

Addendum for Planning and Regulation Committee 20th July 2020

Report by Director of Planning & Place (**PN6**) (Agenda Item 6 (pages 7 to 70))

Paragraph 26 – it is stated in the report that “*There have been forty-nine third-party representations received. These were all objections to both applications and are summarised in Annex 7.*” This should read “*There have been fifty-six third-party representations received. These were all objections to both applications and are summarised in Annex 7.*”

No further material, planning considerations have been received to be considered, than have already been summarised in Annex 7 of the report.

Paragraph 33 – it is stated in the report that:

Recommendation:

Limitation of operations to those extant in infringement of condition as surveyed by Helix Transport Consultants.

Conditions not applied for under s73 here but of highways origin should be carried over from the original application, granted as MW.0049/11.

Routeing to be prohibited via A415 at Marcham. The least impact would be the A34 to be joined via the A338 and the A420 by condition.

This should read:

Recommendation:

Conditions not applied for under s73 here but of highways origin should be carried over from the original application, granted as MW.0049/11.

Routeing to be prohibited via A415 at Marcham. The least impact would be the A34 to be joined via the A338 and the A420 by condition.

For Clarity, the Highway's Authority's final response was that in Highway's terms, 40 movements per day (20 in, 20 out) would be acceptable subject to the routeing agreement set out in the report.

Paragraph 34 – OCC Planning Policy comments. It is stated in the report that:

Conclusion

- *The site complies with policies M1 and W3; it would provide capacity for increased recycling*
- *In terms of general location under policy W4, the site is within the area for a strategic site that would deal with waste from across the County, and this site would deal with well above the 50,000tpa threshold for such a site.*
- *The site does not meet any of the priorities for the siting of waste management facilities. The applicant has provided no evidence as to why the site would be the most suitable and sustainable option.*
- *It does not comply with policy W5, and though the site has been considered suitable for a small-scale local facility, it does not follow that it*

is suitable for expansion onto adjoining greenfield, nor that it is suitable for a larger scale facility.

This should read:

Conclusion

- *The site complies with policies M1 and W3; it would provide capacity for increased recycling*
- *In terms of general location under policy W4, the site is within the area for a strategic site that would deal with waste from across the County, and this site would deal with well above the 50,000tpa threshold for such a site.*
- *The site does not meet any of the priorities for the siting of waste management facilities. The applicant has provided no evidence as to why the site would be the most suitable and sustainable option.*
- *It does not comply with policy W5, and though the site has been considered suitable for a small-scale local facility, it does not follow that it is suitable for expansion onto adjoining greenfield, nor that it is suitable for a larger scale facility.*

Further response

For clarity the previous comments that the site does not appear to conform with policy W5 relate only to the extension to the permitted site (MW.0135/19). The permitted site complies with policy W5 because it is a site already within a waste management use.

Annex 4 – Expanded Consultee Response. The Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team comments should have included the comments (received June 26) below:

Further Response

Tonnages

The proposal would bring in 300,000 tonnes of waste per day to the site, and over 252 days that would be 75,600tpa. However some of the lorry movements would be taken up removing material from the site unless the same lorries bringing waste in were also taking waste out.

Breakdown of Material

69% topsoil seems a high proportion for excavation waste that would normally contain subsoil. In any case the evidence provided is that 99% of the waste is diverted from landfill. The policy team has no evidence to the contrary.

Geographical Coverage

These locations don't suggest any local tie to the area around Swannybrook farm and there is no suggestion that the location is proximate to waste arising or the market for recycling.

Planning Considerations

Policy W5:

The description of previously developed land (PDL) in the NPPF helps with the decision as to whether the site is considered to be PDL. The aerial photograph

shows that most of the airfield has now gone or blended in with the landscape, it appears that the extension site (MW.0135/19) has also now become agricultural land, and indeed the description of development is evidence of that, but that is something ultimately for the case officer to assess.

For clarity the previous comments that the site does not appear to conform with policy W5 relate only to the extension to the permitted site (MW.0135/19). The permitted site complies with policy W5 because it is a site already within a waste management use.

Paragraphs 5.34 and 5.35 doesn't contain any evidence. It expresses the applicant's opinion that the proposed development is the most suitable and sustainable option, but it doesn't appear to me that there is any evidence to demonstrate that to the planning authority.

Annex 7 – Third Party Representations. This should state the same number of responses, as stated in paragraph 26.

We understand a letter from The Rural Planning Practice has been sent direct to members on behalf of one of the objectors in relation to these applications.