

WHITTLESEY TOWN COUNCIL – Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 29th July 2024 at 7.30pm at Peel House, 8 Queen Street, Whittlesey, PE7 1AY

Present: Cllr Miscandlon, Bibb, Laws, Singh-Gill, Wainwright

Officer in Attendance: Sue Piergianni – Town Clerk

Recording: The recording is made as and aide memoir for the Clerk.

P58/2024. To receive apologies for absence from members.

Cllr Dickinson (work), no apologies were received from Cllr Nawaz or Arman

P59/2024. To receive the minutes from the Planning Committee held on Monday 15th July 2024

Ratified: The minutes were approved and signed as a true record.

P60/2024. To receive members' declaration of disclosable pecuniary, non-disclosable pecuniary and non pecuniary interests in relation to any agenda item.

Cllr Laws – Portfolio Holder for planning at FDC, will give policy advice but will take no part in discussions or vote.

P61/2024 – Update from Andrew Hodgson (Pegasus Group on behalf of BDW).

Outline planning application (all matters reserved, except for access) for up to 200 dwellings (including affordable housing and self/custom build plots), 2.3ha of safeguarded land for primary education, public open space, landscaping, children's play area, sustainable drainage infrastructure and all other associated infrastructure – to be submitting in the coming weeks.

Ready – but waiting for the new NPPF.

Since the last meeting, scheme has been revised to include:

- o 5% self and custom build plots.
- o An additional 0.3ha of land for primary education, making 2.3ha total – CCC request.

Additional independent work on local primary education needs has been completed. This work shows that there will be a need for additional education capacity in Coates/Eastrea/Whittlesey by 2032/33.

Scheme provides land sufficient deliver a new 2FE school. This land would be provided with an access and fully serviced as part of the S106 and transferred to the LEA.

P62/2024. Public Forum (Time allowed 15 Minutes).

14 members of the public present.

David Bailey – made the following statement against planning application CCC/24/048/FUL

Having lived and worked close to a ferrous recycling centre in the past – I am sure the residents who will be impacted by this change in operations will be appalled if it is passed.

I along with many residents had no notification of this application and was only made aware by a resident from Priors Road.

With the current Johnsons operations resulting in both Noise and dust, early in the morning and through out the day, compounded by the unacceptable increase in heavy lorries, any change of use to include shearing and compacting of ferrous material will have a detrimental affect on the neighbourhood. We are already subjected to trammel and vehicle noise from as early as 6.45am on some days and I fear that any additional processing of material will be detrimental to our health and enjoyment of our property. Current

mitigation activities have so far failed to provide any satisfactory relief from dust or noise. With the decision to allow the incinerator construction at Wisbech, additional processing and vehicles will additionally be bringing bottom ash and waste to this site for processing.

It seems a shame that once again we find ourselves having to oppose proposals which if passed will impact on our community that should have been refused due to proximity to residential dwellings.

John Bradshaw – echoed David Baileys comments. Sound levels made by crushing metal will echo around the pit, the additional of more vehicle movements will also cause more noise.

Andy Flatters – Viking Way – asked the council to strongly object to any development on the land on Viking Way.

Stephen Hodson – Asked members to take note of the Peterborough and Cambridge Minerals and Waste plan 2021. Mr Hodson also advised the committee representatives from Saxongate would like to speak on that at the CCC planning meeting. Could Whittlesey Town Council discuss with their County Councillor as see if this could be called in for discussion.

Mr Bessant on behalf of the Saxongate residents submitted this attachment to all Councillors, he advised that the Saxongate residents wish to object to application subject to consideration of the following points and possible planning conditions / mitigations

(attachment – Saxongate Group)

P63/2024. To consider planning applications received from FDC and CCC.

F/YR22/0710/F - Change of use of land for 15 No. touring caravans and 15 No. static caravans for recreational use with associated hard standing and to erect facilities block, bin store, chemical waste plant and sewage treatment plant (Revised description) at Land North East Of 351 Drybread Road Whittlesey Cambridgeshire Revised proposals have been received in respect of the above. The revision is: The Highway Authority considers the development to be acceptable (please see the Highway Authority letter dated 08.07.24) on the basis of the four additional passing places shown on the plan included in the Transport Note dated April 2024. Please confirm if the Town Council maintains its earlier objections/concerns.

The town council officially withdraw their objections to the planning application it is therefore recommended to approve.

F/YR24/0555/F - Erect a 2-storey side and a single-storey front extension to existing dwelling including render and plinth to all elevations at 76 Fieldside Coates Peterborough Cambridgeshire PE7 2BG

The Town Council have no objection and therefore recommend approval.

CCC/24/048/FUL - Metal Recycling Facility for the storage, sorting, separation, grading, sheering, baling, compacting, crushing, granulating and cutting of ferrous metals or alloys and non-ferrous metals. Informative: this application seeks to change the existing authorised waste site from plastics recovery facility and recycling of automotive shredder residue (ASR) to metal recycling. Location: Saxon Works, Peterborough Road, Whittlesey, Peterborough, PE7 1PJ.

The Town Council recommend refusal of this application and concur with all the comments below made from the Saxongate Group. They would also add there is a poor history of compliance at this site. Cllr Miscandlon will speak to Councillor Connor, asking if he can bring it forward to the Planning committee at CCC.

1) Operating hours - 07:00-17:00 Monday to Friday. Residents would like any operations that may generate noise dust and odour restricted to 08:00-17:00. Residents have suffered historically and have ongoing issues with noise and dust from operations on this site.

2) Source material – The application states that all material will come from Johnsons Aggregates Recycling Ltd (JARL). (material flowing from their sealed site next door which handles toxic IBA/IBAA), to reduce vehicle movements. We would like a planning condition to ensure this is the only fixed source which prohibits importing materials from any third party. The application is to process 75,000 tons of material. JARL are in negotiation with CCC for a planning permission to significantly increase their output. Residents would like to know if this processing request for 75k tons is based on Johnsons current approved production levels?

3) Transport – JARL have a planning condition that prevents them traveling east through Whittlesey on the A605. If they are now sending material to a site next door residents feel the same condition should apply to this application, otherwise they are simply circumventing this rule which has worked well for residents and prevented more HGV traffic through the town and the A605 road surface. There is no detailed transport plan with the application.

4) Noise – Noise is a major concern for residents. East Midlands Waste Management already run numerous operations in the same area under U1 and T9 self-exemptions and have done for a number of years. There have been numerous resident complaints for noise and dust. Agencies have often failed to differentiate between different operations and operators making meaningful enforcement actions very difficult and leaving residents to suffer the consequences. The noise assessment also includes background noise from the Eastern Buttress works which are temporary and have caused significant disturbance. After two years JARL finally achieved the noise levels requested by the EA, Residents would like to see identical noise limits set as a planning condition. Residents would also like to see a clear validation process to prove that any new operation is meeting its promised / predicted noise targets (34db LAeq / 1hr). That has not happened with previous applications, leaving residents to suffer from excessive noise for years. Aside from measured sound level any persistent / constant noises (whines, hums, droning) should also be eliminated, as these have also caused significant distress in the past. Vehicles should also have appropriate reversing sounders to avoid nuisance noise. Residents would like some form of automated noise monitoring to be included in the permission.

5) Contamination and dust - Residents are concerned about the contamination risk from IBA/IBAA leaving the Johnsons Aggregates Recycling Ltd sealed site. We ask officers to seek clarification on the nature of the material being handled (which is extracted from Incinerator bottom ash residue). Will the material contain any IBA or IBAA dust or dangerous metal dust and what testing and mitigation measures will be in place to control and monitor any pollution risks. We would like any planning permission to include a need for dust monitoring with defined limits, as exists for JARL. We note that JARL has also told the EA that third party dust impacts their permitted (sealed site) dust monitoring results adversely in the past (which they used as a mitigation). Residents fear this makes enforcement harder. Residents are also concerned about the contamination risk from dirty vehicle tyres. We would like a planning constraint to require wheel washes or some other form of mitigation to prevent this issue. The application says no new roads are planned. The lack of tarmacked roads and the lack of ownership / responsibility from previous planning applications for common access roads between existing operations leads to a lot of dust. There should be a clear responsibility for dust suppression on shared access roads to prevent this issue.

6) Water contamination risk - Residents are concerned about the risk of water course contamination from persistent toxic chemicals/metals. The applicant says the site is not near a water course, but it is next to a lagoon which is pumped directly into the Kings Dyke water course (currently without a valid permit). The application states that surface water will be disposed of into an existing watercourse (which would include water used for dust suppression one imagines). Residents have asked before for enhanced water testing and filtration due to the growing number of potential long-term / persistent chemical pollution risks on the site. Also, for a permit to be issued to control the water discharges from the EA.

7) Permit clarification: - What environmental permit process will be used to control the site (presumably from the EA) The applicant already uses a number of self-exemption certificates to operate on the current site. These are disliked by DEFRA and are due for national review as they are prone to misuse. Would the applicant consider applying for a bespoke permit to bring all their waste operations under one management system which would give residents more confidence.

8) S106 question - Residents would like to know if any form of S106 can be included in the application process to benefit local communities.

9) Lack of local weather data – Agencies have highlighted there is no local weather data (e.g. wind direction) for Whittlesey which makes enforcement harder. Could funds (for example from an S106 payment) be directed to set up a local weather station.

10) Lack of permanent receptor dust and noise data – There is a small-scale array dust sensor funded by FDC near Park Lane School. Could this be made permanent and could additional sensors be fitted to give residents long-term peace of mind around air quality risks. In addition, could some form of automated noise monitoring be introduced to detect issues from Saxon pit. Investigations are often long-winded,

unproductive and disruptive for residents. Could funds (for example from an S106 payment) be directed toward these issues.

11) Liaison group - There is no resident's liaison group for EMWM. As part of their application could this be encouraged. There is an active resident's liaison group with the core partner they have listed = Johnsons Aggregates Recycling Ltd.

12) Overall site management – The site is increasingly complex with multiple operations and permits which have common emissions risks (noise, dust and odour) and share access roads and drainage etc. Could the landlord be encouraged to consider installing an overall site manager / technically competent person to run the shared resources and encourage best practices.

Additional Information

Cllr Laws advised there is Planning training initially for district councillors on Wednesday 11th September 9.30 – 12.30pm with external planning consultants, there will be subsequent training for Town Councillors and Clerks.

P64/2024. Date of next meeting: Monday 12th August 2024.

Meeting Closed: 20:07.



.....
Cllr Alex Miscandlon
Chairman
Planning Committee

Saxongate residents wish to object to this application subject to consideration of the following points and possible planning conditions / mitigations: -

1) Operating hours - 07:00-17:00 Monday to Friday. Residents would like any operations that may generate noise dust and odour restricted to 08:00-17:00. Residents have suffered historically and have ongoing issues with noise and dust from operations on this site.

2) Source material – The application states that all material will come from Johnsons Aggregates Recycling Ltd (JARL). (material flowing from their sealed site next door which handles toxic IBA/IBAA), to reduce vehicle movements. We would like a planning condition to ensure this is the only fixed source which prohibits importing materials from any third party. The application is to process 75,000 tons of material. JARL are in negotiation with CCC for a planning permission to significantly increase their output. Residents would like to know if this processing request for 75k tons is based on Johnsons current approved production levels?

3) Transport – JARL have a planning condition that prevents them traveling east through Whittlesey on the A605. If they are now sending material to a site next door residents feel the same condition should apply to this application, otherwise they are simply circumventing this rule which has worked well for residents and prevented more HGV traffic through the town and the A605 road surface. There is no detailed transport plan with the application.

4) Noise – Noise is a major concern for residents. East Midlands Waste Management already run numerous operations in the same area under U1 and T9 self-exemptions and have done for a number of years. There have been numerous resident complaints for noise and dust. Agencies have often failed to differentiate between different operations and operators making meaningful enforcement actions very difficult and leaving residents to suffer the consequences. The noise assessment also includes background noise from the Eastern Butress works which are temporary and have caused significant disturbance. After two years JARL finally achieved the noise levels requested by the EA, Residents would like to see identical noise limits set as a planning condition. Residents would also like to see a clear validation process to prove that any new operation is meeting its promised / predicted noise targets (34db LAeq / 1hr). That has not happened with previous applications, leaving residents to suffer from excessive noise for years. Aside from measured sound level any persistent / constant noises (whines, hums droning) should also be eliminated, as these have also caused significant distress in the past. Vehicles should also have appropriate reversing sounders to avoid nuisance noise. Residents would like some form of automated noise monitoring to be included in the permission.

5) Contamination and dust - Residents are concerned about the contamination risk from IBA/IBAA leaving the Johnsons Aggregates Recycling Ltd sealed site. We ask officers to seek clarification on the nature of the material being handled (which is extracted from Incinerator bottom ash residue). Will the material contain any IBA or IBAA dust or dangerous metal dust and what testing and mitigation measures will be in place to control and monitor any pollution risks. We would like any planning permission to include a need for dust monitoring with defined limits, as exists for JARL. We note that JARL has also told the EA that third party dust impacts their permitted (sealed site) dust monitoring results adversely in the past (which they used as a mitigation). Residents fear this makes enforcement harder. Residents are also concerned about the contamination risk from dirty vehicle tyres. We would like a planning constraint to require wheel washes or some other form of mitigation to prevent this issue. The application says no new roads are planned. The lack of tarmacked roads and the lack of ownership / responsibility from previous planning applications for common access roads between existing operations leads to a lot of dust. There should be a clear responsibility for dust suppression on shared access roads to prevent this issue.

6) Water contamination risk - Residents are concerned about the risk of water course contamination from persistent toxic chemicals/metals. The applicant says the site is not near a water course, but it is next to a lagoon which is pumped directly into the Kings Dyke water course (currently without a valid permit). The

application states that surface water will be disposed of into an existing watercourse (which would include water used for dust suppression one imagines. Residents have asked before for enhanced water testing and filtration due to the growing number of potential long-term / persistent chemical pollution risks on the site. Also, for a permit to be issued to control the water discharges from the EA.

7) Permit clarification: - What environmental permit process will be used to control the site (presumably from the EA) The applicant already uses a number of self-exemption certificates to operates on the current site. These are disliked by DEFRA and are due for national review as they are prone to misuse. Would the applicant consider applying for a bespoke permit to bring all their waste operations under one management system which would give residents more confidence.

8) S106 question - Residents would like to know if any form of S106 can be included in the application process to benefit local communities.

9) Lack of local weather data – Agencies have highlighted there is no local weather data (e.g. wind direction) for Whittlesey which makes enforcement harder. Could funds (for example from an S106 payment) be directed to set up a local weather station.

10) Lack of permanent receptor dust and noise data – There is a small-scale array dust sensor funded by FDC near Park Lane School. Could this be made permanent and could additional sensors be fitted to give residents long-term piece of mind around air quality risks. In addition, could some form of automated noise monitoring be introduced to detect issues from Saxon pit. Investigations are often long-winded, unproductive and disruptive for residents. Could funds (for example from an S106 payment) be directed toward these issues.

11) Liaison group - There is no resident's liaison group for EMWM. As part of their application could this be encouraged. There is an active resident's liaison group with the core partner they have listed = Johnsons Aggregates Recycling Ltd.

12) Overall site management – The site is increasingly complex with multiple operations and permits which have common emissions risks (noise, dust and odour) and share access roads and drainage etc. Could the landlord be encouraged to consider installing an overall site manager / technically competent person to run the shared resources and encourage best practices.



	 Safety helmets must be worn	NO BASIC PPE
 Eye protection must be worn	 Ear defenders use in line with activity risk assessment	NO JOB YOUR SAFETY IS OUR CONCERN
 Gloves must be worn	 Hi-visibility clothing must be worn	
 Safety boots must be worn	 Respirators use in line with activity risk assessment	NO UNAUTHORISED PERSONS BEYOND THIS POINT ALL VISITORS MUST REPORT TO RECEPTION