

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning and New Communities Joint Portfolio Holders 10 March 2009  
**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Corporate Manager (Planning and Sustainable Communities)

---

### **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION BY CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL ON NEW SITES PROPOSED FOR MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE RECENT CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND PETERBOROUGH MINERALS AND WASTE (PREFERRED OPTIONS 2) PLAN CONSULTATION**

#### **Purpose**

1. The purpose of this report is to agree the Council's response to a consultation currently being carried out by the Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council. The consultation is about a number of new or amended proposals for mineral and waste development, which have been put forward by stakeholders following the recent consultation on the Minerals and Waste Preferred Options 2 Plan. These stakeholders wish to see their site (s) included in the next stage of the emerging Minerals and Waste Plan.
2. The County Council and Peterborough City Council have to consider these proposals and decide whether they should be included in the next version of the Plan. They have asked for comments on the proposals by 9<sup>th</sup> March 2009.
3. The full consultation can be seen on the County's website.  
[www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/mineralswasteplan/siteprofilesmap](http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/mineralswasteplan/siteprofilesmap)
4. This is a key decision because it is likely to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in the wards in the District adjacent to the A14 – Fen Drayton; Swavesey; Longstanton; Bar Hill; Oakington; Girton; Lolworth; Boxworth; Dry Drayton; Conington. The location of some of the proposed mineral and waste sites will have a particular impact on specific communities in Cottenham; Waterbeach; Milton; Hauxton; and Little Abington.

#### **Executive Summary**

5. This report outlines the proposed response by this Council to the 21 minerals and waste sites that are either within or near to South Cambridgeshire currently being consulted upon by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council as part of the preparation of the MWDP.
6. The proposed responses to the mineral sites are included in Table 1. 13 borrowpits have been proposed by the Highway Authority to be used for the A14 upgrading. Limited information has been provided on these sites. The restoration of some borrowpits could provide an opportunity to create wetland reserves. It is not known how many borrowpits will be needed by the HA and therefore whether all those proposed are required. The timetable of the MWDP does not accord with the timescale of when the borrowpits will be required. Planning applications may need to be submitted for these sites before the MWDP is adopted.

- 7 A site in Cottenham is proposed for extraction of clay. It is already proposed to extract sand and gravel from this site and the Council is concerned at the additional impact on the surrounding area. There are concerns at the air quality issues along the A14 corridor if all the borrowpits operate at the same time.
- 8 The proposed responses to the waste sites are included in Table 2. Two additional sites have been proposed for Household Recycling Centres – one on land west of the A10 in Hauxton and another at Chesterton Fen. Both locations are considered to be unsuitable.
- 9 Network Rail has proposed the relocation of the freight and aggregate yard from Chesterton Sidings to a new location in Waterbeach. The Council support this proposal in principle.

### **Background**

- 10 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. In September/October last year they carried out a Preferred Options 2 Consultation which set out the County Council's preferred options in terms of policies that will guide minerals and waste development until 2026, and included site-specific proposals. South Cambridgeshire District Council responded to this consultation in October 2008.

### **The Current Consultation**

- 11 During the Preferred Options 2 consultation the County Council received representations from stakeholders who wanted to put forward a number of new sites or had suggestions to amend existing proposed sites. These proposals currently have no formal status. However the County Council has to decide whether they should be included in the Plan, which will be the Pre-Submission Plan, when there will be a further 6 week period of consultation. This is programmed to be in February /March 2010.

### **How it affects South Cambridgeshire**

- 12 Of the 36 sites being consulted upon 21 of them are either within South Cambridgeshire or will have an impact on the District being close to the borders.
- 16 sites are related to mineral uses;
  - 4 for waste, recycling and recovery facilities and
  - 1 is for a railhead.
- 13 Appendix A includes a map showing the location of each of these sites.

### **Minerals**

- 14 Improvements to A14 - Of the mineral sites the majority of them are related to the construction needs when the A14 is upgraded. The Highway Authority (HA) has proposed a number of borrowpits. A borrowpit is a source of aggregate in the immediate area to a major proposal such as a road improvement. Permitting a borrowpit can mean that the need for transporting minerals is reduced, reducing traffic on public roads. The MWDP Core Strategy included a Preferred Option CS9 – Sand and Gravel Borrowpits, which specified a number of sites that would be used as

borrowpits only for the improvements to the A14 (Ellington to Fen Ditton). The sites listed at this stage were located outside of South Cambs District but mention was made that further sites would be put forward after negotiation with the Highway Authority. South Cambridgeshire District Council supports in principle the use of borrowpits, especially as the use of local borrowpits will help to minimise disruption in the District caused by road construction.

- 15 Costain Skanska and Lafarge, who are both working with the HA, have proposed 13 clay-general fill borrow pits, which are located either adjacent to or very close to the route of the current or proposed line of the upgraded A14. The Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the sites, which would have a short-term life whilst the A14 was upgraded. There is however a limited amount of information provided concerning each site other than that provided by the stakeholder. There is no indication of whether the sites are supported by the County.
- 16 In the information provided by the stakeholders in the policy summary for each borrowpit it mentions “ the local district councils are content with the provision of extra water bodies for amenity purposes”. This Council was informally approached by telephone for its opinions on locating borrowpits along the A14 and it was suggested that when the borrowpits were no longer needed that some could be restored as wetland reserves with public access. In principle the Council supports this.
- 17 There is no indication from the Highway Authority as to what quantities of minerals will be required by the A14 works. In order to ascertain which borrowpits will be needed it is vital that this information is provided otherwise the sites needed to provide the correct quantities may not have permission in the necessary timescale. There is no indication as to whether all these borrowpits submitted by Costain will be required for the A14 because if there is a surplus then there are a number within the Green Belt or close to settlements which South Cambs would not support if other locations were available.
- 18 The timetable for the completion of the MWDP would appear to not coincide with that proposed by the HA to upgrade the A14. The borrowpits will be needed for use before they have gained approval through the plan-making process of the MWDP. The borrowpits will need to have gained planning permission before the MWDP is adopted if the construction of the A14 is not to be delayed otherwise there will be the need for the clay to be transported greater distances for the construction works. This option would not be acceptable. Planning applications for the extraction of clay from the borrowpits for a short-term period should therefore be submitted and not be delayed by being included in the MWDP, which generally provides for longer-term mineral and waste proposals.

<b>Minerals and Waste Development Plan</b>		<b>A14 upgrading timetable as proposed by Highway Authority.</b>	
<b>Stages of plan</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Stage</b>	<b>Dates</b>
Consultation / Submission	Pre-submission consultation Feb/Mar 2010  Submission June 2010	Draft Orders to be issues - 13 week consultation	Spring 2009

Examination	Nov 2010	Inquiry	January 2010
Inspector's report	April 2011	Construction to begin on A14.	2011
Adoption	June 2011		

19 Extraction of engineering clay – There is a proposal to allocate a site for engineering clay. The site at Cottenham is currently being proposed as a strategic allocation for sand and gravel extraction. Clay underlies the sand and gravel and is normally extracted in order to line and seal the landfill cell. If the clay were to be extracted and removed from the site then planning permission would be required. The proposers, M. Dickerson Ltd and Donarbon Waste Management state that there is a need for clay sites to be allocated in the MWDP since there will be a demand for this resource given the growth planned for the Cambridge Sub-region. Once excavated the site could be used for inert landfill and then restored.

20 When the Council considered the earlier consultation – Preferred Option 2 it stated the following as regards the sand and gravel allocation at Cottenham –

*'Object to the allocation until such time as more detailed information is provided on the full environmental impact of the larger site now being identified for extraction. Until this information is available it is not possible to evaluate this site. A full environmental assessment is essential at this stage before the Council can determine whether this site should be allocated as a preferred site for extraction.'*

*The Council would need to be assured that the mitigation measure identified by Environmental Health and Conservation could be adopted to minimise impact on sensitive receptors.*

*Routing agreements are essential to ensure that the additional lorries generated by the larger scale of operation do not adversely affect the residents of Cottenham or the Travellers on the nearby Smithy Fen.*

21 If clay is to be extracted and removed from the site as well as the sand and gravel the additional impact on the surrounding roads and on the nearby communities is likely to be greater and the Council should be concerned about these matters. It further reaffirms the need for routing agreements. The County must provide further, more detailed information about the proposed extraction before South Cambs can decide if it is an appropriate allocation.

22 Air Quality issues relating to the mineral sites - If all 16 mineral sites and in particular the A14 borrow pits were operating at the same time close to the A14, there may be a significant negative / detrimental impact on SCDC's designated Air Quality Management Area (AQMA currently along the A14 corridor). Environmental Health officers in considering the sites are concerned about this impact. This is at a time when there is a statutory duty to consider air quality action plans to reduce HGV traffic and bring down pollutant concentrations in the AQMA, effectively plans to maintain and improve the quality of ambient air. However the borrowpits will only be in use for a short time when the A14 construction works are taking place so their impact on the AQMA will only be over a limited period.

- 23 Mineral operations on and off site can have a negative impact on the local air quality in the area due an increase particulate matter (PM), associated vehicle emissions and dust deposition on local property ultimately affecting the quality of life of local communities. If particulate matter from a minerals extraction process results in levels of PM10 being higher in sensitive locations than the prescribed objectives, the LA is required to set out in its Action Plan what steps it intends to take in pursuit of the achievement of the objectives.
- 24 The collective impact of the A14 borrowpits proposals may have a detrimental short-term impact on local air quality and SCDC's AQMA. Insufficient information is provided to fully evaluate the proposals and whether there will be significant cumulative impact / effect. The cumulative impact on air quality of simultaneous and/or successive working of a number of sites in a wider area requires careful consideration. Matters that need to be explored further include:
- How many sites are actually required?
  - How many vehicle movements are expected?
  - Where will the extracted sands and gravels be taken to from the sites?
  - Will Costain Skanska be carrying out an assessment of HGV traffic impact on local air quality if significant movements of vehicles are identified?
  - The duration and phasing / sequencing of operations?
  - The existing dust climate at the sensitive receptors and the need for and scope of a dust assessment study to be conducted by the operator prior to detailed proposals
  - Need for air quality assessments / modelling to determine if breaches of Air Quality Objectives are likely?
  - The proposed methods of mitigation and control of dust-generating activities and vehicle emissions?
- 25 The impact of the borrowpits will be over a limited timescale and the advantages of having them close to the construction works could outweigh the dis-benefits highlighted by Environmental Health. The detailed matters of concern being raised by Environmental Health will need to be fully taken into account when planning applications are submitted for the borrowpits.
- 26 Responses to Mineral Sites - Table 1 lists the Mineral sites that impact South Cambridgeshire and the suggested responses on each site. A fuller assessment of each site is included in Appendix B.

**Table 1 - Minerals**

<b>Ref no in MWDP consultation</b>	<b>Site location</b>	<b>Description of Proposed Use</b>	<b>South Cambridgeshire District Council's proposed response</b>
1	Land at Hinxtton (South of A 505 near Whittlesford Bridge)	Sand and Gravel extraction Site: 4.4 ha, reserves estimated at 170,000 tonnes Access by existing haul road on to the A1301	Support in principle subject to routing agreements for transporting of the minerals and subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health

Ref no in MWDP consultation	Site location	Description of Proposed Use	South Cambridgeshire District Council's proposed response
			and Conservation.
2	Covell's Drain, Swavesey	Sand & gravel borrow pit for the A14 upgrade. (Site currently has permission to extract sand and gravel for the guided busway, but does not have permission to be taken off site)	<p>Object to this site.</p> <p>The use of this borrowpit would result in the sand and gravel having to be transported some distance through Swavesey or Fen Drayton. This would impact on the local roads and affect these local communities.</p> <p>Extraction work is likely to have a detrimental impact on the adjoining wildlife site.</p> <p>This would make the use of this borrowpit unacceptable to South Cambridgeshire District Council especially if other borrowpits are available in more environmentally acceptable locations.</p>
5	Corpus Christi, North of Offord Cluny (BP1)	Clay borrowpit for A14 upgrade. Site 15ha	<p>Object to site</p> <p>The County Council must carry out a full Appropriate Assessment for this site before it can be considered for inclusion in the plan.</p> <p>The use of this site as a borrowpit would be unacceptable if it resulted in the deterioration of Portholme Meadows.</p>

<b>Ref no in MWDP consultation</b>	<b>Site location</b>	<b>Description of Proposed Use</b>	<b>South Cambridgeshire District Council's proposed response</b>
6	New Barns Farm, Conington (BP2)	Clay-General Fill borrowpit for A14 upgrade (Approximately 20 ha proposed from within the identified area)	South Cambs would object to this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations. If the site were used for extraction the impact on the golden plovers would have to be considered and it would also be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health
7	Brickyard Farm, Boxworth (BP3)	Clay-General Fill borrowpit for A14 upgrade (approximately 20 ha proposed from within the identified area)	Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health
8	Boxworth End Farm, North of Trinity Foot Junction (BP4)	Clay-General Fill borrowpit for A14 upgrade Site: 14 ha	Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health
9	South Trinity Foot Junction (BP5 east)	Clay-General Fill borrowpit for A14 upgrade Site: 14 ha	South Cambs would not support this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations however if used it would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health
10	South Trinity Foot Junction (BP 5 west)	Clay-General Fill borrowpit for A14 upgrade Site: 14ha	Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health
11	North Bar Hill, Noon Folly Farm (BP6)	Clay-General Fill borrowpit for A14 upgrade Site: 10ha	Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate

Ref no in MWDP consultation	Site location	Description of Proposed Use	South Cambridgeshire District Council's proposed response
			the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation.
12	North Dry Drayton Junction, Slate Hall Farm (BP7)	Clay – General Fill borrowpit for A14 upgrade Site: 20 ha	Object to site given its proximity to the Crematorium and the site being within the Green Belt.
13	North Junction 14, Grange Farm (BP8)	Clay borrowpit for A14 upgrade Site: 15ha	South Cambs would not support this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations however if used it would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and to concerns about the impact on the watercourses in this area once the land is restored after the A14 upgrade is completed.
14	South Junction 14 (BP9)	Clay-General Fill borrowpit for A14 upgrade Site: 16 ha	South Cambs would not support this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations. However if used it would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and its restoration when construction of the A14 is completed could provide an opportunity to provide a wetland reserve with public access.
15.	Existing waste management park, including Cottenham	Extraction of Engineering Clay	Object to this site.  The Council is concerned that the

Ref no in MWDP consultation	Site location	Description of Proposed Use	South Cambridgeshire District Council's proposed response
	proposals (shown in SS1-16, SS1-35 and SS2-1).		<p>site is being considered for clay extraction, which will result in additional impacts on the local road network and on the nearby communities at Smithy Fen and within Cottenham. If clay is to be extracted and removed from the site as well as the sand and gravel the impact is likely to be far greater. Consideration must also be given to the filled extraction pits as highlighted by Environmental Health.</p> <p>The County must provide further information about the site before this Council can evaluate the site for the proposed additional allocation. Without details of vulnerable receptors and an environmental and health impact assessment it is difficult to evaluate this site.</p>
17	Milton Landfill Site, Milton	Clay extraction for the A14 upgrade– quantity 200,000m3	South Cambs would not support this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations. However if used it would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health

## Waste Recycling and Recovery

- 27 There are four sites relating to waste. Two additional sites are being proposed for a Household Recycling Centre (HRC), one near Hauxton and one at Chesterton Fen.
- 28 Land West of A10, Hauxton – This is an extensive area to south and west of the A10 /M11 junction at Hauxton. It was not included in the areas of search used by the County Council in searching for suitable site for a HRC to serve the south of Cambridge. South Cambs objected strongly to having a HRC located on part of the Bayer CropScience site in Hauxton when County Council proposed this in its Preferred Option consultation in November 2006. The preferred option by the County Council is now a site south of the Addenbrookes Access Road. This option is supported by South Cambs.
- 29 Much of the proposed site now being consulted on is located away from the road therefore making access a major problem. It is all within the Green Belt and within the flood zone 3, which is the high-risk zone where development would not be advisable. It is at some distance from the communities that would be required to use this facility and therefore not a sustainable option. The vast majority of the site is unsuitable for the location of a HRC. The Council consider that it would be inappropriate to locate a HRC on this site and that the preferred option proposed by the County Council is the more appropriate location to serve the city.
- 30 Chesterton Fen – This is being proposed as both a HRC and an inert waste-recycling centre. It is adjacent to the Traveller community who would be directly affected by this proposal and neither proposed use would be suitable neighbours to this community. The site is in the Green Belt adjacent to the river and is in flood zone 3. It is in an area with a very open character where any development would be highly visible. The settlement of Fen Ditton is on the opposite side of the river to the proposed site and would therefore be affected both visually and by any noise or air pollution created by the uses. The existing access road to this area is at capacity and it would not be possible for the road to take the increased use generated by householders visiting the HRC or by commercial vehicles using the inert recycling centre. Development of this site would therefore not be acceptable.
- 31 Responses to Waste Sites - Table 2 lists the Mineral sites that impact South Cambridgeshire and the suggested responses on each site. A fuller assessment of each site is included in Appendix B.

**Table 2**  
**Waste Recycling and Recovery**

Ref no in consultation	Site location	Description of Proposed Use	South Cambridgeshire District Council's proposed response
21	Land West of A10, Hauxton	Area of Search for a (Household) Recycling Centre to serve south Cambridge and outlying villages	Object to locating a HRC on any of the land put forward since it is highly unsuitable being at too great a distance from the population, which would be using the facility and it would be in a sensitive ecological area.

Ref no in consultation	Site location	Description of Proposed Use	South Cambridgeshire District Council's proposed response
22	Land at Chesterton Fen	(Household) Recycling Centre for north Cambridge and inert waste recycling centre Site: 7.4 ha Access: from Fen Road, Chesterton	Object to this site.  The site is unsuitable for locating either a HRC or for inert recycling facilities as highlighted in the comments made by Environmental Health. It is in the Green Belt in a sensitive location and very close to residential properties.
24	South of Worsted Lodge, A11, Pampisford	Waste Transfer Station (Site also currently subject to a retrospective planning application for retention of the Waste Transfer Station - S/1838/08/CM)	Object to the site since it is located in rural countryside, outside of the development framework and is not an essential or appropriate use for this location.
28	Cottenham. SS1-16 area within the preferred area shown on profile M3	Inert landfill and restoration back to agriculture (following sand and gravel extraction)	See comments for site 15

### Railhead

- 32 There is one proposal for a railhead, which is on a site to the north of Waterbeach. Network Rail (NR) has put forward a site because they wish to relocate the aggregate sidings from Chesterton and to facilitate London waste rail transfer. They have confirmed that an expanded aggregate facility as was proposed at Chesterton is not now compatible with their own operational rail uses. Network Rail has had to prepare a National Rolling Stock Strategy in order to accommodate and plan for improvements to the rail network. This is to include a significant increase in rolling stock. A key part of this strategy is to identify locations capable of accommodating this increase, which in this region is expected to approximately double. NR is likely to have to accommodate about 60 four-car trains for this area. Chesterton Sidings appears to be the only site of appropriate size and location. A new island platform is to be made at Cambridge Station and so it is likely in the near future that Chesterton Sidings will have to be used increasingly for stabling rolling stock. Thameslink may also require room for rolling stock.
- 33 When the A14 upgrade takes place there will need to be an extensive on-site stockpiling of aggregates. NR do not think that it will be possible to accommodate an aggregate use at Chesterton Sidings of the scale envisaged by the County Council without creating amenity problems for the future proposed station users and adjoining uses in the commercial/office park. – Problems such as air and noise pollution.
- 34 NR is therefore proposing a site in Waterbeach for a new freight and aggregate yard which would be purpose built to modern standards and offer the opportunity of much

better facilities compared to the current site at Chesterton Sidings. The proposal would include the following

- Two freight aggregate sites of 3.7 hectares with rail access and 185m discharge sidings suitable for letting to independent operators.
- A rail to road Waste Transfer facility with 450 m sidings length and 17.5 m width hard standing
- A suitable haul road link to the A10

35 South Cambridgeshire support in principle the relocating of the use from Chesterton Sidings since this area is to be subject of a further study to be jointly undertaken with the City Council. The aggregate yard would have reduced the options of what could be proposed for the Chesterton site.

36 Policy TR/5 - Rail Freight Interchanges in the Development Control Policies DPD promotes the use of rail for freight movements and so the Council would in principle support the new location at Waterbeach.

37 There can be considerable environmental disruption related to a development of this nature due to potential incompatibility with existing residential uses in a quiet rural location with low background noise levels (in absence of train movements). As the number of vehicle movements associated with aggregate depots can be high, it is therefore essential that the access is good and the surrounding roads are capable of accepting high volumes of traffic. The proposed traffic route appears to avoid direct passing the frontages of existing residential. New road to access the site to the A10 will pass close to and south of Denny Abbey, which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The setting of the abbey would need to be protected. This road passes through areas of Flood Zone 2/3. Access to the A10 is limited to left in / left out, which is a good solution given the amount of traffic that uses this road.

38 However, noise / vibration, dust, odour and possibly bioaerosol generation from aggregate sidings /and containerised waste transfer may have an adverse impact on amenity, health and quality of life. The significance of impact / effect should be assessed by undertaking Health and Environmental Impact Assessments, respectively.

**Implications**

39. Financial	None
Legal	The Council will be obliged to show Mineral and Waste allocations and safeguarding areas for minerals on its own LDF Proposals Map once the Minerals and Waste Development Plan is adopted
Staffing	None
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**

40. In preparing this report consultation has taken place with officers in the Environmental Health; Conservation; and Development Control.

## Effect on Corporate Objectives and Service Priorities

41.	<b>Work in partnership to manage growth to benefit everyone in South Cambridgeshire now and in the future</b>
	The MWDP provides an input into the managing of growth within the district. The additional sites could assist in providing the minerals needed in construction of both the new communities and the major infrastructure projects. The waste facilities allocates for the needs for waste of the future communities. Without this planning the growth would not be well co-ordinated.
	<b>Deliver high quality services that represent best value and are accessible to all our community</b>
	The location of mineral extraction can impact on local road networks and on local communities. By responding to the consultation the Council will ensure that the most appropriate sites are allocated in the MWDP.
	<b>Enhance quality of life and build a sustainable South Cambridgeshire where everyone is proud to live and work</b>
	By responding to the consultation the Council will ensure that the most sustainable sites are allocated and that in identifying sites the local communities are not adversely affected by the subsequent working of the minerals.

## Conclusions / Summary

42. The Council has outlined in this report its proposed responses to the County Council's consultation on additional sites put forward by stakeholders for inclusion in the MWDP.

## Recommendations

43. The Council welcomes the opportunity to respond to the consultation and the suggested responses are as follows –

Mineral sites – The proposed responses on all the sites are included in Table 1

Borrowpits for A14 upgrade – The County Council should review whether the Minerals and Waste Development Plan is the appropriate vehicle for providing borrowpits for the A14 upgrade.

Waste Recycling and Recovery sites – The proposed responses on all the sites are included in Table 2

Railhead – Support in principle the relocating of the freight and aggregate yard to this location subject to the concerns of proximity to Denny Abbey and to the road being in flood zone. Consideration would also have to be given to the matters raised by Environmental Health.

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

- Web based information concerning the consultation on Cambridgeshire County Council's Web site -

[www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/mineralswasteplan](http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/mineralswasteplan)

- Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Preferred Options 2 September 2008
- South Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet Report – 9<sup>th</sup> October 2008

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