

The comments I make are on behalf of the Parishes of Fen Ditton, Horningsea, Quy, Teversham and The Wilbrahams.

I will be commenting on Sites 26 and 36 and topic SS5 option 1 but to avoid repetition the following comments relate to all of these three sites.

I along with the Parish Councils concerned have severe reservations as to manner in which the CC has carried out its consultations. Even our County Councillor had not been informed and knew nothing, let alone the Parish Councils and landowners of the sites. It is purely by chance the parishes found out, via a third party about these proposals. The consultation process has been severely flawed, ironical when at the beginning of the draft plan document the CC states 'A key feature of the new planning system is to strengthen the involvement of the community and stakeholders with a view to involving them in the process much earlier than before!' I would like to see the cabinet make note of this fact in their response to the CC. This lack of consultation has caused great concern and anger in the villages concerned. It is not just this area of the county that has experienced this problem. Some of the information we have only been able to access by using the Freedom of Information act.

On Pg 22 section 8 you will note the deadline is 13th April, today, so our comments need to be in ASAP. Also regarding the deadline what isn't mentioned is that the original deadline was 13th March, which was actually only 2 weeks after the parishes became aware of the proposals, it is only because of their lobbying of the CC that this was extended. The parishes concerned have had to group themselves together quickly in order to respond, and it is to their credit that they have been able to do so.

Site 26 – Household Waste Recycling North of Newmarket Road

Principal concern that as noted by the officer that it is not in tune with what we have already decided in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.

This area is already allocated for community use in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan, jointly prepared with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. This is not the type of community use which was envisaged, but rather uses which will unite the residential development on the North Works with that which may be built in the future on Cambridge Airport. This area is essential to help the two developments blend together.

Totally agree with the comments in 4th paragraph on site 26 page 26.

Site 36 – Household Waste Recycling South of Newmarket Road

Pg 27 – It is assumed that this proposal relates to the site only if the airport is developed, but that is not clear in the draft policy and at a recent meeting with Cambridgeshire County Council officers when one of the reasons mentioned for objecting this site was that Marshalls have informed us this could not operate alongside a working airport, they did not state this proposal was only for if the airport is relocated.

The proposed area of search is so vast that it gives no credibility to this 'option' as it does not give the impression that any serious thought has gone into this idea, but rather suggests that a huge area has been ear marked with no backing evidence.

Also household waste facilities would not be appropriate in what will be a residential development with very high densities.

Topic SS5 – Water Waste Treatment Works Honey Hill

Page 29 – Reasons for objecting to this proposed site for the relocation of the Milton Waste Treatment Works are:

This project is totally unsustainable in terms of cost (£161m), use of materials and should it be built, operation of the new works and therefore against the policies of both SCDC and CCC. The costs are not a 'one off' as this move is associated with an estimated increase in operational costs of £1.2m per year. See report on feasibility of relocating Milton Wastewater Treatment Works commissioned by Cambridge Horizons.

Anglian Water have stated they can remain where they are, operating with modernised plant and using a smaller footprint than they now occupy – whilst being able to provide for future population growth and satisfy sustainability requirements. This is the only sustainable option and should have been included in the consultation. At the present time, the works are operating to 80% of their capacity. See report on feasibility of relocating Milton Wastewater Treatment Works commissioned by Cambridge Horizons.

The land the works is presently sited on is contaminated land; it would require intensive decontamination and even then probably would not be suitable for housing use. Even if housing were provided here, they would be forever associated with the stigma of a contaminated site as those are on the anthrax site adjacent to Elizabeth Way Bridge, Cambridge. Staying on the present site would prevent contamination of another area, especially one presently in greenbelt.

It would not only be the treatment works themselves which would destroy the greenbelt but also the associated access roads which would be required to service the plant. At present we understand Anglian Water has 30-40 vehicles servicing the Milton site. The access roads would intrude into the area and divide the greenbelt up.

Although this proposal is a permitted use of greenbelt, the view of those living in the area is that it is a totally unacceptable use, being one which would have a detrimental impact on the nearby villages and the lives of those living in them. It would also adversely affect the Wicken Fen Vision project and the Bridge of Reeds. Finance for both these projects would be at risk were the works to be relocated here, which could result in the project not being realised, a great loss to all residents of Cambridgeshire, not only local people. Sponsors of this project have already made public their concerns about these proposals.

Only brown field sites for this use should be considered.

Using this site would set a precedent in the future for infill building and encourage development on this side of the A14, destroying the green separation area for Fen Ditton and Horningsea. As these proposals involve greenbelt land, it is therefore reasonable to expect there to be some mitigation plans forming part of these proposals. There appear not to be any.

Anglian Water require a site which would allow for further expansion in the future, which, on this site would further reduce the greenbelt.

The proposed area of search is so vast that it gives no credibility to this 'option' as it does not give the impression that any serious thought has gone into this idea, but rather suggests that a huge area has been ear marked with no backing evidence. However from another map obtained under FOI act we understand that this vast area has been broken down into three possible sites. Why was this map dated 20/09/05 not included in these documents?

The County Council are remiss in only providing one 'option', how can it be an option with no other choice!!!! Why were areas E, F and G on the County Council map dated 20/09/05 not included as options?

The summary at bottom of page 29 is too lame. We need to take a much stronger stance on this. The entire proposed site is within our District. We must not be seen to be 'standing on the fence' with such a potentially damaging proposal. We certainly must not just accept this site just because we have been given no alternative that is not good enough. I have found there to be no local support and this is held out by the 180 comment sheets returned to the CC by 150 houses in Horningsea objecting to this proposal which show overwhelming public objection to this. The public are looking to their District Council to support them in this and this is what they expect of us. There are substantial flaws in the CC's proposals. I urge members of the cabinet to strongly object to this site and to either urge the CC to retain the works on the present site or to look for viable, sustainable and well-researched alternative sites, which would not cause destruction of our countryside and blight the lives of our residents.