

**Planning (Regulatory) Committee
Minutes of the Meeting Held on 16 October 2020
at 11am on Microsoft Teams (virtual meeting)**

Present:

Cllr Colin Foulger (Chair)
Cllr Brian Long (Vice Chair)

Cllr Mick Castle
Cllr David Collis
Cllr Eric Seward
Cllr Danny Douglas
Cllr Brian Iles

Cllr William Richmond
Cllr Bev Spratt
Cllr Martin Storey
Cllr Tony White

Also Present

Hollie Adams
Jane Linley
Nick Johnson
Andrew Harriss
Ralph Cox
Belinder Gill
Jonathan Hanner

Committee Officer
Team Lead (Planning & Environment), nplaw
Head of Planning
Senior Planning Officer
Principal Planner
Veolia; agent for the applicant
Principal Engineer (Developer Services)

1 Apologies and Substitutions

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Roy Brame. Also absent was Cllr Mike Sands.

2 Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes from the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting held on 4 September 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.

3 Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 No declarations of interest were made.

4 Urgent Business

- 4.1 There was no urgent business.

Applications referred to the Committee for determination.

5 FUL/2019/0067: Ernest Gage Avenue, Longwater Industrial Estate, Costessey, Norwich, Norfolk, NR5 0TL

- 5.1.1 The Committee received the report for the application for planning permission for construction and operation of a new industrial building (B2) to house the operation of a Waste Transfer Station, a vehicle depot and ancillary development; the proposed waste transfer station would manage non-hazardous municipal, commercial and industrial waste and construction of a new industrial building which would house the operations and relocation of the applicant's existing vehicle depot from elsewhere within the Longwater Estate.
- 5.1.2 The Committee saw a presentation by The Senior Planning Officer ([see appendix A](#)):
- Design of the proposed building was considered complimentary to the wider industrial estate and was on the site of a former scrap metal breakage site.
 - Existing tree screening would be retained.
 - Costessey Town Council Members and local residents had raised concerns about noise and gulls due to waste on the site, however all waste was proposed to be transported in covered vehicles and processed inside buildings; operations on site would require an environmental permit.
 - Costessey Town Council and the Local Member had raised concerns about an increase in traffic movements in the vicinity. The Highways Authority and Highways England had been consulted and raised no objection.
 - The Local Member had raised concern that the development would prevent long term plans for the second exit from William Frost Way to Queens Hill. Officers had reviewed the plans to provide a second, southern access to the Queens Hill area and concluded that the second option could be modified to avoid the application side by moving the proposed roundabout eastwards. This did not form part of the Local Development Plan and therefore only limited weight could be given to future highways developments.
 - Costessey Town Council had suggested that the applicant should make a contribution to upgrading the pedestrian crossing on William Frost Way; the application site was not identified in the Development Plan as a site required to make a contribution to pedestrian crossings.
 - The site was also not identified in the Development Plan as a site which should make contribution for improvement to the A47 interchange.
 - The proposal would contribute to driving waste up the hierarchy.
 - The proposal was in accordance with National Guidance and the Development Plan when taken as a whole and there were no material considerations stating it should be refused; agreement was therefore recommended.
- 5.2 The Committee asked questions about the presentation:
- Further clarification on B2 use was requested; the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that proposals for general B2 use was usually determined by the District Council but was a County Council matter in this case as waste management was involved in the application. It was recommended that the

operator discuss future uses on the proposed site with the District Council.

- The predicted rise in traffic in the vicinity was queried. The Senior Planning Officer clarified there was an existing site run by the operator in a different area of the Longwater Estate which was proposed to move to the site. There would be an increase in traffic movements however when it was a scrap yard there would also have been a number of traffic movements associated with the site.
- Local bus operators had not been consulted, but the highway authority and Highways England had not raised objections to the application. The Principal Engineer (Developer Services) clarified that the applicant had put forward a transport assessment which showed a marginal increase in overall traffic movements, as although there would be an increase in HGV movements there would be a decrease in car movements when compared to previous use on the site. However, the increase in peak time traffic would be minimal as operations of the site took place over a 24h period with some traffic movement from the site taking place outside of the typical peak hours.
- The building was not proposed to have negative pressure on the basis that this was commonly used to control odour at waste management facilities such as composting or anaerobic digestion plants where this could be an issue, and the Environment Agency had not suggested a need for this.
- It was clarified that, according to the applicants TA, the proposed development would have an estimated 74 two-way car/van movements per day compared to 114 under the previous use and 218 two-way HGV movements compared to 94 under the previous use. This would be an overall increase of 84 vehicle movements per day equating to a 0.26% net traffic increase on Dereham road and a 0.18% traffic increase on the A47. This would also equate to an approximate increase in HGVs of 9.7% on Dereham Road and 4.7% on the A47.
- Planning Officers did not know full details of the operation of the scrap yard which previously operated on the site, but thought it was unlikely that it operated 24h a day. The site operated as an open-air facility, whereas the application proposed handling to be indoors in a building with doors facing north, facing away from nearby residential areas. The route of HGVs would most likely be along the A47, away from local residential areas.

5.3 The Committee heard from Belinder Gill of Veolia, speaking on behalf of the applicant:

- Veolia was the number one waste provider in the UK, providing services to 130 local authorities and a large number of commercial providers, and employing 14,000 people.
- Ms Gill noted that no objections had been received from statutory consultees
- On objections raised related to vehicle movements and the impact on the local road network, Ms Gill noted that Veolia had an existing depot 50m away from the application site which was used for parking of 20 vehicles which left during the night and returned later to park. This activity would be relocated to the application site.
- Veolia had submitted a transport assessment with the application which concluded that there would be a limited increase in traffic movements which would have a limited impact on the surrounding highways.
- Ms Gill suggested that if another operator were to use the site under its current usage as a scrap yard, traffic movements would be uncontrolled due to the

current conditions of the site.

- The small increase in vehicle movements did not warrant a contribution towards making improvements to the crossing on William Cross Way and it would not be legal to ask for this
- Ms Gill also commented on local residents' concerns on local amenity; the nearest residential properties were 150m away from the site and the proposal would be an improvement on the operations which previously occurred on site. It would allow for segregation of waste and management of waste higher up the hierarchy, with the remaining waste being transported away from the site, which would support towards meeting targets for waste recycling and carbon emissions.

5.4 The Committee moved on to debate:

- Cllr Danny Douglas raised concerns as there was a large residential site around the proposed site and no dampening proposed, noting the impact of lorries exiting and entering the site early in the morning. He also felt that the application would exacerbate traffic in the area and affect local bus services which was not discussed in the transport assessment.
- Cllr Mick Castle, seconded by Cllr Bev Spratt, proposed accepting the recommendations.

5.5.1 Councillors were each asked for their vote on the proposal to approve the application (where a Councillor was not present for the whole debate, or was not able to declare their vote due to technical issues, no vote would be recorded)

5.5.2 With 8 votes for and 3 against, the Committee **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** that the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services be authorised to:

- I. Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 11.
- II. Discharge conditions where those detailed above require the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commences, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.
- III. Delegate powers to officers to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

The meeting ended at 11.52

Chair