

## NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

### PLANNING COMMITTEE

**MINUTES of the meeting held at Ground Floor Committee Room - Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham, NG2 3NG on 20 January 2016 from 14.30 pm - 15.33 pm**

#### **Membership**

##### Present

Councillor Chris Gibson (Chair)  
Councillor Cat Arnold (Vice Chair)  
Councillor Jim Armstrong  
Councillor Azad Choudhry  
Councillor Alan Clark  
Councillor Michael Edwards (minutes 38-40 and 41(b))  
Councillor Rosemary Healy  
Councillor Sally Longford  
Councillor Brian Parbutt  
Councillor Wendy Smith  
Councillor Linda Woodings  
Councillor Steve Young

##### Absent

Councillor Graham Chapman  
Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan  
Councillor Toby Neal  
Councillor Malcolm Wood

#### **Colleagues, partners and others in attendance:**

Judith Irwin - Senior Solicitor  
Rav Kalsi - Senior Governance Officer  
Martin Poole - Area Planning Manager  
Nigel Turpin - Heritage and Urban Design Manager  
Lisa Guest - Principal Officer, Highways Development Control

#### **38 APOLOGIES**

Councillor Graham Chapman – other Council business  
Councillor Gul Khan - leave  
Councillor Malcolm Wood – non Council business

#### **39 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Alan Clark declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 5 'Eastcroft Energy From Waste Facility, Incinerator Road,' as a Nottingham City Council-appointed Director of Enviro-Energy, who are a customer of the Eastcroft Energy Facility, which did not prevent him from speaking or voting.

Councillor Michael Edwards declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 5 'Eastcroft Energy From Waste Facility, Incinerator Road' by reason of his having made public statements in support of the existing facility. He decided to take no part in the discussion or voting and he left the room prior to consideration of the item.

## **40 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 December 2015 were amended to include Councillor Wendy Smith's apologies for absence having been given, and subject to that amendment they were agreed by the Committee and signed as a true record by the Chair.

## **41 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **(a) Eastcroft Energy From Waste Facility, Incinerator Road**

Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, introduced the report of the Director of Planning and Transport and application 15/02548/PMFUL3 submitted by Axis on behalf of FCC Environment for planning permission for the extension and refurbishment of the Eastcroft Energy from Waste (EFW) facility, including:

- The addition of a third line with a new boiler and grate;
- New flue gas treatment;
- New turbine hall and air cooled condensers;
- Enlargement of tipping hall;
- New admin and welfare building;
- New export substation;
- New workshop;
- Architectural louvres and mesh screens around existing and proposed external plant;
- Re-cladding, re-painting and cleaning of existing structures;
- Miscellaneous ancillary equipment including pipe bridges, tanks and silos;
- Replacement gatehouse and weighbridge office;
- Demolition of former clinical waste incinerator building;
- Temporary accommodation and weighbridges (on site);
- Temporary compound (off site);
- Landscape scheme and other associated infrastructure.

The report was brought to the Committee because it was a major development which was sensitive, having regard to the planning history of the site.

The Committee also considered additional information contained in the update sheet, copies of which were placed around the table and which had also been published subsequent to the agenda publication.

During the discussion the Committee considered the following issues:

- (a) The EU Waste Framework Directive and Compliance with Waste hierarchy laid down a priority order of what constituted the best overall environmental option for managing waste. The framework incorporated an efficiency calculation (known as the R1 formula) which set a threshold by which to determine whether an incinerator plant could be considered as a more efficient recovery operation. Eastcroft Energy from Waste was operating as an energy recovery facility without the appropriate R1 status. A condition had been

included in the draft decision notice to ensure that a formal process was pursued via the Environment Agency to achieve the necessary R1 status;

- (b) The Committee welcomed the design of the scheme and felt that it was appropriate for its surroundings.

## **RESOLVED**

- (1) That the requirements of Part 2 of Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 were satisfied by reason of the Environmental Statement submitted in support of the application including at least the following information:**
  - (a) description of the development comprising information on the site, design and size of the development;**
  - (b) a description of the measures envisaged in order to avoid, reduce and, if possible remedy significant adverse effects;**
  - (c) the data required to identify and assess the main effects the scheme was likely to have on the environment;**
  - (d) an outline of the main alternatives studied by the applicant and an indication of the main reasons for rejecting these, taking into account the environmental effects;**
  - (e) a non-technical summary of the information provided under (a) to (d) above.**
- (2) That the implications of the development addressed in the Environmental Statement subject to the mitigation measures proposed did not amount to major adverse effects or main effects or other adverse impacts that would justify the refusal of the application.**
- (3) That in making the decision on this application, the environmental information being the Environmental Statement and the representations received on it had been taken into account. The Environmental Statement met the minimum requirements of Part 2 of Schedule 4 to the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 and was sufficient having regard to Part 1 of Schedule 4 to those Regulations.**
- (4) That Regulation 24(1) of the Environment Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 be complied with as soon as reasonably practical and the Director of Planning and Transport be delegated to undertake the necessary requirements, namely to notify the decision in writing to the Secretary of State, inform the public of the decision by newspaper advertisement and to place on deposit for public inspection a statement containing the content of the decision and the conditions attached to it, the main reasons and consideration on which the decision is based and a description, where necessary, of the main measures to avoid, reduce and, if possible offset any major adverse effects of the development, and**

**also to contain information on the ability to and procedures for the challenge of the decision.**

- (5) To grant planning permission subject to the indicative conditions substantially in the form listed in the draft decision notice and the additional condition listed in the update sheet.**
- (6) To delegate power to the Director of Planning and Transport to determine the final details of the conditions of the planning permission.**

**(b) Cedars Hospital, Foster Drive**

Martin Poole, Area Planning Manager, introduced the report of the Head of Development Management and Regeneration and application 15/02805/PMFUL3 submitted by Axis on behalf of Gilling Dod Architects on behalf of Capital Project Manager – Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS for planning permission for the development of two buildings and the refurbishment and alteration of a third building.

The report was brought to the Committee because it was a major application on a prominent site, where there were important land-use, design or heritage considerations.

The Committee also considered additional information contained in the update sheet, copies of which were placed around the table and which had also been published subsequent to the agenda publication.

During the discussion the Committee considered the following issues:

- (a) The attractive and dramatic design of the development was welcomed;
- (b) There was concern regarding parking on Joyce Avenue and that access to residential properties might be adversely affected during peak times. Members of the Committee were satisfied with the proposed imposition of a condition requiring the submission of a car parking management plan and the subsequent monitoring for 12 months of the operation of parking arrangement on the site;
- (c) The Committee noted the highly sustainable and accessible location of the site and welcomed the proposed imposition of a condition requiring the submission of a travel plan;
- (d) In view of the adequate provision of car parking spaces within the site, and the conditions relating to car parking management plan and travel plan, it was not felt that a traffic regulation order was required at this time. If however parking problems did arise later which could not be satisfactorily addressed via better on site management of the existing parking places or improved travel plan measures, discussions could be opened with the developer regarding a possible traffic regulation order and those discussions would include responsibility for meeting the costs inherent in processing such an order.

**RESOLVED to**

- (1) Grant planning permission subject to the indicative conditions listed in the draft decision notice and the additional conditions listed in the update sheet;**
- (2) Delegate power to the Head of Development Management and Regeneration to determine the final details of the conditions.**