

WATERBEACH PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held at 7.30 pm on Tuesday 30 January 2018 at the Old Pavilion, Waterbeach.

17/200 THOSE PRESENT / APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Present: Cllrs Bull, Gaunt, Gilzean, A Grant, K Grant, B Johnson, P Johnson, Rabbett, Shipp, Smart, Williams, J Williamson, M Williamson, Wright

Apologies: Cllrs A Grant, Howlett

Not Present: Cllr Rabbett

In Attendance: S Mason – Clerk

17/201 OPEN FORUM

There were a number of residents who spoke about the Energy to Waste application

A resident expressed concern in terms of the viability of the proposal and the track record of the operator. A local group (Cambridge Without Incinerator) had been formed. At the previous evening's public meeting Amey had asked people to indicate if they might be in favour and she felt any Councillors who had 'voted' should not discuss the proposal tonight.

A resident had concerns about the impact on roads that the additional transit lorries would cause and also felt that the images Amey had published of the chimney were disingenuous at best.

A new village resident expressed shock at the proposal and was concerned that the Planning authority may already have made their minds up on it

A resident was asked the Council to think about the steam that would be emitted and how it would feel if that was water going into the water system. A petition had been organised that had so far attracted over 1000 signatures. He raised issues about the noise and the fact that the facility would import waste from other areas of the country.

A resident from the Denny Abbey area of the parish said at one time the waste park operator had said they considered the Levitt's Field a nature reserve. They also expressed concern over chimney height.

A resident from the Denny Abbey area was concerned that Environmental Agency monitoring would not be effective

17/202 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 9 January will be considered at the next meeting

17/203 MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Cllr K Grant 17/204 – has commented on the proposal as a resident

Cllr J Williamson 17/204 as Chair of the Denny Abbey Farmland Museum

Cllr M Williamson 17/204 – as treasurer of Denny Abbey Farmland Museum

Cllr P Johnson – as SCDC representative on the board of the Farmland Museum

17/204 PLANNING ISSUES

Planning application S/3372/17/CW for Energy to Waste Facility, Waterbeach,

Cllr Shipp raised a point of order. A Cambridge News article had a photo showing one of the Cllrs which could be construed as predetermination. The Chair referred to advice from the DCLG Minister Brandon Lewis on the issue :

It is worth drawing a distinction between pre- determination and pre-disposition. Councillors should not have a closed mind when they make a decision. However, before the meeting, councillors may legitimately be publicly pre-disposed to take a particular stance. This can include, for example, previously stated political views or manifesto commitments.

At the decision-making meeting, councillors should carefully consider all the evidence that is put before them and must be prepared to modify or change their initial view in the light of the arguments and evidence presented. Then they must make their final decision at the meeting with an open mind based on all the evidence. Such a fair hearing is particularly important on quasi-judicial matters, like planning or licensing.

Members must therefore come to the discussion with an open mind. Members initially fed in their feelings about the previous evening's public meeting, organised by a District Cllrs. Cllr Smart and Shipp then reported back on their findings following a visit to the Gt Blakenham facility opened 3 years ago and operated by SITA. A local Liaison group had said they were happy to answer any questions and Cllr Smart volunteered to collate these.

After a lengthy debate Council voted to **RECOMMEND REFUSAL** of the application. A recorded vote was requested:

In favour 10: Cllrs Bull, Gaunt, Gilzean, K Grant, B Johnson, P Johnson, Williams, Wright, J Williamson, M Williamson

Abstentions: 2 Cllrs Shipp and Smart

The points made in the annex to this set of minutes will form the basis of the Council's formal response to the consultation

17/205 2018/19 BUDGET AND COUNCIL PRECEPT 2018/9

A draft budget had been circulated and it was **AGREED** to adopt this as the budget for 2018/19.

Proposed: Cllr Bull Seconded: Cllr J Williamson. A recorded vote was requested:

In favour: : Cllrs Bull, Gaunt, Gilzean, B Johnson, P Johnson, Shipp, Williams, J Williamson, M Williamson, Wright

Against: 0

Abstentions 2: Cllrs K Grant, Smart

It was agreed to extend the meeting by 15 minutes

Proposed: Cllr Wight Seconded: Cllr Williams Unanimous

An explanatory note had been presented to the Jan 9 meeting and it was **AGREED** that the precept be fixed at £154,923

Proposed: Cllr M Williamson Seconded: Cllr P Johnson. A recorded vote was requested

In favour: 9 Cllrs Bull, Gaunt, B Johnson, P Johnson, Shipp, Williams, J

Williamson, M Williamson, Wright

Against: 0

Abstentions 3: Cllrs Gilzean, K Grant, Smart

17/206 LOCAL HIGHWAYS IMPROVEMENT BID

The initial feedback from County Highways Officer was noted – evidence from the Neighbourhood Planning process and the recent Gibson Close application should be drawn to their attention. The Clerk was also asked to accept the offer of a site visit.

The meeting closed at 9.43pm

Unapproved

Points from the discussion to be included in the Consultation response

Robustness of data

The fact that CCC commissioned an independent noise assessment review that concluded the application underestimates its effects leads the Council to question whether other claims on environmental impacts (light etc) are also unduly optimistic.

Community involvement

The level of engagement had been poor for such a significant consultation. The contrast was made with the major developers of the barracks site who both leafleted residents and ran consultation exhibitions in the village. A public meeting the previous evening was too little too late and feedback had shown that many had found the presentations and answers confusing.

Pollution – effects on health

Should the development be approved despite the WPC recommendation that it isn't, it is crucial that the Environment Agency set their conditions at the highest possible level for all the different elements and not only the 10 in the Industrial Emissions Directive (see paras 206-7 of the Defra publication Energy from Waste – a Guide to the debate):

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/284612/pb14130-energy-waste-201402.pdf

The same high limits should also apply to any additional elements that may be monitoring in the future. This is necessary given the high levels of development now planned on the other side of the A10 (which were not in the Local Plan at the time the Energy to waste plant was prosed in 2012)

Traffic

The Council took note of a recent independent report commissioned by CCC suggesting that the applicant has underestimated the effects of noise in its proposal. In view of this, and the recent A10 study, the Council would like to see an independent review of the data on creation of traffic to be assured that the figures are valid.

Should the development be approved despite the WPC recommendation that is isn't, the Council believe that Amey should be required to make a financial contribution (S106) to ameliorate the additional traffic and effects on the A10, and on local residents especially those close to the site. Moreover, the Council would ask that it is consulted by the County Council during its deliberations on what type of contribution is appropriate.

Visual Impact

The Council voted that the current design was unacceptable in visual impact terms.

Should the development and design be approved despite the WPC recommendation that it isn't, it wants to see better mitigation measures than those currently proposed. These should be in the form of screening the facility with semi mature trees comprising a mix of native species to protect against the risk of single species disease.