

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Leader and Cabinet 14 December 2006
AUTHORS: Executive Director / Senior Planning Policy Officer

CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN PREFERRED STAGE CONSULTATION

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to agree the Council's response to the County Council's consultation document on preferred options for the Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework. A copy of the full set of documents will be available in the Members' Lounge.

Executive Summary

2. This report outlines the comments made previously by South Cambridgeshire Council at the Issues and options stages of the Minerals and Waste Development Plan (MWDP). The current Preferred stage MWDP does not include a clear strategy for waste. The MWDP now includes an indication of the scale of the waste issue and the overall type and number of major waste facilities required but not a broad spatial strategy as to where they would be best located. (Para 12-16) The Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) is producing a strategy for Household Waste Recycling Centres, which should be included in the MWDP. (Para.17- 21) The issues and options stage should have included consideration of more sites. (Para 22-24) It is questioned whether the growth areas are the best locations for HWRCs. (Para 23) All the sites considered in the MWDP are shown on maps in **Appendix 1** and the recommended response is **Appendix 2**. A summary is included in the main report (Pages 6- 17). It is recommended that for the preferred sites for mineral uses at Cottenham, Barrington and Steeple Morden and the safeguarding of sites at Cottenham and Needingworth that there be no objection subject to certain issues being addressed. (Page 6-7). For waste recycling and recovery allocations the recommendation is to object to Cambridge North- West, Cambridge Northern Fringe, Hauxton, Flint Cross and Great Wilbraham since it is premature to consider these sites in advance of the development of a strategy for waste. (Pages 9-13) Waste sites in Northstowe and South of the Newmarket Road are supported in principle. (Pages 9-12) The relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Works is considered and the proposed site at Honey Hill is rejected (Page 14-15). More detailed comments on the Core Strategy and Site Specific DPDs is included as **Appendix 3**.

Background

3. Cambridgeshire County Council is preparing jointly with Peterborough City Council a Minerals and Waste Development Plan (MWDP) as part of its new Local Development Framework (LDF). This will replace the adopted Waste Local Plan 2003 and the Cambridgeshire Aggregates (Minerals) Local Plan adopted 1991. The Plan will have to conform to policies set out in the Structure Plan 2003 and Regional Planning Guidance 6 (2000), and have regard to the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England.

4. The MWDP will be vital in ensuring that construction materials are available to support planned growth in Cambridgeshire and that sustainable waste management is in place for existing and planned new communities. It sets out the County Council's preferred options in terms of policies that will guide minerals and waste development until 2021, and includes site-specific proposals.
5. The County Council consulted on the Issues and Options Paper 1 for the emerging MWDP in June 2005. That paper set out key issues and options, including aspirations for new sites for mineral extraction and waste management development, which had been put forward, by operators and landowners. A further Issues and Options Paper 2 was published in January 2006 containing additional site aspirations. These were suggestions, which had arisen during the first consultation period.
6. South Cambridgeshire Council responded to both these consultations. In April 2006 the Council responded as follows:

"There is no clear strategy included in the Waste Local Plan or proposed in the issues and options report for provision of major waste management facilities. A strategy is essential to provide a clear framework for site specific allocations for all scales of waste management facilities, from major waste management facilities to household waste recycling centres, and also any supporting uses such as waste transfer stations. This should make clear the number, nature and scale of uses proposed and their intended catchment. It should also identify the broad locations for such facilities to meet the objectives of the strategy. This will enable a more detailed site selection process to be undertaken within the context of clear strategy."

7. Also:

"It is understood that the County Council intends that the next stage in the Waste Local Development Framework process will include preferred options for specific sites. The District Council is concerned that this is a big step from the general approach being explored here without an intermediate consultation stage on both the overall strategy and site options. The District Council would hope to be consulted on both the strategy and options for site-specific allocations before preferred sites are identified that affect South Cambridgeshire, including the major developments.
8. Therefore:

"In view of these substantial and overarching concerns, the District Council feels it has no option but to make a holding objection to **all** the sites in South Cambridgeshire, pending the preparation by the County Council of options for a strategy for minerals and waste, either prior to or together with possible sites options for each strategy. This should include Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of options as required as part of the LDF process. The District Council will then be in a position to provide considered views on the sites options then identified."

Current consultation on the preferred options stage

9. As a result of the representations received during the two issues and an options consultation the County Council has produced its preferred options. The Preferred Options Plan will be subject to consultation for a six-week period, from 6th November to 18th December 2006.
10. The MWDP comprises of three Development Plan Documents (DPDs). These are:

- The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (MWCS) which sets out the strategic vision and objectives, and includes a suite of development control policies to guide minerals and waste development
- The Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD (MWSSP) which sets out site specific proposals for mineral and waste development and supporting site specific policies
- The Earth and Mepal Area Action Plan DPD, which is an area with inter-related waste and mineral issues that needed specific consideration (this plan does not cover any part of South Cambridgeshire district).

11. A Proposals Map will support these documents.

Issues for Consideration

A. Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD

12. A fundamental concern arising from the previous consultations was the lack of a strategy for minerals and waste. The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (MWCS) at this stage should include a clear spatial strategy for both waste and minerals. The Preferred Options stage of the MWCS disappointingly still does not provide a clear spatial strategy. It is therefore very difficult to provide informed comments on advantages and disadvantages of individual sites. This is particularly important for minerals and waste, which are often considered ‘bad neighbour’ uses and which may require strategic considerations to take precedence over site-specific concerns and to rely upon mitigation rather than avoidance of adverse impacts.

Waste

13. The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD refers to four scenarios to consider different approaches to managing waste:
 0. Do nothing
 1. Meet targets
 2. High minimisation and diversion
 3. Integrated strategy with energy recovery
14. The MWCS indicates a preference for scenarios 2 and 3, but it is not clear, which one will be included in the adopted plan or how a choice will be made. Importantly, there has been no previous consultation on these scenarios, which should have been a fundamental part of issues and options consultation in the front loaded system. Scenario 2 maximises recovery and recycling of waste but with no energy from waste. Scenario 3 is similar but specifically includes energy from waste.
15. It is important for the MWCS to include a specific preferred option that is capable of sustainability appraisal. If it is not possible to make a decision at this time on which scenario is preferred, the Council could suggest that a scenario is pursued that seeks to maximise recovery and recycling but also allows for an Energy for Waste (EfW) option where this is demonstrated through studies to be an appropriate solution. This would provide a single preferred option but allow flexibility for EfW to be considered, particularly in the context of the major developments, if it proves to be a desirable solution within the overall objectives of the MWCS.
16. Whilst there is now an indication of the scale of the waste issue, and the overall type and number of major waste facilities required across the whole plan area, this is not contained in a preferred option in the Core Strategy. There is no indication of the

number of household waste recycling facilities required. There is also no broad spatial strategy for the type and number of facilities needed in different parts of the plan area and an indication of their intended catchments. For example, how many new facilities are required to serve Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and in what broad locations should they be located to serve an appropriate population catchment? In the absence of this type of spatial element to the Core Strategy, there is no clear policy framework against which to judge the allocations in the Site Specific Policies DPD and assess whether there is an appropriate level of provision and whether it is in the right locations.

17. In 2002 the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Joint Waste Management Partnership (partnership of all Waste Collection Authorities in Cambridgeshire, Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) as Waste Disposal Authority and the unitary Peterborough City Council) published its 'Strategy for dealing with Municipal Solid Waste 2002 – 2022 in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.' The strategy anticipates that new waste facilities may be required to deliver the strategy objectives but does not identify the types, locations or catchments of these, preferring to encourage the waste industry to bring forward innovative waste solutions through a waste Private Finance Initiative (PFI) process.
18. Cambridgeshire County Council's waste PFI project has now moved to the preferred bidder stage and it is likely that the provision of additional Household Waste Recycling Facilities (HWRC), required to deliver the municipal waste strategy objectives, will lie outside the PFI. The County Council, as waste disposal authority, is therefore now developing a HWRC strategy and delivery plan to assist delivery of these facilities. The draft HWRC strategy and delivery plan indicates that five new HWRCs will be required in the Cambridge area to serve existing and new developments. It assumes that the existing Thriplow HWRC, which has permanent planning permission and a lease until 2041, will remain open, and that even if the Milton HWRC remains open (it is due to close in 2010 when its temporary planning permission expires), four additional HWRCs will still be required. Further work is under way to identify where these facilities should be located to best serve both Cambridge and the rural communities in South Cambridgeshire.
19. It is essential that the MWDP is capable of delivering the facilities required to meet the municipal waste strategy objectives, including the provision of new HWRCs. The County Council has included with the deposited documents of the MWDP, a Position Statement for a Draft Household Waste Recycling Centre Strategy and Delivery Plan 2006, but there is no explanation of its role or purpose within the MWDP process. It confirms that Cambridge and South Cambs will need in the order of a further 5 new sites. However, it still jumps straight to a conclusion that these should be in the new developments without any consideration of spatial options for the best way of serving both Cambridge and the rural communities in South Cambridgeshire. It also assumes that the existing sites at Milton and Thriplow will not be available in the long term. Thriplow HWRC has not been included as a preferred site in the Minerals and Waste Site Specific Policies DPD and no consideration has been given to Milton HWRC remaining open.
20. It is not clear why the MWDP does not include that level of detail in its preferred option for waste, particularly given that:
 - (a) The background work has identified a required number of different types of major waste facilities (albeit that this varies between 13 and 16 depending on which scenario is preferred), and

- (b) The Draft Household Waste Recycling Centre Strategy and Delivery Plan states a need for a specific number of HWRCs in the Cambridge area (5, if Thriplow is retained),
21. The role of the MWCS is to set the strategy for the provision of waste facilities. However it seems that this is in part being left for a non-statutory process, which is not subject to public consultation or sustainability appraisal. This is not appropriate in a plan-led system.
22. Therefore no document gives consideration to the appropriate spatial strategy for providing the identified number of waste facilities. Should they all be in or the edge of Cambridge? Does this best serve the rural area? If focused on Cambridge, should they be in the major developments? Also, the number of potential sites listed for the different types of major waste facilities is far greater than the number of sites stated as required under either scenario. It is not clear how a choice is to be made between the different sites and how, as facilities come forward, it will be identified whether particular allocations are no longer required.
23. The issues and options stage of the LDF should have considered a wider selection of sites in the context of an emerging strategy. For example, following the proximity principle, brownfield sites in Cambridge city could be suitable rather than locating waste facilities in the new growth areas. Whilst it may be possible to include facilities within the major developments on the edge of Cambridge, in view of their predominantly residential character and lack of general employment areas, they would need substantial buffer zones around them to mitigate their impact on surrounding areas. The question should be asked whether this is the most appropriate use of this scarce land resource on the edge of Cambridge, and in particular whether it is an appropriate location for all types of waste uses.
24. As a matter of strategy, if Glebe Farm on the Cambridge Southern Fringe has been rejected in part because of impact on residential amenity, and an alternative site proposed at Hauxton that is in the Green Belt, this must indicate the need for a similar assessment for all the urban extensions where a variety of waste facilities are proposed. It also raises the question whether the existing HWRC site at Milton, which is rejected because it is in the Green Belt, should be reconsidered within the context of the current overall development strategy for the Cambridge area and the most appropriate waste strategy to go alongside that. These principles are not grappled with in the Core Strategy and there is no clear spatial strategy to provide a framework for making these difficult decisions about the most appropriate sites in the Site Specific Policies DPD. It is considered that this should be a key function of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.

Minerals

25. Options for mineral extraction are much more constrained than for waste disposal as:
- Minerals can only be extracted where they are naturally occurring. Their geological location influences the minerals strategy.
 - The strategy is more likely to be determined by the location of minerals in relation to the proposed development areas and the implications of extracting minerals on amenity of neighbours, traffic generation through towns and villages etc. There are policies in the MWDP to consider this.

B. Site Specific Policies DPD

Plan Preferred Sites

26. The following sites are allocated for minerals or waste facilities in the Site Specific Policies DPD. Maps are attached at Appendix 1 for Members' convenience.

Minerals site allocations:

27. No totally new areas have been allocated for minerals – instead the DPD proposes extensions of existing works (Policies SSP 1-6). No totally new locations have been identified as safeguarded to prevent the sterilisation of long-term mineral reserves – extensions are proposed to existing areas (Policy SSP7). The recommended response to the Preferred Sites is contained in Appendix 2 and summarised in the table below:

Nature of Mineral (Policy number from Site Specific DPD in brackets)	Site (Site reference number in brackets)	Recommended response (See Appendix 2 for full response)
Sand & Gravel Extraction (SSP1)	Cottenham (SS1 Site 4)	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.
Brick Clay Extraction (SSP3)	None in S Cambs	
Chalk Marl Extraction: (SSP4)	Barrington Quarry, Barrington (SS1 Site 8)	No objection subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation.
Specialist Chalk Extraction (SSP5)	Station Quarry, Steeple Morden (SS1 Site 21)	No objection subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation.
Specialist Clay Extraction: (SSP5)	None in S Cambs	
Specialist Limestone Extraction (SSP5)	None in S Cambs	

Nature of Mineral (Policy number from Site Specific DPD in brackets)	Site (Site reference number in brackets)	Recommended response (See Appendix 2 for full response)
Mineral Safeguarding Areas (SSP7)	Cottenham (SS2 Site 1))	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.
	Needingworth (SS2 Site 4)	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.

28. The key points are:

- a. Barrington - 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 in order that the in future consideration can be given to transporting minerals by rail. This is to be welcomed. Environmental Health has made comments regarding potential impacts of noise, dust and vibration on the health of residents and Conservation comments relate to landscape and biodiversity impacts. The issues raised are likely to be capable of being addressed through mitigation measures.
- b. Cottenham - This site is the same boundary as consulted on in June 2005. It would be largely a continuation of existing quarry north of Landbeach. Environmental Health and Conservation have made comments concerning impacts of noise and dust. Conservation comments relate to landscape impacts.

Waste site allocations:

- 29. Preferred option SSP10 in Site Specific DPD allocates a number of sites for waste recycling and recovery. This is followed by a list (Table 5) that identifies potential uses for sites. It appears that the table does not form part of the policy. This method of identifying sites is not considered appropriate. Not all sites will be suitable all waste recycling and recovery facilities. The appropriate uses for specific sites should form part of the policy to ensure that the policy does not provide for inappropriate scale and types of waste facilities in sensitive areas.
- 30. Many of the "sites" that are included in the policy are actually broad areas of search within which waste facilities should be provided. It is questionable whether they can be referred to as "allocations".

31. The list of sites is much longer than the number of sites indicated in either of the preferred scenarios (13-16 facilities compared with 27 sites in the policy). There is no indication how a choice will be made between sites. If there are more sites than required, how is a decision to be made in the context of determining a planning application for one of the urban fringe sites, for example, on whether it should be permitted or refused if there is no provision for a waste facility in the masterplan accompanying the planning application?
32. The site allocations for Waste Recycling and Recovery (Policy SSP10) and the potential uses identified for them are listed in the following table:

Sites allocated in Policy SSP10	Potential uses indicated in Table 5 of Site Specific DPD						
	1. Mixed Waste Stream Recycling Facilities	2. Single Stream Recycling Facilities	3. In Vessel Composting Facilities	4. Inert Waste Recycling Facilities	5. Energy from Waste facilities - if Waste Scenario 3 developed	6. Specialist Facilities (dealing with hazardous waste)	7. HWRC (& Bulking up transfer facility).
Cambridge North West (SS4 Site 8E)	Yes	Yes					Yes
Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) (SS4 Site 8B)	Yes	Yes					Yes
South of Newmarket Road, Cambridge (SS4 Site 36)	Yes	Yes					Yes
Former Bayer Crop Science (West), Hauxton (SS4 Site 51)							Yes
Northstowe (SS4 Site 8A)							Yes
Bridgefoot Quarry, Flint Cross (SS4 Site 21)				Yes			
Great Wilbraham (SS4 Site 18)				Yes			
Brookfield Business Centre, Cottenham (SS4 Site 5)						Yes (Malary Environmental facility managing waste oils and fuel)	

Note: Addenbrookes Hospital allocated for Clinical waste management facility, incorporating energy from waste

33. The recommended response to the **Preferred Sites** is contained in Appendix 2 and summarised in the table below with key issues identified. Environmental Health comments generally that in major new developments it would be possible to ensure minimal environmental impact at the design stage by incorporating mitigation measures into the development.

Nature of Waste Facility (Policy number from Site Specific DPD in brackets)	Site	Recommended response (See Appendix 2 for full response)
Waste Recycling and Recovery (Policy SSP 10)	Cambridge North West (SS4 Site 8E)	<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. Conservation comments it would be difficult to integrate into the existing landscape.</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 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.</p>
Waste Recycling and Recovery (Policy SSP10)	Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) (SS4 Site 8B)	<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>
Waste Recycling and Recovery (Policy SSP10)	South of Newmarket Road, Cambridge (SS4 Site 36)	<p>Whilst accepting the principle of providing waste facilities in close proximity to where waste arises, the difficulties in providing a waste</p>

Nature of Waste Facility (Policy number from Site Specific DPD in brackets)	Site	Recommended response (See Appendix 2 for full response)
		<p>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>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>
Waste Recycling and Recovery (Policy SSP10)	Former Bayer Crop Science (West), Hauxton (SS4 Site 51)	<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 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.

Nature of Waste Facility (Policy number from Site Specific DPD in brackets)	Site	Recommended response (See Appendix 2 for full response)
		<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.</p> <p>Environmental Health comments that 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 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.</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</p>

Nature of Waste Facility (Policy number from Site Specific DPD in brackets)	Site	Recommended response (See Appendix 2 for full response)
		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.
Waste Recycling and Recovery (Policy SSP10)	Northstowe (SS4 Site 8A)	<p>In the Northstowe Area Action Plan it is suggested that an HWRC and bulking up facility be located on the general employment area proposed adjacent to the Park & Ride site. This allocation could therefore be more specific.</p> <p>Environmental Health comments that 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>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>

Nature of Waste Facility (Policy number from Site Specific DPD in brackets)	Site	Recommended response (See Appendix 2 for full response)
Waste Recycling and Recovery (Policy SSP10)	Bridgefoot Quarry, Flint Cross (SS4 Site 21)	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.
Waste Recycling and Recovery (Policy SSP10)	Great Wilbraham (SS4 Site 18)	Object. It is premature in advance of the development of a strategy 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.
Waste Recycling and Recovery (Policy SSP 10)	Brookfield Business Centre, Cottenham (SS4 Site 5)	<p>Environmental Health comments that 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 that large areas of scrub and wildlife cover would be lost 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 Conservation that there is insufficient information to object or support to this proposal.</p>

34. The recommended response to the Preferred Sites for other site allocations for waste and other facilities is contained in Appendix 2 and summarised in the table below:

Nature of Waste Facility (Policy number from Site Specific DPD in brackets):	Site	Recommended response (See Appendix 2 for full response)
Stable Non- reactive Hazardous Waste Landfill (SSP13)	None in S Cambs	
Waste safeguarding area (SSP14)	Pet Crematorium A505, Thriplow	No assessment of this site given by the County Council and it is already in use for waste.
	Waste Management Park Landbeach	No assessment has been given on this site either and it is already in use for waste.
Waste Water Treatment Works (SSP15)	Honey Hill, Horningsea / Fen Ditton (SS5 Site4)	<p>The site is the eastern part of the area considered in January.</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. (See SSP5 Site 1)</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 supply (aquifer)

		<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 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>
Safeguarding railheads/ Transport Protection Zones (SSP16)	Barrington Cement Works railhead	In the MWDP the Barrington Cement Works Railhead has been designated as a Sustainable Transport Protection Zone in order that the in future consideration can be given to transporting minerals by rail. This is to be welcomed.

Safeguarding railheads/ Transport Protection Zones (SSP16)	Cambridge Northern Fringe(Aggregates Railhead)	The Council supports this safeguarding.
Temporary facility for recovery and recycling of construction and demolition waste (Table 5)	All Strategic Development Areas	The Council supports this as long as there is some clarification of what is meant by the Strategic Development Areas.
New Technology - (Table 5)	The accommodation of new technology is not precluded, but until the nature of any technology is known potential sites cannot be identified.	

Non-Preferred Sites

35. The following sites were considered for minerals or waste but were rejected. The recommended response to the **Non-Preferred Sites** is contained in Appendix 2.

Minerals:

Sand & Gravel Extraction (SSP 1)	Smithey Fen, Cottenham (SS1 Site 16)
Brick Clay Extraction: (SSP 3)	None in S Cambs
Chalk Marl Extraction: (SSP4)	None in S Cambs
Specialist Chalk Extraction: (SSP5)	None in S Cambs
Specialist Clay Extraction:	None in S Cambs
Specialist Limestone Extraction:	None in S Cambs
Minerals Safeguarding Area:	Hauxton (SS2 Site 2)

Waste:

36. Waste (Policy SSP 10):

Sites not preferred to be allocated in Policy SSP10	North of Newmarket Road (Cambridge Airport)(SS4 Site 26) Glebe Farm, Trumpington (SS4 Site 27) Cambridge University Farm, Girton (SS4 Site 28) Crane Industrial Site, Milton (SS4 Site 29) Gamlingay (SS4 Site 41) Milton HWRC (SS4 Site 45) Thriplow HWRC (SS4 Site 46) Area of search near M11, Cambridge (SS4 Site 47) Bayer Crop Site area of search (SS4 Site 48) Oakington Area of Search (SS4 Site 49) Cambridge East (SS4 Site 8C)
Inert Waste Landfill (SSP11)	None in S Cambs
Stable Non- reactive Hazardous Waste Landfill (SSP13)	None in S Cambs

37. Other waste sites and other facilities not preferred:

Waste safeguarding area (SSP14)	None in S Cambs.
Waste Water Treatment Works (SSP15)	Honey Hill, Horningsea / Fen Ditton (SS5 Site 1) Milton HWRC area of search (SS5 Site 2) Milton/Landbeach area of search (SS5 Site 3)
Safeguarding railheads/ Transport Protection Zones (SSP16)	None in S Cambs

38. More detailed comments on the Core Strategy DPD and the Site Specific DPD are set out in Appendix 3.

Implications

Financial	None
Legal	The Council will be obliged to show Mineral and Waste allocations on its own LDF Proposals Map once the Minerals and Waste Development Plan is adopted
Staffing	Staff have offered to discuss the emerging policies and proposals with the County and the MWDP is prepared
Risk Management	There is a risk that the MWDP could include allocations for land not acceptable to the Council for example waste management issues could prevail over amenity and other planning considerations
Equal Opportunities	None

Consultations

39. Internal consultation with Development Control, Conservation and Environmental Health.

Effect on Annual Priorities and Corporate Objectives

Affordable Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking the sustainable extraction of minerals and management of waste, including the provision of facilities for household waste in accessible locations to serve existing and planned new communities • Seeking opportunities to work in partnership with the County council as the minerals and waste authority, on the planning for minerals and waste within the district.
Customer Service	
Northstowe and other growth areas	
Quality, Accessible Services	
Village Life	
Sustainability	
Partnership	

Conclusions/Summary

40. The Council commented at earlier stages on the absence on a clear spatial strategy, particularly for waste. The current Preferred Options documents still do not contain a spatial strategy and it has been difficult to assess the best locations for these 'bad neighbour' uses and recommend which could be supported. Only where there it is

clear that a site will form part of any strategy has it been possible to recommend support e.g. at Northstowe and Cambridge East.

Recommendation

41. Cabinet is recommended to agree the responses to the Minerals and Waste Development Plan consultation contained in Appendices 2 and 3.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents - Preferred Options (November 2006)

Contact Officer: Alison Talkington – Senior Planning Policy Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713182