

# LITTLEPORT PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held in the Barn on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> July 2017 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor J J B Lee  
Councillor C Ambrose Smith  
Councillor D Ambrose Smith  
Councillor P M Cox  
Councillor C Webber

## PL17-18.09 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

A member of the public raised concerns over safety as he had a near miss on his mobility scooter at the junction of City Road and Granby Street now that the scaffolding has been removed and work is nearly completed on the extension to the flats.

Two residents of Mare Fen attended the meeting to share their views on Planning application (f), the presentation is attached to these Minutes for information.

## PL17-18.10 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors Jordan, Norman and Green

## PL17-18.11 DECLARATIONS

JL In respect of (e) and (f), CAS (f) and PC (f)

## PL17-18.12 To consider the following Planning Applications:-

- a) **17/00708/FUL – 64 Black Horse Drove – Change of use from an open plan home office to a self contained annexe. Applicant : Ms Jane Baker**

No comment

- b) **17/00999/FUL – 52 Victoria Street – Two storey rear extension. Applicant : Mr & Mrs Nigel Driver**

No comment

- c) **17/00944/FUL – 8 Ely Road – Two storey extension to side of existing property. Applicant : Mr & Mrs J and D Lampshire**

No comment

- d) **17/00952/VAR – Land of Wisbech Road – To vary conditions 3 (materials), 6 (soft landscaping) and 13 (biodiversity) of the decision dated 19/08/2014 of previously approved application 14/00411/FUL. Applicant : Jonathan and Rebecca James**

No comment

Due to declarations having been made at the commencement of the meeting, CW took chair for the next two items.

- e) **17/01033/TPO – 22 Hempfield Road – T1 ASH – Fell. Applicant : Mrs Miller**

No comment

- f) **16/01121/FUM – Land north of 190 Wisbech Road – Change of use of agricultural land to industrial (class B2) use and erection of a concrete manufacturing facility.**

Declarations of interest having been made at the commencement of the meeting, the committee was inquorate for this item.

JL resumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

- g) **17/01075/VAR – BP Wisbech Road Service Station – Variation of Condition 10 (Foul Water Drainage) to increase their height and floorspace etc. Applicant : Jonathan and Rebecca James**

No comment

- h) **17/01018/FUL – 2 Parsons Lane – Loft conversion with rear dormer window and 2 front roof lights. Applicant : Mr M Rahman**

No comment

- i) **17/01116/FUL – 1 Ferry Way – Erection of 1.8m fence with gates around rear garden and picket fencing at front boundary. Applicant : Mr Mark Wright**

No comment

Meeting ended at 7.31 pm

Signed:

.....  
CHAIRMAN

.....  
DATE

## Presentation by local residents to Little port Parish Council Planning Meeting 10.7.17

This is a planning application that you have previously supported but, as you may know, approval was quashed in the High Court so the application is live again. In the meantime, the Environment Agency has lodged two objections and the planning department of ECDC has requested much more information from McCann on a number of their claims so you will no doubt be consulted again in due course.

As far as the people you represent are concerned, all of those on the consultee list have formally objected as have many more local people, about 40 households at the last count.

A lot more information has now come to light about errors and omissions in McCann's original submission and about the practices of McCann at similar sites across the country. This is extremely worrying.

The scale of what is being proposed here is vast. It covers nearly half a square mile. In the words of the Ely Standard, Littleport will become "the concrete capital of the Fens".

Approval or otherwise is all about the balance between the claim that jobs will be created versus the damage and risks that will result.

We argue that the jobs claim is unreliable and that this is likely to cause a net loss of jobs to Littleport at the same time as causing damage and serious risks to the community.

FP McCann have submitted no evidence to support their "expectation" that 90 jobs will be created. Independent analysis shows this to be highly questionable. But let's just apply common sense. If you build a giant factory, you are going to need factory workers. So some jobs will be created. But are these the sort of jobs we want in Littleport? Will there be 90 of them? Highly unlikely. Will they go to local people? Again, unlikely. Most of the staff at the existing site are Eastern European agency workers.

Why don't we ask McCanns to produce some evidence? Why don't we ask them how many local people they employ currently? Or put it another way, why haven't they given us that information?

Even if McCann generates every single job it has promised, this will represent a return of 3 new jobs per acre of agricultural land lost. Is that a good return? Think of how many jobs there are in E-space on a tiny fraction of the land area.

Not only that, but this giant site will stifle future job creation at this location. The industrial park is the natural site for employment growth for Littleport. But who would site new office jobs or new light industry or new commerce right next to a giant noisy, dusty concrete factory? So those higher-quality jobs will be driven out of Littleport and the net effect of having this new concrete factory may well be a loss of jobs to Littleport.

FP McCann's **transport** report is not accurate. It has information that is plain wrong about the number of accidents in Wisbech Road, about bus times and they have told fibs about the size of their lorries.

There are going to be 40 or so lorry movements on a busy day.

Whenever a 16m lorry enters or exits the new site it will have to cross the centre line – even to turn left out of the site. So we will have large articulated lorries carrying cement, aggregates or blocks of pre-cast concrete, regularly going across the centreline on a busy 60 mile an hour single carriageway road. A road which will be even busier during the school run when the new school opens. This is bound to increase the risk of serious accidents

The existing site has a **dust** problem. Trebling the size of site will only, can only, increase this dust problem. The prevailing wind will blow this dust eastwards towards the new school.

Bad enough on a day-to-day basis but what if there's an accident?

The **noise** report submitted by FP McCann is not accurate. It suggests that concrete batching plant will only operate for 5 minutes each hour, it has omitted to measure the noisiest activity; it has neglected to take readings at the residential properties that will be affected. It does not comply with the British standard and much of it is simply cut and pasted from the noise report for another site altogether.

So, again, let's just apply common sense. The existing site is a constant noise nuisance to residents. A site three times the size, is going to be noisier.

The proposed new site is to be built on a floodplain. This is contrary to the National planning policy framework and has resulted in an objection by the Environment Agency.

The Environment Agency has also objected about the failure of McCann to address the water pollution that will be caused.

I could go talk about loss of agricultural land, about light pollution, about damage to the environment and to wildlife but time does not allow. Instead, I will just touch upon the planning process and then summarise.

This is the third planning application in recent years from FP McCann at this site and a bid has already been submitted for still further expansion to be included in the new local plan. No doubt this will lead to a fourth application.

FP McCann breached the planning conditions of the last planning approval at this site. At another site, they breached planning conditions regarding working hours and have an enforcement order against them, they also felled 100 mature trees without permission and have been issued with a restocking notice.

We have before us an application from a company that has submitted at least three similar planning requests at other sites in the recent past and has failed to deliver the jobs they promised. It is a company that routinely breaches planning conditions. It is a company whose noise report, transport report, ecology report and planning application generally has been shown to be inaccurate and misleading.

We think there are several reasons why you should oppose this application and they include the fact that

- We cannot be confident that the jobs claimed will be generated or will go to local people.
- In terms of jobs growth this would be a poor return for the amount of agricultural land lost and may actually drive existing and new jobs out of the area.
- It is out of scale for its location and should be sited on land allocated for industrial use.
- It will create a serious risk of road accidents, generate noise, dust, water contamination and light pollution.
- It will damage the environment and wildlife.