

APPENDIX 2

Site Specific Proposals – Schedule

This includes both preferred and non-preferred sites.

*Site references – SS1- New or allocated mineral sites; SS2 -Mineral safeguarding areas; SS4 -New Waste Management sites; SS5 -Milton Waste Water Treatment Works

Map number refers to the MWDP Proposals Map- only the preferred sites are included in this.

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
SS1 Site 4 Map 7	Needingworth	Sand and gravel extraction		NP	June 2005	Site not preferred but being safeguarded as future supply for sand and gravel. See SS2 Site 4. Boundaries are the same as at the previous consultation. Support the County Council's rejection of the site close to Willingham and Over.
SS1 Site 8 Map 13	Barrington	Chalk marl extraction Sustainable Transport Protection Zones	SSP 4 SSP 8 SSP 9 SSP 16	P	June 2005	The Council in June had been concerned about the size of the extension to the quarry and had requested that the proposal be reduced in size. The preferred site is considerably smaller now. The mineral safeguarding area is also considerably smaller being just around the existing quarry and the smaller extension site. In the MWDP the Barrington Cement Works Railhead has been designated as a Sustainable Transport Protection Zone(Policy SSP 16) in order that the in future consideration can be given to transporting minerals by rail. This is to be welcomed. Environmental Health comments: The impact of operations in this area would need to be assessed for noise, dust and vibration on the health of

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>residents.</p> <p>There is great local concern over the proposals to increase capacity at this site. Any such decision should only be made in the light of a full Health Impact and Environmental Assessment with full public consultation at every stage.</p> <p>Conservation comments: The impact on landscape character is also likely to be an issue in considering extensions to the quarry. Would need to protect and retain strong boundary planting to the North and strengthen planting to the east. Also strengthen off site planting along Whale Way.</p> <p>The nearby road verge and possibly habitats in the site are used for foraging by at least one barn owl that is now regularly seen. The small copses are used as breeding display areas by buzzards that have recently returned to the district. It is probable that buzzards breed in the woodland nearby.</p> <p>In the January 2006 consultation a site at Barrington Cement works was put forward as a potential waste management site. This site has since been withdrawn so no site profile is available (SS4 Site 38)</p> <p>No objection subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
SS1 Site 16 Map 3	Cottenham	Sand and gravel extraction	SSP 1 SSP 8 SSP9	P	June 2005 & January 2006	<p>This site is the same boundary as consulted on in June 2005. This would be largely a continuation of existing quarry north of Landbeach.</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: There are a number of farmhouses within 200m of the site so there could be a potential impact on these properties in terms of noise and dust. The impact on residents should be assessed further and appropriate measures taken to mitigate the effects if necessary.</p> <p>Conservation comments: There would have to be mitigation and strengthening of field patterns along B1049 to link Twenty Pence Pit, Bean Ditch and river corridor. Measures would be needed to protect and enhance to reduce impact on Cottenham Load corridor. Also there would need to be mitigation and enhancement to reduce impact on river Great Ouse corridor.</p> <p>An additional site at Smithey Fen was consulted on in January 2006 (SS1 Site 25) but this site has now been withdrawn so no plans have been included in the site profiles even as a rejected non-preferred site!</p> <p>No objection provided that mineral traffic is routed via the A10 and subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
SS1 Site 21 Map 19	Station Quarry, Steeple Morden	Chalk extraction	SSP 5 SSP 8 SSP 9	P	January 2006	<p>The site is the same as was consulted on in January. It is understood that this is a rare type of chalk. The proposal is an extension to an existing site. Whilst recognising that in view of its rare nature, it can only be worked where it exists, there are reservations in view of potential countryside impact. If this site were pursued it is essential that appropriate mitigation be provided.</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: there are several properties located around the site. Without details of vulnerable receptors and an environmental and health impact assessment it is difficult to evaluate this site. A number of farmhouses are within 300m of the site so there could be a potential impact on these properties in terms of noise and dust. The impact on residents should be assessed further and appropriate measures taken to mitigate the effects if necessary.</p> <p>Conservation comments: If the site were used there would have to be protection and enhancement of southern edge of Morden Grange Plantation. Protection and Enhancement of the Bell Barrow to the south of the site. Mitigation including strengthening of planting on existing track linking chalk pits to reduce impact of open views from Station Road. Mitigation including strengthening planting along footpath to Morden Grange farm.</p> <p>No objection subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
SS1 Site 35	Smithey Fen, Cottenham	Sand and Gravel extraction		NP	New site	<p>This site has not been considered before. Not stated who proposed it.</p> <p>Environmental Health comment: There are a number of sensitive receptors adjacent to the site; residential development including a traveller's site is in close proximity to the area identified. Without details of vulnerable receptors and an environmental and health impact assessment it is difficult to evaluate this site.</p> <p>Support the County Council's rejection of the proposed site. This location would not be suitable for mineral extraction unless mineral traffic could be routed via the A10. In any event, the site cannot be supported because insufficient information is available to assess the environmental health impact on nearby residents.</p>
SS2 Site 1 Map 3	Cottenham	Safeguard for Sand and gravel	SSP 7	P	June 2005	<p>This site adjoins the preferred option for extracting sand and gravel so although detached from the existing quarry is next to what will be quarried</p> <p>Although relatively remote from settlements, it raises the issue of how materials would be transported. It would not be acceptable through Cottenham village. This issue would need to be resolved before the site is safeguarded.</p> <p>Access to Smithy Fen is extremely limited, consisting of a single-track concrete road with passing places; there is also a very narrow hump-backed bridge with limited visibility across Cottenham Lode. Such a proposal would not be supported.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>Environmental Health comments: There are a number of sensitive receptors adjacent to the site; residential development including a travellers' site is in close proximity to the area identified. Without details of vulnerable receptors and an environmental and health impact assessment it is difficult to evaluate this site.</p> <p>Conservation comments: Mitigation of impact and enhancement of Cottenham lode and Great Ouse corridor County Wildlife Site. Mitigation and enhancement of Setchel Drove. Protection of Bullocks Haste Common and Roman Canal. Protection and Enhancement of Lakes and ponds at Twenty Pence Road.</p> <p>No objection provided that mineral traffic is routed via the A10 and subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation.</p>
SS2 Site 2	Hauxton	Safeguard for sand and gravel		NP	June 2005	<p>This site has the same boundaries as in the June consultation when the Council was concerned about the impact of this proposed site. It is therefore to be welcomed that it has been rejected at the preferred stage.</p> <p>Environmental Health comment: that part of the site is designated a Special Site Part IIa Contaminated Land as mentioned "in support" of the proposal. However it is questioned whether such land would support</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>such a development as extraction, which could alter groundwater flow and promote migration of pollutants. Planning Policy Statement 23 would require a suitable risk assessment to demonstrate that the site was suitable for the proposed use.</p> <p>Conservation comments: the adjacent river is of a good water quality and natural appearance. The land opposite is proposed to become part of the country park for a large housing development. Any impacts must not compromise the general landscape setting for the large housing development or impact on the quality of the experience when the public makes use of the country park. Aware of badgers using part of the site and barn owls and bats foraging over the grassland and river margins.</p>
SS2 Site 4 Map 7	Needingworth	Safeguard for sand and gravel	SSP 7 SSP 8 SSP 9	P	June 2005	<p>The site boundary has been amended from the issues and option stage. The area to be safeguarded has almost doubled in size and now extends further to the east so that it is much nearer to Willingham. In June the Council was concerned at the impact on Willingham and Over of the proposal. It would bring extraction closer to both villages and would need careful mitigation. .</p> <p>Environmental Health comment: that this site is within 1km of Willingham, Therefore dust, noise, issues would need to be assessed to ensure appropriate mitigation measures were adopted to minimise impact on sensitive properties.</p> <p>Conservation comments: Future extraction planned together with</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>mitigation to retain and strengthen strong edges and field patterns along Long Lane, The Pound County Wildlife Site, Hither Way, Furtherford, Middle Way, Further Way and Lords Ground. Mitigation needed south of the pound to reduce impact to buildings on Long Lane, Over. Mitigation needed north of Highgate farm to reduce impact to buildings on Over road, Willingham.</p> <p>No objection provided that buffer zones can be provided to ensure that appropriate separation and protection for Willingham and Over is provided and that mineral continues to be removed from the site via Needingworth.</p>
SS4 Site 5 Map 26	Cottenham Business Centre, Cottenham	Waste recycling and recovery Hazardous waste dealing with waste oil and fuel.	SSP 10 SSP 14	P	June 2005	<p>This site was put forward in the issues and options as a potential waste management site – no mention was made of hazardous waste issues.</p> <p>Environmental Health comment : This is a proposed extension to an existing facility but it is within 100m of residential premises therefore noise/pollution impact would need to be assessed.</p> <p>Conservation comments: Proposal removes large areas of scrub and wildlife cover in a very open area and is directly adjacent to Cottenham Lode with potential for pollution. It is probably reasonable to assume that great crested newts might be present associated with the open water habitats due to their general presence in parts of Cottenham.</p> <p>On the basis of the advice from Environmental Health and</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						Conservation that there is insufficient information to object or support to this proposal.
SS4 Site 8 A Map 51	Northstowe	Waste recycling and recovery	SSP 10 SSP 14	P	June 2005	<p>This is the continuation of a site allocation in the Waste Local Plan 2003. The allocation is for an area of search.</p> <p>In the Northstowe Area Action Plan it is suggested that an HWRC and bulking up facility be located on employment land within the new settlement. This allocation could therefore be more specific.</p> <p>Potential uses for site include - HWRC (& Bulking up transfer facility) Suitable for new waste management technologies</p> <p>In the potential uses there is not listed a temporary waste management facility for construction. This should be added.</p> <p>Environmental Health comment; There is the potential for a Combined Heat and Power plant at Northstowe and this should be included in the list of preferred uses. As this is a new development it would be possible to ensure minimal environmental impact at the design stage</p> <p>Northstowe should be included in Table 5 of the Site Specific DPD under the heading 'Energy from Waste facilities (if Waste Scenario 3 is developed) in order to allow for such a facility in the new settlement.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>Support in principle but object to the inclusion of the proposed Green Separation within the area of search. Northstowe will be a new town and it is likely that whatever the strategy for household waste recycling that a site at Northstowe would be appropriate. The Northstowe Area Action acknowledges the suitability of a proposed general employment area at the northern end of the new town site (adjoining the proposed Park & Ride site). Also forward the comments on Energy from Waste.</p>
SS4 Site 8B Map 28	Northern Fringe	Waste recycling and recovery	SSP 10 SSP 14	P	June 2005	<p>This is the continuation of a site allocation in the Waste Local Plan 2003. The allocation is an area of search</p> <p>Potential uses for site include Mixed waste stream recycling; Single stream recycling HWRC and bulking up transfer facility Suitable for new waste management technologies</p> <p>In the potential uses there is not listed a temporary waste management facility for construction. This should be added.</p> <p>Environmental Health comment: As this is a new development consider that it would be possible to ensure minimal environmental impact at the design stage by incorporating mitigation measures into the development.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>Conservation comment: Potential pollution into drain flowing into Cam. Limited space for landscape buffer.</p> <p>Object. It is premature in advance of the development of a strategy for waste management to support the possibility of providing a Household Waste Recycling Facility in the Cambridge Northern Fringe, which will be a relatively small, but high-density development. However, the County Councils Supplementary Planning Document “The Location and design of Major Waste Management Facilities” 2006 shows that such facilities can be planned into urban extensions.</p>
SS4 Site 8C	Cambridge East	Waste recycling and recovery	SSP10 SSP14	NP for HWRC	June 2005	<p>This is the continuation of a site allocation in the Waste Local Plan 2003 and is now not a preferred site...however the site was considered in two parts in January 2006- North and South of the Newmarket Road. (SSP4 Site 36 and SS4 Site 26)</p> <p>It was considered as a potential HWRC and bulking up facility</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: As this is a new development consider that it would be possible to ensure minimal environmental impact at the design stage by incorporating mitigation measures into the development.</p> <p>See comments below for SS4 Site 36. (South of Newmarket Road)</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
SS4 Site 36 Map 57	South of Newmarket Road, Cambridge	Waste recycling and recovery	SSP10 SSP14	P	January 2006	<p>This is one part of Cambridge East, which was considered as a whole in June 2005. The allocation is an area of search.</p> <p>Potential uses for site include Mixed waste stream recycling; Single stream recycling HWRC and bulking up transfer facility Suitable for new waste management technologies Temporary Waste Management Facility for construction/ demolition waste</p> <p>At the previous consultation stage the Council stated the following</p> <p>“This area forms the major part of a high-density urban extension to Cambridge, as proposed in the Structure Plan and the Cambridge East Area Action Plan. Whilst accepting the principle of providing waste facilities in close proximity to where waste arises, the difficulties in providing a waste facility here in an appropriate way should not be underestimated because of the high density nature of the development and the fact that there are no proposals for a general employment area where waste facilities would normally be located.</p> <p>Employment at Cambridge East is to be integrated into mixed-use developments, particularly in the district and local centres. It is not considered that a major waste management facility would be appropriate</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>in such mixed-use areas. Whilst it is recognised that modern waste management facilities are very different from older operations, they nonetheless involve significant levels of heavy traffic and have some issues of noise, dust, and odours and in principle are not good neighbours to be placed in close proximity to residential uses. This will cause significant difficulties in identifying a suitable site for a major waste management facility, without taking large areas of land from other forms of development for both the facility itself and the amount of landscaping that would be required to act as a buffer to other uses in the new urban quarter. The incorporation of a household waste recycling centre to serve the urban quarter would be easier to accommodate and would be appropriately located in the development.</p> <p>It should be made clear that this location would only be possible with the relocation of the Airport. The identification of such a large area of search is not helpful”</p> <p>Environmental health comments: Stated in January that there is a potential conflict with the proposal for large-scale residential development in close proximity to this site. The proposal should be subject to an environmental and health impact assessment. These comments still remain valid but have been added to - that as this is a new development it would be possible to ensure minimal environmental impact at the design stage by incorporating mitigation measures into the development.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>Conservation comment: Potential impacts on large areas of housing. Potential impacts on Cherry Hinton Brook and Coldhams Common. Potential impacts on view of City edge. Heavy traffic from Cambridge</p> <p>Support. Cambridge East will be the largest single development in the Cambridge Sub-Region over the next 15 years. To be planned at high densities, whatever the overall strategy for waste management the opportunity to make the development more sustainable by providing Household Waste Recycling Facilities on site is supported.</p>
SS4 Site 8D	Cambridge South	Waste recycling and recovery		NP	June 2005	<p>This is the continuation of a site allocation in the Waste Local Plan 2003. A new wider area of search has been considered at the preferred stage and rejected (Site SS4 47 – M11 area of search)</p> <p>Object. It is premature in advance of the development of a strategy for waste management to reject the possibility of providing a Household Waste Recycling Facility in the Cambridge Southern Fringe area. The County Councils Supplementary Planning Document “The Location and design of Major Waste Management Facilities” 2006 shows that such facilities can be planned into urban extensions.</p>
SS4 Site 8E Map 27	Cambridge North West	Waste recycling and recovery	SSP 10 SSP 14	P	June 2005	<p>This is the continuation of a site allocation in the Waste Local Plan 2003. The University Farm at Girton was considered for an HWRC in the January 2006 consultations. (Site SS4 28)</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>The allocation is an area of search</p> <p>Potential uses for site include Mixed waste stream recycling; Single stream recycling HWRC and bulking up transfer facility Suitable for new waste management technologies</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: This is a new development and it would be possible to ensure minimal environmental impact at the design stage by incorporating mitigation measures into the development.</p> <p>Conservation team: Potential impacts on large areas of housing. Difficult to integrate into existing landscape. Impact of heavy traffic on Huntingdon road.</p> <p>There is concern as to which of the potential waste facilities can be located on this site and whether the major waste facilities are suitable for this primarily residential area? It is not intended that there be an employment area in this urban extension. This land has been removed from the Green Belt specifically to meet the future growth needs of the University. Structure Plan Policy P9/2 states that it is reserved for predominately University-related uses and only to be brought forward when the University can show clear need for the land to be released.</p> <p>Object. It is premature in advance of the development of a strategy</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						for waste management to support the possibility of providing a Household Waste Recycling Facility in the North West Cambridge. However, the County Councils Supplementary Planning Document "The Location and design of Major Waste Management Facilities" 2006 shows that such facilities can be planned into urban extensions.
SS4 Site 18 Map 48.	Great Wilbraham Quarry, Gt Wilbraham	Waste recycling and recovery and inert landfill	SSP 10 SSP 11 SSP14	P	June 2005	<p>This is the continuation of a site allocation in the Waste Local Plan 2003. Access to the site is currently poor.</p> <p>Potential uses for site include Inert waste recycling Suitable for new waste management technologies</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: There is a question mark at the use of this site for landfill. The Environment Agency have highlighted that this site is close to a source protection zone on the chalk aquifer. There is therefore a potential for contamination to groundwater. The nearest residential is within 500 metres of the site therefore noise and dust impacts should be evaluated.</p> <p>Conservation comments: Presently very poor access but this will be improved if the Camgrain facility is built next year in the adjacent field. Substantial landscaping required to integrate the facility into a very open landscape.</p> <p>Object. It is premature in advance of the development of a strategy</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						for inert waste management to support the use of this site at Great Wilbraham. Much of the inert waste that is likely to be generated will arise from development, which is located in and on the edge of Cambridge or to the north of the city.
SS4 Site 21 Map 25	Bridgefoot Quarry, Flint Cross	Inert waste recycling	SSP10 SSP14	P	January 2006	<p>The site boundaries are the same as January. However at this consultation no mention was made of inert waste recycling. There are concerns about the access to the site from the A505.</p> <p>Potential uses for site include Inert waste recycling Suitable for new waste management technologies</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: In January it was stated that there is a private water supply close to this site and potentially sensitive receptors that could be affected by noise from the proposed facility. Mitigation measures or noise conditions could be used to prevent any issues arising.</p> <p>These previous comments continue to apply; further information available is that current works on site operate within acceptable levels, as plant is located at the bottom of the void.</p> <p>Object. It is premature in advance of the development of a strategy for inert waste management to support the use of this site at Flint Cross. Much of the inert waste that is likely to be generated will arise from development which is located in and on the edge of Cambridge or to the north of the city.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
SS4 Site 26	North of Newmarket Road	HWRC and transfer facility		NP	January 2006	<p>This site is the same as proposed in January and the Council at this time stated-</p> <p>“The Submission Draft Cambridge East Area Action Plan identifies Phase 1 of development on land north of Newmarket Road, which can come forward with the Airport still operational. The AAP identifies the considerable challenge that exists in creating a satisfactory residential neighbourhood ahead of the wider development and specifically adjoining the North Works site, and the relocation of some existing employment uses will be important to help provide a suitable residential environment. There will be no general employment area in Phase 1, which is the sort of location that a waste management facility could potentially be accommodated.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to locate a household waste recycling centre or transfer facility in Phase 1 in principle. It would significantly undermine the ability to create a successful residential area. This relates both to the nature and scale of the use and the type and level of traffic generation that would be created into an area with a single traffic access.</p> <p>The specific site proposed in the consultation document compounds these problems by completely taking up the limited frontage that exists to Newmarket Road between the car showrooms and the employment uses adjacent to the Park and Ride site. The Area Action Plan makes clear that the limited extent of this frontage will require a very careful design approach to provide an appropriate face to the development and to</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>enable it to integrate successfully with development south of Newmarket Road in the longer term.</p> <p>It appears that this objection is very much opportunity led in view of the County Council's concern that there is an urgent need for a facility, rather than the good planning of this major new urban quarter. Achieving a high quality neighbourhood will be crucial to achieving a successful new development in the longer term and this proposal would seriously damage the ability for this to be achieved.”</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: In January it was said that there is a potential conflict with the proposal for large-scale residential development in close proximity to this site. The proposal should be subject to an environmental and health impact assessment.</p> <p>The Council welcomes that this site is not a preferred option.</p>
SS4 Site 27	Glebe Farm, Trumpington	HWRC and transfer facility		NP	January 2006	<p>No comments were made about this site when reporting on January consultation.</p> <p>In assessing this site for an area of search for a HWRC and transfer facility the County has stated –</p> <p>‘The area appears to have potential in relation to the need for an HWRC to serve the Southern Fringe of Cambridge. It is located within the new</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>development area and close to the source of household waste in the southern part of the City. The site is also on land excluded from the Green Belt. However, the area has already been allocated for housing in the Cambridge City local development documents, and if taken for waste management would reduce the land available for new homes. An HWRC would also be located very close to existing and future residential areas, raising amenity concerns and requiring careful landscape/design mitigation. Access would need to be taken from the proposed southern access link road needed to serve the new developments. The site is above a major aquifer. Land availability would not be an issue.'</p> <p>For these reasons the County Council has not identified this site as a Preferred Site for an HWRC.</p> <p>The reasons given for rejecting this site could equally be used to reject the area of search allocations for the Northern Fringe, Northwest Cambridge and South of the Newmarket Road. These too will be on land identified for homes and will be located adjacent to existing and future residents.</p> <p>Object. It is premature in advance of the development of a strategy for waste management to reject the possibility of providing a Household Waste Recycling Facility in the Cambridge Southern Fringe. The County Council's Supplementary Planning Document "The Location and design of Major Waste Management Facilities" 2006 shows that such facilities can be planned into urban extensions.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
SS4 Site 28	Cambridge University Farm, Girton	HWRC and transfer facility		NP	January 2006	<p>The site is not preferred.</p> <p>At the January consultation the council stated - “This site is likely to be part of an area of land that will be removed from the Green Belt as an exception specifically to meet the long term needs of the University. It is a sensitive site, particularly the southern part which extends into a very open, visible area that forms an important setting for Cambridge. The nature of land contours mean that the rear of the site would be on land sloping down towards the M11 and would be very visible and potentially difficult to screen.</p> <p>If the alternative to provide a site in this sector were to be development in the more open Green Belt west of the M11, then consideration could be given to this site as an alternative subject to detailed consideration of its impact and potential for mitigation. The Council would not completely dismiss the site at this stage for HWRC, subject to further consideration of the waste strategy for this sector of Cambridge and sustainability appraisal of site options.”</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: In January it was stated that there are several properties located around the site. Without details of vulnerable receptors and an environmental and health impact assessment it is difficult to evaluate this site. Additionally, as this is a new development it would be possible to ensure minimal environmental impact at the design stage by incorporating</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>mitigation measures into the development. However, it is essential to consider this at the master planning stage to minimise impacts.</p> <p>Support the rejection of this site. The County Council in its assessment of the site highlights concerns about the danger to traffic of a site adjoining this approach road to Cambridge.</p>
SS4 Site 29	Crane Industrial Estate, Milton	HWRC and transfer facility		NP	January 2006	<p>The site is the same as consulted in January and at this time the Council stated the following -</p> <p>‘This site lies in the Green Belt. It adjoins an employment area within the Milton village framework to the west. To the east of the site are further industrial type uses, which lie within the Green Belt. The site adjoins the Milton Country Park, which lies to the north.</p> <p>The current access to the site running parallel to the A14 is basically single track and the access through the industrial estate is shared with that to the country park. Access is very poor and there are concerns that if there were significant queues to the site as there are at the existing Butt Lane site that this would go back to the A14 junction and have major impacts on traffic in this part of the village, including those visiting the Tesco supermarket and country park. Very significant improvements to the access would be essential if this site were to be considered.’</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: This site is located within an</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>industrial area and adjacent to the A14, there would be no objections in principle to a facility located here.</p> <p>Conservation comments: Any use of this site must not compromise the enjoyment of persons visiting Milton Country Park.</p> <p>Support the rejection of this site. It has not been preferred as a site for an HWRC because of its close proximity to the village of Milton and the fact that it is located on green belt land. There were also some concerns with regard to highway and traffic matters.</p>
SS4 Site 34 Map 20	Addenbrookes Hospital, Cambridge	Clinical Waste Management Facility incorporating energy from waste	SSP 10 SSP 14	P	January 2006	<p>The site is an area of search that is not within S Cambs boundaries.</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: An environmental impact assessment should be carried out to ensure potential emissions are not detrimental to public health.</p> <p>Support. This waste management facility is based on the Hospital's needs and can be supported whatever the overall strategy for waste management. Support also for the proposals for energy from waste subject to an environmental health impact assessment.</p>
SS4 Site 41	Gamlingay	Proposed extension of end of life recycling		NP	Not included in previous consult-	<p>This site was introduced at the preferred stage. It had not previously been considered. It was proposed to extend the life of an existing recycling centre.</p> <p>Concerns were expressed by the County Council in assessing the site in</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
					ations	<p>relation to the high potential for archaeological remains in the area. Any significant increase in heavy goods vehicles would raise environmental and highway issues with Gamlingay and Potton. There are residents within 200 metres. It is also located over two major aquifers but is not within a source protection zone. It has therefore been rejected as a preferred site.</p> <p>Support the County Council's rejection of the site. Whatever the overall strategy for waste management the County Council has identified serious objections to the extended use of this site.</p>
SS4 Site 45	Milton HWRC	HWRC and transfer facility		NP	Not included in previous consult- ations	<p>This site was proposed at the preferred stage.</p> <p>It is an existing HWRC, which has a temporary planning permission for this use. It is part of the landfill site and will be filled under current plans. In assessing the site the County Council has expressed concerns about queues at busy times affecting the local highway capacity/ road safety. Site is within Green Belt so a HWRC within a building on a long term basis is not consistent with the intent of the policies for the Cambridge Green Belt according to the County Council. It has therefore been rejected as a preferred site.</p> <p>Object. It is premature in advance of the development of an overall strategy for waste management to reject the possibility for the continued use of the present Milton Waste Transfer Site on the grounds that the site lies within the Green Belt. This rejection is also inconsistent with the County Council's proposals for a</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						replacement Waste Water Treatment Plant at Honey Hill and a Household Waste Recycling Facility at Hauxton, both of which are in the Green Belt.
SS4 Site 46	Thriplow HWRC	HWRC and transfer facility		NP	Not included in previous consultations	<p>This site has been considered as a permanent HWRC. It is some distance from neighbouring residential properties and a brownfield site already used for recycling. However the key problem with this site is its remoteness from Cambridge and the new development areas of the Southern Fringe. Highway access is poor giving rise to safety concerns. The site is located over a major aquifer and a Source Protection Zone. The site is located within the Green Belt. It has therefore been rejected as a preferred site.</p> <p>Object. It is premature in advance of the development of an overall strategy for waste management to reject the possibility for the continued use of the present Thriplow site. It has permanent planning permission and the WDA has leasehold on the site until 2041 and has therefore included it as a permanent site in the draft HWRC Strategy. There would appear to be a conflict in views at the County Council.</p>
SS4 Site 47	Area of search near M11	HWRC and transfer facility		NP	Not included in previous consultations	<p>This site was not considered in the issues and options stage. In assessing this site for an area of search for a HWRC and transfer facility the County has stated –</p> <p>‘This broad area of search encompasses land within and surrounding the main development areas on the Cambridge Southern Fringe. Any HWRC</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>site in this area would be well located to serve existing and new population in accordance with the proximity principle. However, much of the area has already been allocated for housing in the Cambridge City local development documents, and if taken for waste management would reduce the land available for new homes. An HWRC would also be located close to existing and future residential areas, raising amenity concerns and requiring careful landscape/design mitigation. Only areas with direct access (i.e. not through existing or proposed residential areas) could be considered. Highway capacity may be an issue. Site availability could not be guaranteed. Land at Trumpington Meadows is subject to a planning application. The Green Belt covers that part of the area beyond sites planned for development.'</p> <p>For these reasons the County has not included this as a Preferred Site for waste recycling and recovery (including an HWRC)</p> <p>If the Southern Fringe area is not considered suitable then it could be questioned how suitable are the other fringe areas – Northern Fringe, North-West and South of the Newmarket Road.</p> <p>The County Council has in their assessment of the area suggested that although not ideally suited development could be located to the north-west of the site, behind the existing development of the Park and Ride and the large shed associated with the plant breeding research buildings. Care must be taken not to harm the approach to Cambridge along the A10, the setting of the River Cam Corridor or the setting of</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>Trumpington Conservation Area and Listed Buildings, and the view of Cambridge from Chapel Hill.</p> <p>Object. It is premature in advance of the development of a strategy for waste management to reject the possibility of providing a Household Waste Recycling Facility in or close to the Cambridge Southern Fringe. The County Council's Supplementary Planning Document "The Location and design of Major Waste Management Facilities" 2006 shows that such facilities can be planned into urban extensions.</p>
SS4 Site 48	Bayer Crop Science Site , Hauxton	HWRC and transfer facility		NP	Not included in previous consultations	<p>This area of search was not included on the issues and options stage. In assessing the eastern part of this site for an area of search for a HWRC and transfer facility the County Council has stated –</p> <p>'The area appears to have potential in relation to the need for a HWRC to serve the Southern Fringe of Cambridge. This is brownfield land and it is not located within the Cambridge Green Belt. However, a significant difficulty in identifying this site for any waste management use is that it has already been included in the draft South Cambridgeshire Development Plan Documents as an allocation for housing. Land availability would also be an issue here. Related matters to be addressed include neighboring residential areas, access and landscaping.'</p> <p>Conservation comments: The adjacent river is of a good water quality and natural appearance. The land opposite is proposed to become part</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>of the country park for a large housing development. Any impacts must not compromise the general landscape setting for the large housing development or impact on the quality of the experience when the public makes use of the country park. Badgers using part of the site and barn owls and bats foraging over the grassland and river margins</p> <p>There would appear to be some confusion in the assessment of sites If land availability is an issue for this eastern side of the site then this is true for the preferred site too.</p> <p>Support. Whatever the strategy for waste management a Household Waste Recycling Facility at the former Bayer factory site at Hauxton would not be appropriate. The cessation of the industrial activities on the Bayer site and its replacement with a mixed housing/employment development as proposed in the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework provides an opportunity to secure an overall package of development which will be more sustainable than the continuation of wholly employment uses and will secure the remediation of a site which has been contaminated by the previous industrial use.</p>
SS4 Site 49	Oakington area of search	HWRC and transfer facility		NP	Not included in previous consult- ations	<p>This site was not considered in the issues and options stage.</p> <p>The site lies within the Green Belt where there is a presumption against built development except in exceptional circumstances. According to the County Council a suitable area should be located at Northstowe to serve this area.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>However in the absence of a strategy for waste it is unclear why this area has been brought forward for consideration.</p> <p>Support the County Council's rejection of this site. Northstowe will be a new town and it is likely that whatever the overall strategy for household waste recycling that a site at Northstowe would be more appropriate.</p>
SS4 Site 51 Map 35	Bayer Crop site West site only	HWRC and transfer facility	SSP 10 SSP 14	P	Not included in previous consult- ations	<p>This site was not considered at the issues and options stage having been proposed by objectors to the Glebe Farm proposals. It is considered by the County Council to be the best location to serve the needs of Cambridge southern fringe and surrounding villages.</p> <p>The proposal is for a HWRC without a separate waste transfer building. The County Council is currently in negotiations to enable waste to be taken direct to Waterbeach without the need for a bulking/transfer facility at the site. If such an additional facility were needed it would be incorporated into the same building as the HWRC. This has implications for all the HWRC proposals in the MWDP which all include an additional bulking /transfer facility.</p> <p>This site was not considered in the issues and options stage. In assessing this site for an area of search for a HWRC and transfer facility the County has stated –</p> <p>'The area appears to have potential in relation to the need for an HWRC to serve the Southern Fringe of Cambridge. Although beyond the urban</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>area, it is in reasonable proximity to proposed new developments and could also serve nearby villages. This is brownfield land, which has an established use as an effluent treatment works. Its use for waste management would not conflict with the South Cambridgeshire draft Development Plan proposals for Hauxton and it is well separated from any immediate residential neighbours. The planting and bunding around the site would greatly assist in landscape mitigation.</p> <p>Whilst access to the A10 is suitable in principle, it will be important to integrate any new junction design with any new access arrangements for eastern development and to ensure compatibility with any future use of the former Sports Ground between the site and the A10. The site is located within the Cambridge Green Belt. Land availability is known to be an issue.'</p> <p>The County Council has considered other land in the southern fringe and the site selection process indicated that this was on balance, the best site for this use in relation to a number of key factors including –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of previously developed land • Avoiding residential areas as near neighbours • Minimising conflicts with emerging planning policies of other local councils • Land benefits from a good level of existing landscaping • Relatively easy access from an A class road • A good proximity to existing future demand for a waste recycling service for existing and new households. <p>This list of factors was included in a leaflet available at exhibitions into</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>the MWDP. There should be a list of all the factors and they could form the basis for selecting sites in other areas – not just the southern fringe. The list of factors should be incorporated into a criteria based policy in the Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>The County Council consider that given the significant advantages of the site that an exception should be made for it to be located in the Green Belt. The alternative to the Green Belt would be to take up an area designated for new homes. This dilemma is one that could also be addressed in the Northern Fringe, Northwest Cambridge and South of the Newmarket Road areas and yet the County has come to different conclusions in these areas- allowing an HWRC to be alongside houses.</p> <p>The site is already being used as an effluent treatment works however unlike a HWRC this does not generate a significant amount of traffic. The County Council has stated that the only traffic that would visit the site are cars/vans owned by local residents and lorries accessing the site to collect the skips full of segregated waste materials. They consider that even if as many as 600 deliveries were made daily to the site, assuming these deliveries were made outside peak hours, the A10 would be minimally effected by congestion. The current usage for effluent treatment generates minimal traffic and cannot be compared to the proposed usage.</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: This site is designated as a special site under Part IIa EPA 1990, the land having been contaminated by previous industrial use. Any proposed development would need to</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>account for on-going remediation works and whether the site was suitable for the proposed use without risk to the environment or human health. There are residential properties within 200 metres and new dwellings are proposed for the Eastern Bayer site, therefore the impact of the new development would need to be assessed accordingly. However, as this is a new development it would be possible to ensure minimal environmental impact at the design stage by incorporating mitigation measures into the development.</p> <p>Object. It is premature in advance of the development of a strategy for waste management to propose a Household Waste Recycling Facility at Hauxton. The present waste water treatment plant is an inappropriate use within the Green belt which has proven acceptable only because of the direct link with the former uses on the Bayer Site. The cessation of the industrial activities on the Bayer site and its replacement with a mixed housing/employment development as proposed in the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework provides an opportunity to secure improvements to the Green Belt by securing a future use which will have less impact. The current waste water treatment plant does not generate any traffic but is prominent in views and detracts from the openness of the Green Belt on this important approach/exit from Cambridge.</p>
No Site ref Map 52	Pet Crematorium and waste	Waste safeguard- ing area	SSP14	P		This site is an existing site that is to be safeguarded under Policy SSP14. However no site assessment appears to have been carried out on this facility by the County Council.

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
	Treatment Facility Thriplow					
No site ref Map 62	Waste Management Park , Landbeach	Waste safeguard- ing area	SSP14	P		This site is an existing site that is to be safeguarded under Policy SSP14. However no site assessment appears to have been carried out on this facility by the County Council.
SS5 Site 1	Honey Hill	Waste water treatment		NP	January 2006	<p>This area of search was considered in January and at this time the Council stated-</p> <p>'This area lies in the Green Belt and is very open and visible, particularly from the A14. A site further from the A14 would provide better opportunities for screening, but may take it closer to other more local vantage points. With a modern facility that may well be enclosed within a building, the visual impact is a particularly important consideration in determining an appropriate location, notwithstanding that it may be acceptable to locate such a use in the Green Belt. The associated access roads and traffic flows would also have an adverse impact and intrude into the area.</p> <p>The proposal could have an adverse impact on the Wicken Fen Vision project and the Bridge of Reeds project that is being developed and there is concern that finance for these projects and their delivery could be at risk; a loss to residents of the sub region, not just the local area.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>Use of this site could set a precedence for future infill building and encourage development on this side of the A14, and could damage the green separation around Fen Ditton and Horningsea. As the proposal would involve Green Belt land, it is reasonable to expect that there would be mitigation as part of any proposals. Anglian Water require a site which would allow for further expansion in the future, which would have further impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>The relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Works is related to the proposed redevelopment of the Cambridge Northern Fringe, which includes land at Chesterton Sidings in South Cambs. If it is found that it is imperative that the use is relocated, this location should be consideration alongside other options.</p> <p>However, at this stage the District Council has not been offered other site options for consideration. Consideration of alternatives will need to be a key part of the sustainability appraisal of site options as an integral part of the preparation of the Site Specific Policies DPD. The County Council is urged to look for viable, sustainable and well-researched alternative sites, which would not cause destruction of the countryside and blight the lives of South Cambridgeshire residents.</p> <p>If the location was found to be the most appropriate following consideration of options, there would need to be very careful consideration of the detailed siting and design of the facility to minimise</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>any impact on nearby communities, and mitigation measures would be required.</p> <p>Summary: Pending the consideration of site options for the WWTW relocation, it is not possible to be definitive as to whether this is the least harmful site. However, there are clear reservations about this site.'</p> <p>There are now alternative options available and the County Council has now proposed that the eastern area of this site has more potential and is separately assessed (SS5 Site 4)</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: This site is recorded on the land quality database as having a potentially contaminative use in that there was infill material deposited circa 1976 (extracted for A14). There is also a disused railway line across the site. Any potential development should ensure that the site is suitable for the proposed use (PPS23). There is concern locally about this proposal, however without details of vulnerable receptors and an environmental and health impact assessment it is difficult to evaluate this site further.</p> <p>During the consultation in January there was considerable local opposition to the relocation of the WWTW to this area. The County Council in assessing the site listed a number of important factors, which could affect the area's potential for accommodating a water treatment works.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>Support the County Council's rejection of the larger site at Honey Hill.</p> <p>The current Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant is allocated for a primarily residential development in the Cambridge Local Plan and together with Chesterton Sidings will deliver some 2,000 – 3,000 dwellings.</p> <p>The County Council has responded to the District Council's objection at the earlier consultation stage when only a Honey Hill option was being consulted upon.</p> <p>The County Council's rejection of the western part of the site is supported for the reasons set out in the accompanying Site Profiles and Site Assessment Methodology 2006 document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inappropriate development in the Green Belt • Access via the Horningsea junction is not favoured • Close proximity to Horningsea, Fen Ditton and Stow-Cum-Quay • Account needs to be taken of nearby development proposals at Cambridge East • The area is rural and open in character • The location could adversely impact the Wicken Fen Vision

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>and the Bridge of Reeds initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rights of way cross the area or lie nearby • Effects on nature conservation, archaeology and water supply (aquifer) • Considerable local opposition.
SS5 Site 2	Milton area of search	Waste water treatment		NP	Not included in previous consultations	<p>The County Council in assessing the site has stated the following -</p> <p>‘The area is positive in relation to the emerging Core Strategy. The land is not liable to flood. Some planting already in place could assist in mitigating landscape impact. However, the available site area is significantly restricted by the proximity of a number of residential properties and other sensitive receptors in the vicinity, making it difficult to physically accommodate the development of a wastewater treatment works. The site also abuts the Science Park immediately to the south of the A14. Vehicular access would be required from Butt Lane to the A10. A public footpath crosses through this area. As with all potential relocation sites for the wastewater works, this site is located in the Cambridge Green Belt.’</p> <p>Support the County Council’s rejection of the site to the west of Milton.</p> <p>The current Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant is allocated for a primarily residential development in the Cambridge Local Plan</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>and together with Chesterton Sidings will deliver some 2,000 – 3,000 dwellings.</p> <p>The County Council has responded to the District Council's objection at the earlier consultation stage when only a Honey Hill option was being consulted upon.</p> <p>The County Council's rejection of the site is supported for the reasons set out in the accompanying Site Profiles and Site Assessment Methodology 2006 document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inappropriate development in the Green Belt • The site abuts the Cambridge Science Park • Public access along Mere Way • Vehicular access would be required from Butt Lane to the A10 • Relatively open countryside in views from the north and south.
SS5 Site 3	Milton / Landbeach area of search	Waste water treatment		NP	Not included in previous consult- ations	<p>The County Council in assessing the site has stated the following -</p> <p>'The area is positive in relation to the emerging Core Strategy. There is some planting structure to assist in landscape mitigation, mainly in the southwest.</p> <p>However, there are some very significant constraints. Most of the site area is affected by liability to flooding, which would be a significant risk in relation to the operation of a waste water treatment works. The</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>southwestern end of the site lies in close proximity to the village of Milton. Much of the rest of the area is relatively open. Another relevant factor includes the importance of the area for archaeology. Although not given significant weight at this stage, it should also be noted that a major competitive rowing lake for Cambridge has been proposed here.'</p> <p>Support the County Council's rejection of the site to the north of Milton.</p> <p>The current Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant is allocated for a primarily residential development in the Cambridge Local Plan and together with Chesterton Sidings will deliver some 2,000 – 3,000 dwellings.</p> <p>The County Council has responded to the District Council's objection at the earlier consultation stage when only a Honey Hill option was being consulted upon.</p> <p>The County Council's rejection of the site is supported for the reasons set out in the accompanying Site Profiles and Site Assessment Methodology 2006 document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inappropriate development in the Green Belt • Most of the site area is liable to flood • Close proximity to Milton village

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open countryside • Important archaeological site • Proposals for a rowing lake.
SS5 Site 4 Map 68	Honey Hill East part of site	Waste water treatment	SSP 15	P	January 2006	<p>The site is the eastern part of the area considered in January.</p> <p>The County Council in assessing the site has stated the following -</p> <p>"The area is positive in relation to the emerging Core Strategy. The land is not liable to flood. There is potential for access via High Ditch Road from the A1303/A14 Stow cum Quy interchange. The site location is further from villages of Horningsea or Fen Ditton than the original area of search. Whilst the site has been brought closer to Stow-cum Quy than the first area of search, there is still a 1 kilometre of separation in relation to the main village. With high standards of odour containment anticipated at a modern works, such separation should provide adequate protection (prevailing wind directions have been taken into account).</p> <p>There remain a number of other factors which could affect the area's potential for accommodating a water treatment works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Account needs to be taken of the expansion plans for Cambridge East to the south of • The A14 but there is scope for adequate buffering; • The area is rural and open in aspect, requiring landscaping mitigation, however, the • Site is considered capable of appropriate landscape treatment; • The location could impact on the Wicken Fen Vision and the Bridge of Reeds initiative, but with an imaginative approach there

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>could be positive synergies (e.g. through the planting of reedbeds as a final element in the treatment process);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a byway open to all traffic which would be needed to form the access across • The A14, but this is capable of rerouting and a degree of segregation from motor traffic access can be provided; • Other considerations include effects on nature conservation, archaeology and location over a major aquifer, but the indications are that adequate mitigation can be provided; • There is considerable local opposition to relocation of a works in this area and extensive consultation opportunities should be provided to the neighbouring communities. <p>As with all potential relocation sites for the waste water works, this site is located in the Cambridge Green Belt.”</p> <p>The County Council as a result has identified this site as preferred.</p> <p>Environmental Health comments: This site is in close proximity to a few isolated residential properties and therefore noise and odour impact assessments should be undertaken to determine the potential affect on these dwellings. As a new development there is potential to incorporate mitigating features within the design and construction of the new plant. There is concern locally about this proposal, however without details of vulnerable receptors and an environmental and health impact assessment it is difficult to evaluate this site further.</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>Anglia Water has stated that they will only consider moving if a suitable alternative site is found and it is financially viable for them to move. There is currently a gap of some £76 million in the proposed move to Honey Hill and unless this money is found Anglia Water will not move their treatment works. The existing works although old is perfectly adequate for their needs and is regularly updated- meets all the pollution requirements. In fact any improvements to water quality would be the same whether on the old or new site. The new works will not necessarily be any more efficient.</p> <p>Anglia Water has produced suggested designs for the new WWTW at Honey Hill. These are only indications of what a new works would look like. It shows a large number of buildings close to the A14 in a green belt location. The main building will be some 14 metres to the eaves. The works needs to be in buildings in order to reduce the odour problems that will arise for a treatment works.</p> <p>Concern was expressed at the public meeting in Bottisham on 27th November that this preferred site had been more thoroughly considered by Anglia Water than the other options and that artists impressions should be done on all the options. Also it was suggested that the 'do-nothing' option has not been included in the consultation ie the Treatment works staying on its current site. The County Council should have assessed this 'do nothing' option.</p> <p>The works will be generating 200-250 heavy commercial vehicles per week and there is great concern at this number using the suggested</p>

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>access of High Ditch Road. This would not be an acceptable access road to the site.</p> <p>Object to the proposed site at Honey Hill.</p> <p>The current Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant is allocated for a primarily residential development in the Cambridge Local Plan and together with Chesterton Sidings will deliver some 2,000 – 3,000 dwellings.</p> <p>The County Council has responded to the District Council's objection at the earlier consultation stage when only a Honey Hill option was being consulted upon.</p> <p>The only advantage of this site over the rejected larger area of search is that it is further from Horningsea and Fen Ditton</p> <p>The disadvantages are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inappropriate development in the Green Belt • Greatest impact on public rights of way • Greatest impact in the expansion plans for Cambridge East • Greatest impact on the proposed Bridge of Reeds and the Wicken Fen Vision • The area is rural and open in character • Effects on nature conservation, archaeology and water

Site ref. and map number on Proposals Map *	Site name	Policy reference	Policy No	Preferred / Not preferred	Issues and options	Comments
						<p>supply (aquifer)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considerable local opposition. • Traffic generation on High Ditch Road, which would need to be routed to avoid Fen Ditton village. <p>The County Council's preference for this location at Honey Hill is therefore not supported by its own assessment. Indeed the County Council's Sustainability Appraisal Report identifies "no significant positive effects" for any of the areas (para 7.204) and significant negative effects on health, amenity, landscape, water quality, biodiversity as well as best and most versatile agricultural land. The extensive reference in its assessment to mitigation could equally apply to those of the other options, which lie outside the flood plain of the River Cam.</p> <p>The County Council needs to consider alternative locations for the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant, which will have less impact on local communities and the natural environment. This may mean considering locations more distant from the current Waste Water Treatment Plan, which will add to the costs of the relocation.</p>