

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning and New Communities Joint Portfolio Holders 2 March 2010
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director (Operational Services) / Corporate Manager (Planning and Sustainable Communities)

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION BY CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL AND PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL ON THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION OF THE MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

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 on the proposed Submission version of the Minerals and Waste Development Plan (MWDP) which has been jointly prepared by these two councils and which is intended to be submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2010.
- 2 This Plan sets the framework for all minerals and waste developments over the period 2006 –2026. It allocates sites to ensure a steady supply of minerals including those necessary to supply much of the growth agenda. It also facilitates the provision of modern waste management facilities so that the way the Cambridgeshire manages waste will become much more sustainable.
- 3 The consultation is for six weeks from 15 February to 29 March 2010.
- 4 The full consultation can be seen on the County's website.
<http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/mineralswasteframework/>
- 5 This is a key decision because it is likely to affect many of the communities across the district. Some of the allocated mineral sites may have an impact on their local communities such as at Cottenham, Willingham, Over and Barrington. Also there will be a significant impact on communities living or working in the wards in the District adjacent to the A14 because clay borrowpits are identified in the minerals plan – Fen Drayton; Swavesey; Longstanton; Bar Hill; Oakington; Girton; Lolworth; Boxworth; Dry Drayton; Conington. The proposed waste sites are to serve the whole of the district and so their locations will have a district wide benefits.
- 6 It was first published in the December 2009 Forward Plan.

Executive Summary

- 7 The report outlines the Council's response to the Minerals and Waste Development Plan Consultation. It indicates the previous consultations that have taken place and when South Cambs has responded to these. Few changes have been made to the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (MWCS). *Minerals* - Only one site is allocated as a strategic site within South Cambs – Barrington for chalk marl extraction. Two sites are identified in MWCS as being broad locations for sand and gravel extraction – Cottenham and Needingworth both of which the Council objects to until more detailed information is made available. The Council is concerned that there is no routeing strategy policy as had been requested in earlier consultations. The traffic impact of

minerals and waste developments is not adequately covered in the MWCS. The measures to address impact of the traffic should be included in a policy. Need for recognition that it is not just the increase in traffic but the nature of this traffic – i.e. HCVs. Concern that air quality issues are not adequately addressed in MWCS. Waste – Council remains concerned at waste strategy in MWCS. Regret that Cambridgeshire's Household Recycling Strategy is not part of supporting documents to MWDP. Concern that no strategy for waste transfer stations if they are essential element of waste strategy. Mention made of RECAP Design Guide SPD and great importance attached to this document. South Cambs concerned that it may not be robust enough to achieve that aims of recycling, waste minimisation. MWCS requiring future new development to contribute to Household Recycling Centres (HRC) with section 106 – question whether this can be asked for. If review of East of England Plan results in more housing growth would need to review MWDP to revise waste strategy. Waste Water Treatment Works have a 400m safeguarding area around them – Council concerned at why arbitrary figure of 400m. Comments made on sites for HRCs within S Cambs – Cambridge East, Cambridge Northern Fringe; Northstowe and Cambridge South.

Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD (MWSSP) South Cambs repeats its concerns about mineral safeguarding areas and the policy has not been revised to clarify that not all the areas safeguarded would be worked; These areas still extend over environmentally sensitive areas. All the clay borrowpits for the A14 improvements are within S Cambs and still concerned about air quality if all sites worked at same time. Hierarchy of sites has been proposed by S Cambs if Highway Agency does not need all sites identified. Schedule included in report that provides summary of Councils comments on all the sites for minerals and waste identified within the MWDP that affect this district.

Background

- 8 Cambridgeshire County Council is preparing jointly with Peterborough City Council the 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 procedures for preparing the MWDP have been lengthy and have included significant public consultation¹. South Cambs has responded at all the relevant stages.
- 9 In September/October 2008 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.
- 10 During the Preferred Options 2 consultation the County Council received representations from stakeholders who put forward a number of new sites or suggestions to amend existing proposed sites. The County Council carried out two further consultations on these new/ amended sites early in 2009 and the Council responded to those sites that were within South Cambridgeshire in March 2009.

¹ Public consultation on MWDP - Two rounds of Issues and Options (June 2005 and January 2006); Two rounds of Preferred Options (November 2006 and October 2008) ; Two rounds of consultation on additional proposed sites (both early 2009)

The Current Consultation

- 11 The MWDP comprises
- Core Strategy (MWCS): a document setting out the strategic vision and objectives, and including a suite of development control policies to guide minerals and waste development
 - Site Specific Proposals (MWSSP): a document setting out site specific proposals for minerals and waste development and supporting site specific policies.
- 12 Before the MWDP is submitted to the Secretary of State it has to be subject to a further 6 weeks of consultation. If representations are made during this consultation then a public inquiry will be arranged to consider them once the Plan is formally submitted. Once submitted there will be no opportunities for the Councils to make changes to the Plan. This current version of the Plan is the one that the County Council and Peterborough City Council are intending to submit in July 2010 and will seek to adopt and implement in the future.

Stages	MWDP – Core Strategy	MWDP Site Specific Policies
Preferred option 2	September / October 2008	September / October 2008
Pre –submission consultation	February / March 2010	February / March 2010
Submission	July 2010	July 2010
Pre-hearing meeting	September 2010	May 2011
Hearing	November 2010	July 2011
Adoption	June 2011	February 2012

Issues for consideration

MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGY DPD

- 13 The content of the proposed **Submission Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (MWCS)** has only had minor amendments made to it from that which was consulted upon in the Preferred Options 2 in 2008 and to which South Cambs submitted comments. (See Appendix XXX for report) As a result of the additional consultations that the County carried out in 2009 there have been some amendments made to the sites identified and policies and relevant updates have been included on waste and mineral matters.
- 14 The MWCS in this proposed Submission version has strategic allocations for minerals and waste sites plus a list of broad locations within different policies of where particular uses will be. The specific sites to achieve these policies are contained within the **Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals (MWSSP)**. The detailed comments relating to these sites are contained within Appendices 2 and 3.

MINERALS

- 15 Options for mineral extraction are constrained by the fact that minerals can only be extracted where they occur. Their geological location has greatly influenced the mineral strategy. This strategy has been 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.
- 16 In the MWCS there is now only one policy that contains a strategic allocation within South Cambs – **Policy CS9 The Scale and Location of Future Chalk and Marl Extraction**. There are broad locations identified in **Policy CS4 The Scale and Location of Future Sand and Gravel Extraction**. Maps showing the location of the sites are included in Appendix 1.

Table 1

Site location (Proposals Map number in brackets)	Location of Proposed Mineral Workings; Policy Ref from Core Strategy and Site Specific Proposals DPD and number	Summary of South Cambs comments
Barrington Quarry, Barrington (Strategic site) (Map 13)	Chalk marl extraction CS9 The Scale and Location of Future Chalk Marl Extraction. SSP M4A – Specific site allocation for chalk marl extraction SSP M9Q - Mineral consultation areas	No objection to the mineral allocation subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation. These are that full Health and Environmental Impact Assessments should be carried out and that consideration needs to be given to the impact of the extension of the quarry on the character of the landscape. A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.
Cottenham (Broad location) (Map 1)	Sand and gravel extraction CS4 The Scale and Location of Future Sand and Gravel – Principal broad locations for sand and gravel Cottenham/ Landbeach (Central / Southern Zone) SSP M1A – Specific site allocations for sand and	Object to the allocation until such time as more detailed information is provided on the full environmental impact of the 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

	<p>gravel</p> <p>SSP M9E - Mineral consultation areas</p>	<p>Council can determine whether this site should be allocated as an allocated site for extraction.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A site-specific policy is needed for this allocation indicating that routing agreements are essential before permission is given to work this site to ensure that the additional lorries generated by the larger scale of operation do not adversely affect the residents of Cottenham or the gypsies and travellers on the nearby Smithy Fen.</p>
<p>Needingworth (Broad location)</p> <p>(Map 2)</p>	<p>Sand and gravel extraction</p> <p>CS4 The Scale and Location of Future Sand and Gravel – Principal broad locations for sand and gravel Needingworth (Central / Southern Zone)</p> <p>SSP M1B – Specific site allocations for sand and gravel</p> <p>SSP M9R - Mineral consultation areas</p>	<p>Object to the allocation until such time as more detailed information is provided on the full environmental impact of the site now being identified for extraction. Until this information is available it is not possible to evaluate this site and decide whether it is an appropriate allocation</p> <p>The settlements of Willingham and Over are very close to the identified site and 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. The MWSSP should include a site-specific policy to include</p>

		<p>these matters.</p> <p>Routing agreements would need to be made to ensure that lorries do not go through the villages of Willingham and Over. These must be a requirement of a site-specific policy for this allocation to be included in the MWSSP.</p> <p>Minerals would need to continue to be removed from the site via Needingworth and the need for a bypass for Willingham would have to be a requirement included in a site specific policy for this allocation if this site were to be identified for sand and gravel extraction.</p>
--	--	--

Traffic and Highways issues

- 17 **Routeing Agreements** - The Council proposed routeing agreements in its response to the Preferred Options 2 consultation in October 2008 stating the following

Traffic routeing agreements are a good way of reducing the impact of traffic movements to and from minerals and waste sites on the local community. The MWDP supports such agreements but because routeing agreements are usually done as legal agreements then no specific policy has been included in the plan. Such agreements will be of particular relevance within South Cambridgeshire as heavy lorries carry minerals to the many development sites in the Cambridge Sub-region. Given the scale of all the development proposed this is likely to generate a considerable amount of traffic that must avoid going through the many villages in the District. In particular the Mepal/ Earith area has been identified in the MWDP as an area where there will be large-scale extraction of sand and gravel over the plan period and much of this is likely to have to be transported along roads in South Cambridgeshire to reach the new development areas in the sub-region. The Council would want the MWCS to include a policy to consider providing a routeing strategy for the plan area. This must be an enforceable routeing strategy that mineral and waste traffic must follow. The Council would wish to see included in this policy an identification of those settlements most likely to be affected by minerals and waste traffic so that there can be a requirement for bypasses – e.g. Willingham and Cottenham.

- 18 The proposed Submission MWCS does not contain a routeing strategy policy for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and therefore the Council must object to this and request that the MWCS be revised to include such a policy. The Council is extremely concerned that as a result of the housing and employment growth within the district there will be more traffic on the roads. “*Traffic density on Cambridgeshire’s rural*

*trunk 'A' roads is 90% higher than the national average and is 38% above average on other 'A' Roads. Over the last 10 years there has been a significant growth in the number of heavy commercial vehicles with five or more axles. The density of HCV traffic on Cambridgeshire's trunk 'A' roads is just under three times the national average with non-trunk roads nearly twice the national average*². The on-line information provided by the County Council on its consultation pages for the MWDP indicates that ...'the area around Northstowe is ...likely to be affected, where the construction of the new settlement will draw material from local quarries such as Needingworth via its existing approved quarry HCV route via the A1123, A1096 and the A14.' It is unclear whether the approved quarry HCV route that is mentioned is specific to Needingworth. The MWCS should therefore include a policy to provide a routeing strategy for the plan area rather than it be left to be devised on an ad hoc basis as each planning application is submitted for mineral workings and waste uses.

- 19 **Addressing the transport problems of mineral and waste developments** - The MWCS considers in paragraph 11.5 the measures that could be sought to address the main problems associated with mineral and waste operation related traffic but has not incorporated them into a policy to give them increased weight. These measures include strategic signage for mineral and waste lorry movements; backloading (i.e. bringing out one type of load and taking back another; highway improvements; private haul roads and hours of working. An addition has been made to **Policy CS 32 Traffic and Highways** about the Mineral / Waste Planning Authority entering into binding agreements covering some of these measures but this relates only to mineral extraction in the Earith/ Mepal area primarily on Block Fen / Langwood Fen. The policy should be revised to consider the whole of the plan area and to incorporate in a fuller way the measures that can be used to address the traffic problems associated with minerals and waste operations. A separate policy should be included in the plan to consider the Earith / Mepal area.
- 20 Policy CS32 Traffic and Highways gives three criteria that must be considered before permission is given for mineral and waste development – one of which is that ‘any associated increase in traffic or highway improvements would not cause unacceptable harm to the environment, road safety or residential amenity.’ This does not recognise that it is not just the increase in traffic but the nature of the vehicles associated with these types of development – i.e. large lorries / HCVs. The County Council has recently been out for consultation on a suggested route map for HCVs for the County and this should be included within Policy CS32 to assist in devising suitable routes for mineral and waste traffic.

Air quality issues

- 21 South Cambs supports **Policy CS 34 Protecting Surrounding Uses** since it includes consideration of no significant harm to the environment, human health or safety ...or loss to residential or other amenity and which is linked to CS24 Design of sustainable minerals and waste management facilities and CS 32 Traffic & Highways. However the Council is concerned that there is no specific mention of air quality in the context of National Air Quality Objectives pollutants and impact locally. Whist this is mentioned specifically on page 11 of the MWCS in the Sustainability Appraisal under point 5 it is not mentioned elsewhere and is inextricably linked / integrated with to CS 24 and 32. Air quality must be included within Policy 34.

² Extract from report on Draft Advisory Heavy Commercial Vehicles Route Mao considered by Planning and New Communities Portfolio Holders on 26 January 2010.

- 22 In paragraph 8.17 there is a list of matters that would need to be considered in the design of minerals and waste facilities. However this should be consistent with the related **SPD on the Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities**. The local and design criteria should be consistent and an obvious omission is any reference to national air quality objectives.

WASTE

Spatial strategy

- 23 South Cambridgeshire District Council has in previous consultation stages of the MWCS expressed concerns at the lack of a strategy for waste and this concern was partly addressed in the Preferred Options 2 with some reservations about the strategy devised for inert waste since sites proposed within South Cambs seemed unsuitable for this use.
- 24 The spatial strategy for municipal waste has largely been determined through documents that have not formed part of the consultation process for the MWCS. In October 2008 South Cambs responded as follows

The spatial strategy for municipal waste has largely been determined through the Waste Management Strategies that have been prepared by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Authorities in their roles as Waste Disposal Authorities. The County adopted a Cambridgeshire Household Recycling Strategy in December 2006 which ‘sets out the Authority’s strategy for delivering these facilities as a resource to the public, and as a critical aid to meeting statutory waste to landfill diversion targets. This Strategy has been supplemented by further work which has refined the need and best locations for local recycling centres in Cambridgeshire.’ (paragraph 6.45 Page 96 MWCS³) These strategies and additional work are not part of this consultation and it is regrettable that they have not been included as supporting documents as it would have assisted the understanding of the recycling centres strategy. South Cambridgeshire District Council considers that these should have been part of the Preferred Options 2 consultation and been subject to a sustainability appraisal. The MWCS identifies Cambridge East; Cambridge North; Cambridge South and Northstowe as preferred allocations for household Recycling Centres. These preferred locations appear to have been decided upon through the County’s Recycling Strategy- a non-statutory document.

- 25 These documents have still not been included as supporting ones to the current MWCS and the Council remains concerned about this omission. This omission may provide the basis for a legal challenge at the adoption stage of the plan.
- 26 In paragraph 7.45 of MWCS it states ‘ An essential element of the network of waste facilities is waste transfer stations which bulk up and transfer waste of different types onwards for treatment and disposal. They tend to be small scale but are important in securing sustainable waste management. They will therefore be encouraged wherever this is appropriate.’ It is intended that these be considered under **Policy CS18 Waste Management Proposals Outside Allocated Areas**’ however if they are an essential element then why have they not been included in site allocations within the MWDP? In considering other waste facilities the emphasis has been one of flexibility and therefore it would seem more appropriate to include a strategy for this type of facility within the plan.

³ MWCS mentioned here is that of Preferred Option 2, 2008.

Planning for waste management in new developments and RECAP Waste Guide SPD

- 27 **Policy CS28 Waste Minimisation, Re-use and Resource Recovery** is about how the Waste Planning Authority will encourage waste reduction, recycling and resource recovery in new developments across the plan area. It is a fundamental one to achieving improvements in the management of waste in future residential and commercial developments. Much emphasis is placed upon the **RECAP Waste Management Design Supplementary Planning Document**, which is out for consultation alongside the proposed Submission MWDP. The success in achieving the requirements of CS28 will rest on the contents of this SPD and how clearly it outlines the requirements for waste management with future developments. South Cambs is concerned that the contents of the SPD are not robust enough to achieve this. This SPD is being considered in a separate report at 2 March Joint Portfolio Holders meeting.
- 28 Policy CS28 states that new developments should contribute to the provision of 'bring sites' consistent with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD. It is not made clear that 'bring sites' are the responsibility of District Councils or indeed what a 'bring site' is. If new developments are to contribute to provide bring sites then there needs to be more information in the supporting text to Policy CS28.
- 29 **Policy CS16 Household Recycling Centre** states that ' New developments will contribute to the provision of HRCs. Contributions will be consistent with RECAP Design Management Guide SPD.' The Council is concerned that this contribution is included in a policy since the provision of HRC is the responsibility of the County Council under the Refuse Disposal (Amenity) Act 1978 and the MWDP has made provision for 9 additional HRCs to meet future demands. Planning obligations could not be used to provide for additional sites if more growth is planned for through the Review of the East of England Plan. The MWDP would need to be reviewed to take into account this planned growth. It could have major implications for the whole waste strategy and as such should be appropriately planned for.
- 30 There is also a sentence at the end of *Policy CS18 Waste Management Proposals Outside Allocated Areas* which states that.' All strategic development will make provision for permanent waste management.' In the supporting text paragraph 7.46 it states that this relates to any large-scale development in future plans such as new settlements or large extensions to urban areas. If such proposals are planned in the future such as through a review of the Regional Spatial Strategy then if they are of a large scale the MWDP would need to be reviewed to make any necessary allocations – allocations for minerals and waste developments cannot be made in the District Councils Development Plan Documents (DPDs).

Waste Water Treatment Safeguarding Areas

- 31 In the MWCS it is recognised that wastewater treatment works (WWTW) are likely to create odours that may be a nuisance to people living and working nearby and therefore a safeguarding area is to be created around all works with a capacity exceeding 2000 population equivalent. Within the safeguarded area '*there will be a presumption against allowing any new development which involves odour sensitive development. Odour sensitive development includes buildings normally occupied by people and would include houses, offices, industrial units, sport and recreational buildings.*' The safeguarding area will extend to 400 metres around the boundary of the site. There is no reasoned justification for this distance and there would appear to be no evidence presented to explain why 400 metres and not another arbitrary

distance has been identified or why development within the whole circumference of a WWTW needs to be blighted in this way. For example the prevailing wind towards Cambridge WWTW (Site I) is from the south- west, which results in any odour primarily, affecting the area to the north east of the A14 rather than the businesses to the west and south. South Cambs is concerned that there is no evidence base for the 400 metres.

Waste site allocations

- 32 There are no sites within South Cambridgeshire that have been allocated for a strategic use for waste however there is a strategic allocation for a hazardous waste facility at Addenbrookes Hospital that could have an impact upon this district and therefore is considered in this report. There are however 'broad locations' within one policy that affects South Cambs – **Policy CS16 for Household Recycling Centres**. Maps showing the location of the sites are included in Appendix 1.

Table 2

Site location (Proposals Map number in brackets)	Nature of waste facility; Policy Ref from Core Strategy and Site Specific Proposals DPD and number	Summary of South Cambs comments
Addenbrookes Hospital, Cambridge (Waste) Map A 3	Replacement Clinical Waste Facility CS 19 The Location of Hazardous Waste Facilities – Resources Recovery and Landfill Type of facility Replacement Clinical Waste Facility (energy from waste) CS30 Waste Consultation area	Support. This waste management facility is based on the Hospital's needs and can be supported.
Cambridge East (Map inset 41)	Household Recycling Centres Policy CS 16 Household Recycling Centres -Broad locations listed in policy Policy SSP W1E Site specific allocations for waste recycling and recovery facilities Potential uses include – Recycling facility; Household Recycling Centre; Temporary Inert Waste Recycling;	Support the uses being proposed for the site. Cambridge East will be the largest single development in the Cambridge Sub-Region over the next 15 years and it is to be planned at high densities and therefore the location and design of the proposed waste management facilities must have regard to this. Support would be subject to consideration of the matters raised by Environmental Health, which are that the

Site location (Proposals Map number in brackets)	Nature of waste facility; Policy Ref from Core Strategy and Site Specific Proposals DPD and number	Summary of South Cambs comments
	<p>Suitable New Waste Management Technologies; Materials Recovery Facility</p> <p>Policy SSP W8H Waste Consultation Areas</p>	<p>proposal should be subject to an environmental and health impact assessment.</p> <p>The inert recycling facility is supported however it should be recognised that it may be more appropriate to have a number of smaller sites to serve the development of Cambridge East. Support would be subject to the measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health, which are that the proposal should be subject to an environmental and health impact assessment.</p> <p>The facilities should not be located so that they impact upon the existing communities within Cambridge and the villages of Fen Ditton and Taversham particularly the temporary inert recycling facility.</p> <p>South Cambs request that a site – specific policy be included for Cambridge East to include those issues mentioned above relating to mitigation matters and impact on surrounding communities.</p>
Cambridge Northern Fringe Map inset 42	<p>Household Recycling Centres</p> <p>Policy CS 16 Household Recycling Centres -Broad locations listed in policy</p> <p>Policy SSP W1F</p>	Support in principle the use of the site for a Recycling Centre and for inert waste recycling subject to the measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation, which are to ensure the

Site location (Proposals Map number in brackets)	Nature of waste facility; Policy Ref from Core Strategy and Site Specific Proposals DPD and number	Summary of South Cambs comments
	<p>Site specific allocations for waste recycling and recovery facilities Potential uses include – Household Recycling Centre; Inert Waste Recycling; Suitable New Waste Management Technologies;</p> <p>Policy SSP W8I Waste Consultation Areas</p>	<p>development has a minimal environmental impact by incorporating mitigation measures preferably at the design stage of the development.</p> <p>South Cambs request that a site-specific policy is included for this site and that this incorporates all the issues mentioned that would need to be addressed by a planning application.</p>
Northstowe Area 2 Map inset 57	<p>Household Recycling Centres</p> <p>Policy CS 16 Household Recycling Centres Broad location listed</p> <p>Policy SSP W1U Site specific allocations for waste recycling and recovery facilities Proposed use is Waste Recycling and Recovery –a Household Recycling Centre</p> <p>Policy SSP W8AQ Waste Consultation Areas</p>	<p>Support in principle subject to the measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health, which are that at the design stage consideration, is given to minimise the environmental impact of the development. Any household-recycling centre must also ensure that settlements adjoining Northstowe are not adversely impacted by noise or odour. 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).</p> <p>South Cambs request that a site-specific policy be included in the MWSSP to cover the issues identified above relating to the impact of the facility on adjoining settlements and mitigation measures needed.</p>
South of Addenbrookes	Household Recycling	No objection subject to

Site location (Proposals Map number in brackets)	Nature of waste facility; Policy Ref from Core Strategy and Site Specific Proposals DPD and number	Summary of South Cambs comments
Access Road Map inset 60	Centres Policy CS 16 Household Recycling Centres Broad location listed Policy SSP W1X Site specific allocations for waste recycling and recovery facilities Proposed use is Waste Recycling and Recovery –a Household Recycling Centre Policy SSP W8AV Waste Consultation Areas	<p>measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health. These are that appropriate buffer zones will be required in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures to minimise impact and to protect health and wellbeing of residents. As this is a new development it should be possible to ensure minimal environmental impact at the design stage by incorporating intrinsic mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Council supports the identification of the site for a recycling centre and welcomes the additional information provided by the County as regards how the facility will be designed to reduce its impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>South Cambs request that a site-specific policy be included in the MWSSP. This policy should include both the mitigation measures raised by Environmental Health and the design issues outlined by the County to reduce the impact of the facility on the surrounding area.</p>

MINERALS AND WASTE SITE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS DPD (MWSSP)

- 33 As a result of the additional consultations carried out in 2009 there are new sites within the proposed Submission MWSSP notably a number of engineering clay borrow pit sites to serve the improvements to the A14 and additional inert waste sites.

Mineral Safeguarding Areas (Policy CS25)

- 34 Mineral Safeguarding Areas have been included in the MWDP and their purpose is to ensure that mineral resources are adequately protected and effectively considered in land use planning decisions so like other finite resources they are not needlessly sterilized. Within these areas the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) must be consulted when planning applications are made for major developments⁴. These areas were included in the previous MWSSP and South Cambs expressed its concerns at the extent of the safeguarding areas within this district. In October 2008 the Council stated

Within South Cambridgeshire there are proposed very large areas of mineral safeguarding for sand and gravel, which surround many settlements... It should be emphasized that there is no presumption that the land safeguarded will ever be worked for the extraction of minerals. However the policy that accompanies MSAs does not emphasize this point and it would be beneficial to add in order to reduce the potential confusion by those communities directly affected by these areas.

- 35 The policy has been revised but not to take into account this request by South Cambs and therefore it is necessary to restate this requested amendment to clarify that they are areas of potential mineral resource which may be considered in the future but that all material planning considerations will be taken into account in any decision whether or not to permit extraction.
- 36 Also in October 2008 the Council was concerned that some of the proposed safeguarding areas cover sites that are affected by specific non-minerals related development policies. This related especially to
- Northstowe
 - Established employment areas including the Cambridge Research Park, Landbeach, and Granta Park, Great Abington and
 - Bayer Cropscience at Hauxton.
- 37 In October 2008 the Council stated the following -

Given that these sites are within adopted DPDs it would seem confusing to suggest that the proposed mineral safeguarding areas should continue to be allocated over these sites.... the methodology should be revised to take into account existing allocations.

- 38 The revision to the policy now includes a list of criteria a development must demonstrate to the MPA before it will be permitted in a MSA. One of these criteria is that the development is allocated in other adopted local development documents. The Council therefore welcomes this amendment to the policy however it is still a requirement that any development coming forward in these areas must carry out consultation with the MPA to ensure consideration is given to the mineral resource.
- 39 The Council also expressed its concern in October 2008 that

'...there are extensive areas of sand and gravel identified in MSAs around the Shelfords, Grantchester and Newnham areas where it is important to protect the landscape character and setting of Cambridge. The MSAs also impact on many villages that have conservation areas where the setting of these areas must be

⁴ The definition of major development is that found in the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995

preserved such as Little Shelford; Whittleford; Foxton; Duxford; Horningsea. Whilst the Council can accept that there may be reserves, there are over-riding planning and environmental reasons why they should never be worked. The methodology used for identifying MSAs must be flawed if such areas must continue to be included. Likewise environmentally sensitive areas such as the Gog Magog Hills/ Wandlebury Country Park, Grantchester Meadows and Denny Abbey should be excluded from MSAs. By including such areas to be safeguarded it creates concern amongst the local communities surrounded by such areas. Such reserves cannot ever be considered as economic resources because they have too high a value attached to them for environmental reasons. The MSAs boundaries should be revised accordingly.

- 40 The safeguarding areas have not been revised and South Cambs is disappointed that the methodology does not take into account the importance of these environmental reasons.

Borrow pits for use in the A14 improvements.

- 41 In the consultation in 2008 Costain and Lafarge who are both working with the Highway Authority proposed 13 clay- general borrow pit sites, which are located either adjacent to or very close to the route of the current or proposed line of the upgraded A14. The County Council then consulted upon these sites in 2009 and the comments submitted by South Cambs are contained within Appendix 5.
- 42 It should be noted that all of the clay borrow pits identified to serve the A14 improvements are all within South Cambridgeshire. Those that had previously been identified in other districts in the consultation in 2009 have not been allocated in the proposed Submission MWSSP. As part of the consultation there is additional information available on the County's website relating to the A14. This states - *The A14 scheme will require large quantities of clay as engineering fill. The fill is used to construct embankments for the road and whilst some may be sourced from within the scheme (from "cut and fill" engineering), the Plan makes provision for 9 general fill borrowpits to be constructed alongside the road primarily between Histon and Fen Drayton. At the eastern end of the scheme, suitable clay fill may be available from a local landfill site.* These nine borrowpits are those within South Cambs. It is unclear whether this implies clay would have to be transported out of South Cambs to provide for A14 improvements to the north of the district and the traffic implications of this. South Cambs would request that if this clay has to be transported this should be done along haul roads rather than impact on local roads.
- 43 The comments relating to borrowpits submitted for the consultation in 2009 still remain valid and can be summarized as follows –
1. The Highways Agency (HA) has not indicated what quantities of minerals will be required by the A14 works and whether by allocating all the proposed borrow pits there will be a surplus. South Cambs would not support some sites if other less sensitive locations were available.
 2. The timetable for the completion of the MWDP would appear not to coincide with that proposed by the HA to upgrade the A14. Is the MWDP the most appropriate vehicle for providing borrowpits for the A14 upgrade?
 3. Air quality – Concern if all the mineral sites and borrow pits were operating at the same time close to the A14 – there may be a significant degradation of air quality within the A14 Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) within South

Cambridgeshire. There is a statutory duty to consider air quality action plans to reduce HCV traffic and bring down pollutant concentrations in the AQMA. The collective impact of the A14 borrowpits may have detrimental short-term impact on local air quality and SCDC's AQMA. Insufficient information has been included for the Council to assess the cumulative impact on air quality.

4. Air quality – The impact of borrow pits will be over a limited period and the advantages of having them close to construction works could outweigh the dis-benefits highlighted by Environmental Health.
- 44 If the borrowpit allocations are to remain as part of the MWCS the concerns about air quality should be included as a separate paragraph in the supporting text to the policy about clay borrows pit allocations after paragraph 3.22 MWSSP.
- 45 The concern about how many borrowpits will be needed by the Highways Agency and also whether the MWDP is the most appropriate vehicle is further reaffirmed in the information provided on-line by the County during this consultation when it states '*The Highways Agency will clarify how many borrowpits are needed once they have a more accurate idea of their requirements. All borrowpits will require a planning application, which will include public consultation.*' South Cambs is concerned that there is such uncertainty and question whether the borrowpits should be included in the MWDP. If the Highway Authority has been unable to indicate how much clay would be needed for the A14 improvements the currently proposed sites may create a surplus or not be enough! South Cambs in its response to the actual allocated sites would be in favour of some sites if other less environmentally acceptable ones could be rejected. The following table indicates the hierarchy that South Cambs has devised in relation to the borrowpits within the district taking into account planning; conservation and environmental health considerations. Those borrowpits that are placed at 1 in the hierarchy should be used first for improvements to the A14

Figure 1 Hierarchy of borrowpits

Borrowpit	Place in hierarchy	Comments made on this site in Preferred Option 2 consultation 2009
New Barns Farm, Conington (16)	3	Supported with reservations concerning proximity to Conington; impact on wintering site for golden plovers.
Brickyard Farm, Boxworth (15)	1	Supported by South Cambs
Boxworth End Farm, North of Trinity Foot Junction (14)	1	Supported by South Cambs
South Trinity Foot Junction- East (21)	2	Supported with reservations concerning proximity to Lolworth
South Trinity Foot Junction - West (22)	1	Supported by South Cambs
North Bar Hill, Noon Folly Farm (17)	1	Supported by South Cambs
North Dry Drayton Junction, Slate Hall Farm	4	Rejected by South Cambs

Borrowpit	Place in hierarchy	Comments made on this site in Preferred Option 2 consultation 2009
(18) North Junction 14, Grange Farm (19)	3	Supported with reservations concerning impact on Beck Brook and site is in Green Belt
South Junction 14 /Girton/ Madingley (20)	2	Supported with reservations concerning site in Green Belt but potential for restoration of site for wetland reserve.

Implementation issues

- 46 For each of the sites included in the MWSSP there is an identical sentence included in the implementation issues for each site summary, which states –
- ‘Detailed assessment of development impacts and mitigation techniques will be required as part of any individual development proposal through the planning process. ‘*
- 47 The successful implementation of these minerals and waste sites will be dependent on there being detailed information available on the impact of each development and the mitigation required to make development of any particular site acceptable. The MWDP must include a list of the information required within the DPD or supporting documents.
- 48 There is also in the supporting text for each site a list of the issues that would need to be addressed within a planning application for each site. These include a range of topics such as preferred access routes to sites; noise and dust mitigation required; ecological management required to restore site; HCV routeing to be addressed; impact on adjoining residents; flood risk assessment; landscape mitigation; potential impact on nearby wildlife or archaeological sites. If these issues are to be adequately addressed in planning applications they should be incorporated into a policy for each site. This will give them more weight than being in the supporting text and would therefore have to be considered by an applicant. If a more detailed policy were included for each site in the MWDP this would address some of the concerns that South Cambs has relating to sites within the district particularly relating to access and environmental impact matters.

Minerals site allocations

- 49 The recommended response to the sites allocated in the MWSSP is contained in Appendices 2 and 3 and summarised in the table below. This list also includes those sites consulted upon in 2009 but not subsequently included in the plan. Sites that have been identified as either strategic allocations or broad locations within policies in the MWCS although they also appear in the MWSSP have not been included in the table below since they have been considered earlier in this report. Maps showing the location of the sites are included in Appendix 1.

Table 3

Site Location	Nature of mineral Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred Option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
Land at Hinxton (South of A 505 near Whittlesford Bridge)	Sand and Gravel extraction in Preferred option 2 consultation 2009.	South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this site in the proposed Submission MWDP.
Covell's Drain, Swavesey	Sand & gravel borrow pit for the A14 upgrade in Preferred option 2 consultation 2009.	South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this borrowpit from the proposed Submission MWDP.
Corpus Christi, North of Offord Cluny	Clay borrowpit for A14 upgrade in Preferred option 2 consultation 2009.	South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this borrowpit from the proposed Submission MWDP.
New Barns Farm, Conington Inset map 16	Engineering clay borrow pits CS 12 Engineering Clay SSP7C The site allocations for engineering clay borrowpits to serve the A14 upgrade	South Cambs would object to this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations. It is considered to be level 3 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs. 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. These are that an assessment is needed about the impact of the noise and dust from the site. With an appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level. There are also concerns about air quality to be taken into account.

Site Location	Nature of mineral Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred Option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
		A site-specific policy for this allocation could include a requirement for the impact on the golden plovers to be considered and also the matters raised by Environmental Health.
Brickyard Farm, Boxworth Inset map 15	Engineering clay borrow pits CS 12 Engineering Clay SSP7B The site allocations for engineering clay borrowpits to serve the A14 upgrade	<p>Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health. These are that an assessment is needed about the impact of the noise and dust from the site. With an appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level. There are also concerns about air quality to be taken into account.</p> <p>It is considered to be level 1 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</p> <p>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</p>
Boxworth End Farm, North of Trinity Foot Junction Inset map 14	Engineering clay borrow pits CS 12 Engineering Clay SSP7A The site allocations for engineering clay borrowpits to serve the A14 upgrade	<p>Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health. These are that an assessment is needed about the impact of the noise and dust from the site. With an appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific</p>

Site Location	Nature of mineral Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred Option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
		<p>mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level. There are also concerns about air quality to be taken into account.</p> <p>It is considered to be level 1 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</p> <p>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</p>
<p>South Trinity Foot Junction (East)</p> <p>Inset map 21</p>	<p>Engineering clay borrow pits CS 12 Engineering Clay</p> <p>SSP7H The site allocations for engineering clay borrowpits to serve the A14 upgrade</p>	<p>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. These are that an assessment is needed about the impact of the noise and dust from the site. With an appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level. There are also concerns about air quality to be taken into account.</p> <p>It is considered to be level 2 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</p> <p>A site-specific policy could</p>

Site Location	Nature of mineral Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred Option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
South Trinity Foot Junction (West) Inset map 22	Engineering clay borrow pits CS 12 Engineering Clay SSP7I The site allocations for engineering clay borrowpits to serve the A14 upgrade	<p>include a requirement to consider these matters.</p> <p>Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health. These are that an assessment is needed about the impact of the noise and dust from the site. With an appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level. There are also concerns about air quality to be taken into account.</p> <p>It is considered to be level 1 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</p> <p>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</p>
North Bar Hill, Noon Folly Farm Inset map 17	Engineering clay borrow pits CS 12 Engineering Clay SSP7D The site allocations for engineering clay borrowpits to serve the A14 upgrade	<p>Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation. These are that an assessment is needed about the impact of the noise and dust from the site. With an appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to control noise and dust impact to an acceptable</p>

Site Location	Nature of mineral Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred Option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
		<p>level. There are also concerns about air quality to be taken into account. Consideration also needs to be given to the impact on the ecology of the area.</p> <p>It is considered to be level 1 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</p> <p>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</p>
<p>North Dry Drayton Junction, Slate Hall Farm</p> <p>Inset map 18</p>	<p>Engineering clay borrow pits CS 12 Engineering Clay</p> <p>SSP7E The site allocations for engineering clay borrowpits to serve the A14 upgrade</p>	<p>Given its proximity to the Crematorium and the site being within the Green Belt South Cambs would not support this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations.</p> <p>It is considered to be level 4 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</p> <p>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation. These are that an assessment is needed about the impact of the noise and dust from the site. With an appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level. There are also concerns about air quality to be taken into account. Consideration</p>

Site Location	Nature of mineral Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred Option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
North Junction 14, Grange Farm Inset map 19	<p>Engineering clay borrow pits CS 12 Engineering Clay</p> <p>SSP7F The site allocations for engineering clay borrowpits to serve the A14 upgrade</p>	<p>needs to be given to the biodiversity of the area.</p> <p>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. These are that an assessment is needed about the impact of the noise and dust from the site. With an appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level. There are also concerns about air quality to be taken into account.</p> <p>South Cambs is concerned at the flood risk implications of using this site and the subsequent impact on the watercourses in this area when the land is restored afterwards</p> <p>It is considered to be level 3 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</p> <p>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</p>
South Junction 14 Inset map 20	<p>Engineering clay borrow pits CS 12 Engineering Clay</p> <p>SSP7G The site allocations for engineering clay</p>	<p>South Cambs would not support this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations.</p>

Site Location	Nature of mineral Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred Option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
	borrowpits to serve the A14 upgrade	<p>However if used it would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health. These are that an assessment is needed about the impact of the noise and dust from the site. With an appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level. There are also concerns about air quality to be taken into account.</p> <p>It is considered to be level 2 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</p> <p>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters and to include that the restoration of this site could provide a wetland reserve with public access.</p>
Milton Landfill Site, Milton	Clay extraction for the A14 upgrade– in Preferred option 2 consultation 2009.	South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this site from the proposed Submission MWDP.
Barrington Cement Works Railhead Inset map 157	SSP T2A Transport Protection Zone	No objection to the mineral allocation subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation. These are that full Health and Environmental Impact Assessments should be carried out and that consideration needs to be given to the impact of the

Site Location	Nature of mineral Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred Option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
		<p>extension of the quarry on the character of the landscape.</p> <p>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</p>

Key issues for minerals

- 50 **Needingworth** - The site allocated is an extensive area and although the actual quarry is in the adjoining district of Huntingdonshire, South Cambs is concerned at the proximity of the settlements of Willingham and Over to these proposals and particularly concerned about the traffic implications. Further environmental information needs to be provided by the County before this Council can evaluate the site and decide if it is an appropriate allocation and the Council remains concerned that it is still identified within the current MWDP. The Council is therefore objecting to this allocation until such time as more detailed information is provided on the full environmental impact of the site now being identified for extraction.
- 51 **Cottenham** – The site being allocated is now smaller than that identified in the earlier consultation in 2008 which is to be welcomed. It is recognized that extraction of this reserve would have to be phased to start around 2014. The Council is concerned at the potential impact on the local road network at this working and at the impact on the nearby communities at Smithy Fen and within Cottenham. Further environmental information needs to be provided by the County before this Council can evaluate the site and decide if it is an appropriate allocation. The Council is therefore objecting to this allocation until such time as more detailed information is provided on the full environmental impact of the site now being identified for extraction.

Waste Site Allocations

- 52 **Policy SSP W1 allocates sites specifically for waste recycling and recovery facilities** and as was the case in earlier versions of the MWSSP there are more sites identified for particular uses than the waste strategy indicates it needs for the plan period. This is in accordance with Government guidance for maintaining flexibility so a single or a range of uses may take place on different sites including new technology if this is appropriate. South Cambs has stated that this does not result in a very clear strategy but recognize that it is following accepted Government advice.
- 53 The recommended response to the allocated waste sites is contained in Appendix 3 and summarized in the table below with key issues identified. Sites that have been identified as either strategic allocations or broad locations within policies in the MWCS although they also appear in the MWSSP have not been included in the table below since they have been considered earlier in this report. Maps showing the locations of the sites are included in Appendix 1.

Table 4

Site Location and map inset number	Nature of waste facility Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
Brookfield Business Park, Cottenham Map inset 40	Policy SSP W1D Site specific allocations for waste recycling and recovery facilities – Potential uses include – Specialist Suitable new waste management technologies Policy SSP W8G Waste Consultation Areas	No objection in principle to the allocation providing that any planning application includes a satisfactory environmental impact assessment. A site-specific policy should be included for this allocation in the MWSSP to incorporate the need for an environmental impact assessment.
Cambridge Northern Fringe (Aggregates Railhead) Map inset 159	Policy SSP T2C Sustainable Transport Protection Zones	The Council welcomes the safeguarding in the short term of the railhead for aggregates given the needs of the A14 improvements but in the longer term such a use may not be appropriate for this site.
North of Chesterton Sidings, Cambridge Inset map 156	Policy SSP T1A Designated Sustainable Transport Zone. Policy SSP T2E Sustainable Transport Protection Zones	Object to the allocation until such time as the significance of impact / effect is assessed by undertaking Health and Environmental Impact Assessments respectively. If the site were to be allocated within the plan South Cambs request that a site-specific policy be included for this site and that this incorporates all the issues mentioned that would need to be addressed by a planning application.
Extension of Waste Management Park, Waterbeach Inset map 47	Policy SSP W1K Site specific allocations for waste recycling and recovery facilities Potential uses include – Material Recovery Facility; In Vessel Composting; Energy from Waste; Inert Waste Recycling; Suitable New Waste	No objection subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation. These are that the proposal should be subject to an environmental and health impact assessment and that any development must take

Site Location and map inset number	Nature of waste facility Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
	Management Technologies; Policy SSP W8K Waste Consultation Areas	<p>account of the proximity of Denny Abbey.</p> <p>The Council supports the identification of the site for a range of waste management facilities.</p> <p>South Cambs requests that a site-specific policy be included in the MWSSP to include consideration of matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation.</p>
Great Wilbraham Quarry, Great Wilbraham Inset map 48	Policy SSP W1K Site specific allocations for waste recycling and recovery facilities Proposed use is Waste Recycling and Recovery (Inert waste recycling) Policy SSP W8Y Waste Consultation Areas	Object. The identification of this site as preferred for inert waste recycling and landfill is of concern to the Council. The strategy for inert waste facilities must be questioned by this Council and in particular whether this site is the best one to serve the Cambridge area. Much of the inert waste that is likely to be generated will arise from development, most of which is located in and on the edge of Cambridge or to the north of the city. Whilst accepting that a study has been carried out by the County looking for suitable additional sites for waste facilities this site would need to take into account the concerns of Environmental Health and Conservation if it is to be allocated as an inert recycling and landfill site. The concerns of Environmental Health are that any the development should ensure that measures are taken to protect the groundwater

Site Location and map inset number	Nature of waste facility Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
		from pollution since the site is close to the protection zone on the chalk aquifer Conservation is concerned that the facility would need substantial landscaping to integrate it into its surrounding.
Needingworth Quarry, Needingworth Inset map 55	Policy SSP W1S Site specific allocations for waste recycling and recovery facilities Proposed use is Waste Recycling and Recovery (Inert waste recycling) Policy SSP W8O Waste Consultation Areas	Object. The identification of this site for inert waste recycling and landfill is of concern to the Council. If this site is to be included in the MWSSP South Cambs request that a site-specific policy be included for Needingworth to include the need for a routeing agreement or a Willingham bypass and to include mitigation to reduce the environmental impact of this development on the surrounding area.
Northstowe Inset map 56	Policy SSP W1T Site specific allocations for waste recycling and recovery facilities Proposed use is Waste Recycling and Recovery (Temporary Inert waste recycling) Policy SSP W8AQ Waste Consultation Areas	Support in principle recognising that it may be more appropriate to have a number of smaller sites to serve the development of Northstowe and that the location of these sites should change as phased development progresses to minimise adverse impact. Support would be subject to the measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health. These are that noise, odour and dust must be assessed and appropriate mitigation taken to protect existing residents in the area and the new residents of Northstowe, as the phased development progresses. This may include, appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with sensitive

Site Location and map inset number	Nature of waste facility Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
		<p>design and mitigation of site operations.</p> <p>The facility should be located so that it does not impact upon the existing communities of Longstanton, Oakington or Rampton Drift.</p> <p>South Cambs request that a site specific policy be included in the MWSSP to include measure to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and to take account of the impact to the existing communities as mentioned above.</p>
Cottenham Inset map 72	Policy SSP W2B Site specific allocation for inert waste landfill disposal Policy SSP W8K Waste consultation areas	<p>Objection until such time as the County provides more detailed information about the site so that this Council can evaluate it for the proposed additional allocation for inert landfill. Without details of vulnerable receptors and an environmental and health impact assessment it has not been possible to evaluate this new allocation.</p> <p>South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of the proposal for extracting clay at Cottenham from the MWDP.</p>
Waste Water Treatment Works Safeguarding Areas	Policy CS31 and Policy SSPW7	Support in principle but there should be a reasoned justification included in the MWDP as to why an arbitrary distance of 400 metres has been included as a buffer zone to such areas and why areas which are upwind of WWTWs are included. Each site for residential

Site Location and map inset number	Nature of waste facility Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
		should be considered having regard to local circumstance on a case-by-case basis and subject to a representative odour assessment.
Balsham (77)	Policy SSP W7B	Support in principle
Bassingbourn (78)	Policy SSP W7C	Support in principle
Bourn (80)	Policy SSP W7E	Support in principle
Cambridge (84)	Policy SSP W7I	Support in principle
Duxford (87)	Policy SSP W7L	Support in principle
Foxton (90)	Policy SSP W7P	Support in principle
Gamlingay (91)	Policy SSP W7Q	Support in principle
Haslingfield (93)	Policy SSP W7S	Support in principle
Linton (97)	Policy SSP W7W	Support in principle
Melbourn (101)	Policy SSP W7AA	Support in principle
Over (104)	Policy SSP W7AD	Support in principle
Papworth Everard (105)	Policy SSP W7AE	Support in principle
Royston (108)	Policy SSP W7AH	Support in principle
Sawston (109)	Policy SSP W7AI	Support in principle
Taversham (117)	Policy SSP W7AQ	Support in principle
Uttons Drove (118)	Policy SSP W7AR	Support in principle
Waterbeach (119)	Policy SSP W7AS	Support in principle
Waste Consultation Areas	Policy CS30 Policy SSP W8	South Cambs supports the use of Waste Consultation Areas.
Cottenham Skips, Cottenham (127)	Policy SSP W8L	South Cambs supports the use of Waste Consultation Areas.
Dawson Plant Hire, Swavesey (129)	Policy SSP W8P	South Cambs supports the use of Waste Consultation Areas.
Lesanna Farm, Haslingfield (138)	Policy SSP W8AE	South Cambs supports the use of Waste Consultation Areas.
Milton (Landfill) (144)	Policy SSP W8AM	South Cambs supports the use of Waste Consultation Areas.
Pet Crematorium. Thriplow, A505 (147)	Policy SSP W8AR	South Cambs supports the use of Waste Consultation Areas.
Thriplow HRC (152)	Policy SSP W8BD	South Cambs supports the use of Waste Consultation Areas.
South Of Worsted Lodge, A11, Pampisford (149)	Policy SSP W8AW	South Cambs supports the use of Waste Consultation Areas.
Land West of A10, Hauxton	Area of Search for a (Household) Recycling	South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this site

Site Location and map inset number	Nature of waste facility Policy Ref and number in 2010 / Preferred option 2 consultation 2009	Summary of South Cambs comments
	Centre to serve south Cambridge and outlying villages PO2 2009 consultation	from the MWDP.
Land at Chesterton Fen	(Household) Recycling Centre for north Cambridge and inert waste recycling centre Site: 7.4 ha Access: from Fen Road, Chesterton PO2 2009 consultation	South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this site from the MWDP.
Waterbeach	Relocate aggregate sidings from Chesterton and to facilitate London waste rail transfer PO2 2009 consultation	South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this site from the MWDP.

Key issues

- 54 **Chesterton Sidings Railhead** - This is a new designation. The site is allocated as a Sustainable Transport Zone.
- 55 In the MWSSP it states in paragraph 5.6 that ‘ An opportunity has come forward for a new railhead in the Cambridge North Fringe.....In allocating this site it is recognised that there is an existing railhead just south of the allocated site. This new site could supplement the existing facility or in the event of the existing facility closing, replace it. It is considered vital to have railhead provision in the Cambridge area, particularly given the growth that is anticipated in the immediate area. This includes the upgrade of the A14, which will require the import of a substantial amount of hard rock by rail.
- 56 Notwithstanding the fact that there is an existing aggregates railhead it appears that the proposals are to accommodate not only local mineral and waste, in addition it may also receive residential municipal and commercial / industrial waste from London. It has been agreed in the East of England Plan that this region will import London waste and this new railhead could be where this waste is received into this area.
- 57 The site is within the Cambridge WWTW and therefore is in Cambridge City but this site forms part of a larger area that expands into South Cambs. The City Council and South Cambs intend to jointly prepare a new plan for this area. The proposed new railway station and link to the busway will be considered as part of this new plan and according to the County Council ‘ ...they would not be compromised by what is being suggested in the Minerals and Waste Plan.’

- 58 In the online information provided by the County Council it states that ‘...This new railhead is allocated on land currently within the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Works site. ... This allocation will not mean that the Waste Water Treatment Works will need to relocate and it will not prejudice any future improvement to the Works.’
- 59 South Cambs are concerned that by increasing the railhead capacity at Chesterton Sidings there is the potential to have a significant environmental impact in the area that may cause serious detriment to amenity. The cumulative impact may also be even greater with the new proposed train station in this location.
- 60 There can be considerable environmental disruption related to a proposal of this nature due to potential incompatibility with existing residential uses in a relatively quiet urban location with low background noise levels (in absence of train movements) contrary to PPG24: Planning & Noise.
- 61 As the future number of train / vehicle movements associated with railheads can be high, it is therefore essential that the access is good and the surrounding roads are capable of accepting high volumes of traffic.
- 62 However, noise / vibration, dust, odour and possibly bioaerosol generation from aggregate sidings /and containerised waste transfer may have an adverse impact.
- 63 Whilst implementation issues in the MWSSP identifies measures to protect amenity of local communities for odour, noise and dust as something to be addressed, in the absence of any detailed operational information, hours of use etc the significance of impact cannot be quantified. Due to the close proximity of sensitive receptors It is uncertain / unknown if it is practical or even possible to implement mitigation measures engineering or otherwise to adequately protect amenity and the health and wellbeing of residents.
- 64 Due to serious concern about significant environmental impact and in particular noise impact, a precautionary approach should be taken. The site should not be allocated until significance of impact / effect is assessed by undertaking Health and Environmental Impact Assessments, respectively.
- 65 **Household Recycling Centre to serve Cambridge South** - A number of sites were considered before the proposed allocation for land to the south of the Addenbrookes Access Road, Trumpington within Cambridge. This recycling centre must be convenient to serve the community in the south of Cambridge and the outlying villages if the sustainability benefits of recycling are not to be undone by unsustainable journey distances.
- 66 In earlier consultations Glebe Farm and the Bayer CropScience site (West) at Hauxton were suggested and South Cambs supports the current site being allocated in the proposed Submission MWSSP to serve the area to the south of the district.
- 67 More detailed comments on the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD and the Site Specific Proposals DPD are set out in Appendix 4.

Implications

68	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

- 69 Consultations have taken place with officers in Environmental Health; Development Control and New Communities.

Effect on Strategic Aims

70	Commitment to being a listening council, providing first class services accessible to all. There are some concerns relating to the MWDP that the Council can highlight when it responds to the consultation on behalf of the affected communities within the district. Commitment to ensuring that South Cambridgeshire continues to be a safe and healthy place for all. The Council by responding to the consultation will be able to ensure that the MWDP includes policies that can continue to keep the district a safe and healthy place for all and by implementing the policies on waste and minerals will in the future endeavour to improve the environment. Commitment to making South Cambridgeshire a place in which residents can feel proud to live. 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. Commitment to assisting provision for local jobs for all. By responding to the consultation the Council can ensure that the planning for minerals and waste within the district assists the growth agenda and future development within the district. This will ensure that a good economic environment is promoted within the district thereby assisting in keeping and creating local jobs within South Cambs. Commitment to providing a voice for rural life. The Council in responding to the consultation will be able to voice the concerns of communities that may be affected by the proposals within the MWDP.
----	---

Conclusions/Summary

- 71 South Cambs has responded to each stage in the consultation on the MWDP, which has now reached its proposed Submission stage. This report highlights the particular issues that South Cambs is concerned about relating to both mineral and waste matters. It has also considered each site allocated for a particular use in the MWDP and made detailed comments on each where appropriate. The Council is aware that this is the last opportunity to make such comments and for some sites is

disappointed that not more information was provided in order to assist in assessing the sites suitability for a particular use.

Recommendations

- 72 The Portfolio holders for Planning and New Communities are recommended to agree the responses to the Minerals and Waste Development Plan consultation contained within the report and in Appendices 2,3 and 4.

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

South Cambs response to Preferred Options Consultation of the Minerals and Waste Development Plan – Cabinet Report 14 December 2006

South Cambs response to the Preferred Options 2 Consultation of the Minerals and Waste Development Plan. – Cabinet Report 9 October 2008 (September 2008)

South Cambs response to the New Sites proposed during Preferred Options 2 consultation March 2009. – Joint New Communities and Planning Portfolio report (10 March 2009)

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD Submission Plan 2010

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD Submission Plan 2010.

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

Appendices on the website

1 - Maps of the locations of the relevant sites for South Cambs.

2 - Schedule of mineral sites allocated in South Cambridgeshire

3 - Schedule of waste sites allocated in South Cambridgeshire

4- Schedule of detailed comments on the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD and Site Specific Proposals DPD

5 - Comments submitted about the borrow pits identified in the Preferred Option 2 consultation in March 2009