaeological features.
- Comments of consultees had been taken into account, and there were no additional issues to be considered than for the original application. Suitable, and where appropriate updated conditions would be attached addressing all the issues previously raised and which were still relevant. The amenity of neighbours had been taken into account (although no objections had been received), and given that the site fell within a designated Minerals Consultation Area and in all other respects the proposal was acceptable, there was no reason not to approve the application in line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act.
- Consideration had been given to the interaction of the proposals with those set out in application 16/02447/MMFUL for an extension to the west of the existing site, and it was considered that appropriate control could be exercised over both applications for them to be considered for approval.

77.5 16/02447/MMFUL - Pode Hole Quarry, The Causeway, Thorney, Peterborough

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee received a report in relation to Extension to Pode Hole sand and gravel quarry, including retention of concrete batching plant and aggregate plant, with restoration using inert materials

Kirsten Hannaford-Hill, agent addressed the Committee and responded to questions from Members. In summary the key points highlighted included:

- Pode Hole had been identified as a strategic site for the company Aggregate Industries UK Ltd.
- The extension would allow the continuation of gravel and sand sales.
- The company had considered the site to be an important contribution to the local economy.
- Operations at Pode Hole had been completed in line with high environmental standards that would continue to be applied to the proposed extension.

- The plan would include the restoration of the site to the original ground level. The restoration scheme would improve the site biodiversity.

The Planning and Environmental Protection Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- It had been noted that the restored meadow looked fantastic on the site.
- It had been observed that among all statutory consultees there had been only one objection.
- The facility had been well managed and there would be no reason not to expect the the same level of management on the extension.
- The materials produced on the site could not be imported hence the work of the company had been considered to be necessary for the city.
- Members felt that the proposal should be accepted and the application for extension granted.

RESOLVED:

The Planning Environment Protection Committee considered the report and representations. A motion was proposed and seconded to **GRANT** the application. The Committee **RESOLVED** (Unanimously) to **GRANT** the planning permission subject to relevant conditions delegated to officers.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION:

- The NPPF stated that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development - in terms of decision taking this meant approving development proposals that accorded with the development plan without delay. The application had been considered in light of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan, the NPPF and accompanying Planning Practice Guidance.
- The principle of development was in accordance with policy SSP M2 of the SSP which allocated the site for sand and gravel extraction. The proposal also included the restoration of the site through the importation of inert waste. The site was not allocated for inert fill but the proposal complied with policies CS18 and CS25 of the Core Strategy with regards to managing waste outside allocated areas due to the requirements to restore high grade agricultural land, and, as the applicant had also highlighted the limited availability of inert fill capacity coming forward at the strategic Block Fen / Langwood Fen allocated site (policy CS20), it was accepted that there may be a requirement to divert inert fill in the plan area to other available sites. The retention of the stocking and processing area, and the concrete batching plant represent a sustainable method of maximising the use of the existing site and the facilities were considered to be co-located complementary to the quarrying and landfill activities and accord with policies CS18 and CS41 of the Core Strategy.
- An Environmental Statement, including the additional information requested and provided, accompanies the application which was considered comprehensive and meets the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017.
- Detailed topic areas had been assessed and considered;- With regard to landscape and visual impact, the proposal was in compliance with policies CS24, CS33 and CS34. Nature conservation, ecology, geodiversity, including

the impacts on protected species and habitats, had been carefully considered and were in accordance with policies CS25, CS34 and CS35. Issues of noise and dust had been considered and were in accordance with policy CS34. Soils and agriculture, including the retention and re-use of high grade agricultural soils, and the balance of the proposed restoration between agricultural and ecological aims, had been carefully considered and were in compliance with policies CS25 and CS38. Cultural heritage, including archaeology, the historic environment and notably the adjacent Bar Pasture Scheduled Monument, had been assessed and were in accordance with policy CS36. The impact on water resources and the water environment had been assessed and the proposal was in compliance with policy CS39. Transport, including the proposed Willow Hall Lane crossing point, had been carefully considered and was in compliance with policy CS32.

- Cumulative impacts with the neighbouring quarries at Pasture House Farm, Willow Hall Farm and Podge Hole had also been taken into account.
- Comments of consultees had been taken into account and suitable conditions attached to address any issues raised. The comments of the neighbours and other respondents, both for and against the proposals, had also been taken into account, and the positive and negative aspects of the proposal weighed in the balance. Further, given that the majority of the site was allocated for sand and gravel extraction and in all other respects the proposal was acceptable, there was no reason not to approve the application in line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act.
- Consideration had been given to the interaction of the proposals with those set out in application 17/01707/WCMM for amendments to the sequence of phasing and restoration of the existing site, and it was considered that appropriate control could be exercised over both applications for them to be considered for approval.

Chairman
1.30pm – 3.50pm