

## APPENDIX 4 - DETAILED COMMENTS ON THE CORE STRATEGY DPD AND SITE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS DPD

### Minerals and Waste Development Plan Core Strategy DPD

Page numbers in brackets refer to the relevant document referred to in heading for that column

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
1.3.3 Page 3	Does not mention Natura 2000 sites – These should be included given they need to be Appropriately Assessed under new Habitat Directive.	Include mention of Natura 2000 sites.	No change made  (Page 9)	No change made
2.4.15 –2.4.20 London apportionment  Page 23	<p>The East of England is required through the Government Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS 10) to apportion between the waste planning authorities the amount of London’s commercial / industrial and municipal waste being exported to the Region from London.</p> <p>The apportionment exercise carried out on the total volume of imported waste from London to the East of England region results in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough being required to accommodate</p>	Note that the apportionment will be confirmed when the Government Office publishes the changes to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England.	The amount required for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough to accommodate is now 22%. – This amounts to 5.1 million tonnes of waste between 2006 to 2026. After making an allowance for this 5.1 million tonnes and the indigenous needs of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough there is a deficit of non-hazardous landfill of between 647,000 tonnes and 4.9 million tonnes depending on whether scenario 2 or 3 is	Within <i>Policy CS14 The Scale of Waste Management Provision</i> it states that the Waste Planning Authority must make provision for 9.6 million cubic metres of inert landfill void space. ...It also states that an estimated 4 million cubic metres of inert waste recycling capacity in the early plan period will be addressed through additional inert landfill provision. So this would imply that 13.6 million cubic metres of inert land fill capacity will be

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
	<p>26.3% of that total – this amounts to around 5.7 million tonnes of waste between 2006 to 2021.</p> <p>In assessing how much waste Cambridgeshire and Peterborough will have to deal with during the plan period an allowance for around 3 million tonnes of non-hazardous waste to be imported has been allowed for. There is a surplus of non-hazardous landfill once the locally generated waste of the plan area is considered and therefore Cambridgeshire has capacity for this imported waste.</p>		<p>pursued.</p> <p>(Page 35) The MWCS has therefore allocated a site for non-hazardous landfill – however this site only has a capacity of 3 million cubic metres, which will not cover the existing shortfall. In paragraph 6.80 it states that additional opportunities for landfill will come from the extraction of engineering clay. The MWCS should be identifying landfill sites to cover the shortfall rather than leave uncertainty.</p>	<p>needed or is this part of the 9.6 million? Need for clarification within the policy and supporting text</p> <p>(Page 41)</p> <p>The Earith/ Mepal area is seen as providing the majority of the space for inert waste with other capacity being met by sites identified within Site Specific Plan.</p> <p>Site is identified in Cottenham in MW Site Specific Proposals DPD.</p>
<p>Preferred option MW2 – Vision and objective for waste Page 30</p>	<p>There is no mention of air quality in relation to waste. The Region has a high level of fine particles and the LDF should therefore seek to minimise the contribution of fine particles from minerals and waste processes. A sustainable soil strategy as part of the LDF suite of documents would help to stabilise</p>	<p>Include protection of air quality as a strategic objective in MW2.</p>	<p>There would appear to be no direct mention of air quality in the objectives although additional objectives have been added (Page 81)</p>	<p>Still no objective concerning air quality in <i>Policy CS2 Strategic Vision and Objectives for Sustainable Waste Development</i>. (page 17)</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
	soils and reduce emissions of dust.			
Preferred option MW 7-) recycled and secondary aggregates Page 44	<p>Support the principle of reuse and recycling of material on sites where development is taking place. The South Cambridgeshire LDF documents propose that planning applications for developments should recycle construction waste, including reuse of materials currently on the site, such as redundant buildings or infrastructure. This will be particularly relevant in the major developments, e.g. Northstowe and Cambridge East, where temporary on-site recycling facilities <i>may</i> be appropriate.</p> <p>Support policy where it says that suitable locations for permanent recycling facilities include general industrial land and waste transfer stations.</p>	Replace “must” with “may”. It will be a matter for the masterplanning process for each strategic development to determine appropriateness.	<p>The policy has been amended and now includes a list of strategic allocations for recycling which includes Waterbeach Waste Management Park, Waterbeach (Site CS5 C)</p> <p>(Page 63)</p> <p>The sentence referring to all strategic development schemes ‘must’ make provision for a temporary waste facility has been removed. Temporary facilities are referred to in paragraph 4.74.</p>	<p>Support <i>Policy CS7 Recycled and Secondary Aggregates</i>.</p> <p>Support the principle of reuse and recycling of material on sites where development is taking place.</p> <p>The previous identification of Waterbeach as a strategic allocation has been removed but it is still in Site Specific Plan.</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
	Object to the policy where it states that all strategic development schemes <i>must</i> now make provision for a temporary waste facility for recycling aggregates rather than <i>may</i> have to make provision.			

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
<p>Page 53 Existing allocations</p>	<p>The preferred option is that existing allocations will be subject to the same site selection procedure as 'new' sites. Areas of search allocated in existing Local Plan will be re-visited, as will the allocations in new development areas.</p> <p>However S Cambs at the last consultation stated that the site search should focus on existing waste operations and brownfield sites, and should only consider greenfield sites where this is crucial for delivering the strategy and no more appropriate sites are available. Since the issues and options consultation the search for sites appears not to have been carried out considering existing and brownfield sites in a comprehensive way. Sites have now been allocated at the preferred option stage.</p>	<p>The Plan has not carried out a comprehensive search for potential sites for waste facilities.</p>	<p>For recycling centres the locations of the preferred sites has been determined through the Waste Management Strategies. (Page 85)</p> <p>The County Council has carried out a study of all the brownfield and industrial land in the Cambridge Area and assessed its suitability for a range of waste facilities including household waste facilities. The study concluded that no additional sites other than those already considered by the Minerals and Waste Plan were potentially suitable for waste facilities.</p> <p>Jacobs have been commissioned to assess the number of sites needed to meet demand in the future for other types of waste recovery sites and to determine their</p>	<p>Policy CS15 has been included that indicates that a network of waste facilities will be developed across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. The locations are set out in the Site Specific Proposals DPD.</p> <p>This policy has not included Waste Transfer Stations, which are considered to be an essential element of the network of waste facilities.</p> <p>This policy is to be welcomed because it sets out the criteria that would be used to identify sites. Issue considered in main report.</p> <p>Also there is <i>Policy CS16 Household Recycling Centres</i>, which identifies five broad areas of location for HRC – four of these, are within South</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
			best location. The selection has looked at catchment areas. Travel times and distance has been a deciding factor.	Cambs. Cambridge East; Cambridge North; Cambridge South; Northstowe.
Preferred	A site-specific allocation is to be	Include reference to	Cambridgeshire Horizons have	

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
option MW 15 Relocation of Milton Waste Water Treatment Works Page 58	<p>made in the SSP DPD. New criteria for choosing a site are listed as a result of the consultation exercise at issues and options. S Cambs asked for additional criteria to be included - visual impact, impact on Green Belt, the natural and built environment, including biodiversity, conservation and archaeology.</p> <p>Some of the additional criteria requested have been included. However, there is no reference to visual impact, impact on the built environment, including conservation. There is reference to nationally protected biodiversity but not other designated sites. These are important criteria, consistent with national planning policy guidance and should be included.</p>	visual impact, impact on the built environment, including biodiversity and conservation.	<p>carried out a feasibility study on the redevelopment of the Cambridge Northern Fringe East and this concluded that comprehensive redevelopment on the entire site will not be viable in the foreseeable future. The draft Core Strategy DPD states in paragraph 6.18 (page 88) “ ...the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Works is not deliverable and the works will therefore be retained on the current site. “</p> <p>However if a new waste water treatment works is needed in the future Preferred Option CS15 provides a criteria based policy to consider it. (Page 101). The first criteria mentions ‘suitable water course to discharge treated water’ but does not then include consideration of the</p>	<p>In the revised <i>Policy CS17 Waste Water Treatment Works</i> the request made by South Cambs to include consideration of flooding has been added as a criteria within the policy. This is to be welcomed.</p> <p>(Page 45)</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
			likelihood of flooding resulting from this addition to the water course.- although consideration of the risk of flooding is considered in paragraph 6.57 . This concern should be included in the policy. (Page 100)	
Preferred option MW 16 Waste management proposals outside of the allocated areas Page 59	In the absence of a clear strategy in the Core Strategy there is a danger that this policy will allow for additional facilities and thereby undermine the waste facility hierarchy.  Clarification needs to be given as to bullet (g) of the policy as to which strategic locations there are that are additional to the Structure Plan.	Once a clear strategy is in existence this policy could be used but without a strategy it could be a loophole to allow uncertainty in waste planning.	The County Council has carried out a study of all the brownfield and industrial land in the Cambridge Area and assessed its suitability for a range of waste facilities including household waste facilities. The study concluded that no additional sites other than those already considered by the Minerals and Waste Plan were potentially suitable for waste facilities.  The network of household recycling centres has been considered by the Waste	There is a sentence at the end of <i>Policy CS18 Waste Management Proposals Outside Allocated Areas</i> 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 RSS then if they

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
			<p>Management Strategy and is included in the adopted Household Recycling Strategy adopted by the County.</p> <p>Jacobs have carried out work to assess sites for inclusion in a network for different waste facilities</p>	<p>are of a large scale the MWDP would need to be reviewed to take into account such growth. It could have major implications for the whole waste strategy and as such should be appropriately planned for. Issue considered in main report.</p>
Preferred option MW 24 Borrowpits Page 82	<p>Priority is to be given to maximising the use of secondary and recycled aggregate in the first instance before borrowpits are considered. The consideration of allocations for mineral working has had regard to the location of the growth areas. Therefore if borrowpits are used they will come from the allocations within the SSP DPD. This is to be welcomed.</p>	Support this policy.	<p>Priority should be given to use of secondary and recycled aggregates before the use of borrowpits – this is included in paragraph 4.84 (Page 70). This is to be welcomed. There is a strict list of acceptable conditions allowing for borrowpits in the Preferred option CS9.</p> <p>Some borrow pits have also been allocated to serve specific road schemes notably the A 14. This will reduce the need for transporting of sand and gravel around the county.</p>	<p>In the Preferred Options 2 consultation a number of borrow pits relating to the A14 improvements were identified. South Cambs submitted comments on these sites and the proposed Submission MWDP has included all these sites.</p> <p>Issue considered in main report.</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
			<p>This is to be welcomed. However in the policy it states that the final lists of borrow pits relating to the A14 is to be confirmed with the Highway Authority (Page72 CS). If further sites are to be included that affect S Cambs then there should be further opportunity to comment on these.</p> <p><b>PO2 Consultation in 2009</b></p> <p><b>The County Council should review whether the Minerals and Waste Development Plan is the appropriate vehicle for providing borrowpits for the A 14 upgrade and consider how the borrowpits should be restored after the A14 work has been completed.</b></p>	
Preferred option MW 28 Safeguarding	This policy seeks to safeguard against sterilisation of mineral reserves through the designation of	Support this policy.	The Mineral Safeguarding Areas are now much more extensive and their extent is	Within Minerals Consultation Areas it is still all planning applications (except

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
mineral resources Page 88	Safeguarding Areas. Also Minerals Consultation Areas will be defined within which the Minerals Planning Authority will have to be consulted on any planning proposals. These will both be defined in the SSP DPD.		<p>defined in PPS1.</p> <p>MSA's are required to identify what are considered to be economic deposits of minerals –although there is no presumption that resources defined in MSA's will be worked.</p> <p>It is only for major developments that the MPA will have to be consulted. (definition of major included in plan –page 45)</p> <p>For Mineral Consultation Areas it is all planning applications made that will be consulted with MPA except householder and adverts. Preferred option CS23 (page 135)</p> <p>This Preferred option does not include the exceptions that are included in the Site Specific Proposals DPD – it would be clearer if these were added</p>	<p>householder and adverts) that must be consulted. In paragraph 9.12 of MWCS there is an explanation for this saying that even a single dwelling can have an impact on the future use of the mineral resource and could compromise the planned working of the mineral.</p> <p>No change suggested to plan.</p> <p>(Page58)</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
			rather than implying all applications will have to be consulted on.	
Preferred option MW 29 Restoration and after-use of minerals working Page 91	Support the policy requiring restoration on a site-by-site basis.	Support this policy.	No change - Support	Support <i>Policy CS27 Restoration and Aftercare of Mineral Workings</i>  (Page 60)
Preferred option MW 31 Movement of waste Page 94	Support the continuation of the current policy intended to minimise the long distance transport of waste.	Support this policy.	No change – Support.	Support <i>Policy CS23 Sustainable Transport of Minerals and Waste. And CS32 Traffic and Highways.</i> (Pages 55 and 68)
Preferred option MW 33 Safeguarding Waste Management Facilities Page 100	Existing and proposed waste management facilities should continue to be safeguarded, but subject to a review of their continued suitability and that they are well located to serve the catchment area.	Existing and proposed waste management sites should only be safeguarded if their continued suitability is reviewed  Support waste Consultation areas	Work has been carried out by Jacobs to assess the best locations for waste facilities.  The WPA must be consulted on <b>all</b> planning applications made in waste consultation areas not just on significant	Policy CS31 Waste Water Treatment Works Safeguarding Areas has now been revised and additional wording placed in the policy to indicate that the Waste Planning Authority must be consulted on an planning proposal within a Safeguarding Area except for householder applications or advertisements.

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
	<p>Agree that waste consultation areas should be established, where the waste planning authority would be consulted on significant planning applications which if approved may permit development that would adversely affect a waste management facility.</p>		<p>applications.</p> <p>The policy for waste consultation areas has been expanded to now include Waste Water Treatment Works Safeguarding Areas although it does not state in the policy that the WPA must be consulted for these additional areas- it is just implied. Wording in the policy should clarify this –Preferred option CS27 (Page 147). However in the Site Specific Proposals DPD Preferred Option SSP15 states that the WPA must be consulted on any planning proposal within a safeguarded area except householder applications or advertisements.</p> <p>A safeguarding area will be identified around existing and allocated WWTplants to prevent the encroachment of</p>	<p>Issue of extent of consultation area is considered in main report.</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
			sensitive development.	
Preferred option MW 34 Sustainable construction Page 103 Preferred option MW 34 Sustainable construction Page 103	<p>Temporary waste recycling facilities will be required in strategic development areas including Northstowe. Clarification is needed as to what is meant by these areas. Is this the same as strategic growth areas as identified in SSP DPD figures 2 and 3?</p> <p>Also a Waste audit is to be required on all proposals that are likely to generate significant volume of waste. The South Cambridgeshire LFD documents propose that planning applications for developments should recycle construction waste, including reuse of materials currently on the site, such as redundant buildings or infrastructure. However, clarification is needed as to how the Waste Audit is calculated.</p>	<p>Clarification is needed as to what is meant by strategic development areas.</p> <p>S Cambs supports the requirement for a Waste Audit, but clarification is needed as to how this is calculated.</p>	<p>Strategic development sites are now referred to as major development sites – no further definition is given.</p> <p>A waste audit and strategy is now required for <b>all</b> development proposals and a more general policy devised for waste minimisation.- Preferred option CS25 (page 142)</p> <p>No further advice is provided as to how the audit must be calculated. Reference is made to the recent requirement for Site Waste Management Plans for development over the value of £300,000 should be assist.</p>	<p><i>Policy CS28 Waste Minimisation, Re-use and Resource Recovery</i> includes many important requirements for future developments. Great emphasis is placed with the supporting text of the role of the Waste Design Guide. This SPD is currently out for consultation. (A separate report is considering this SPD, which is out for consultation alongside the MWDP.)</p> <p>Issue considered in main report.</p> <p>Policy CS28 does not explain clearly nor does the supporting text what a waste management audit and strategy is and a fuller definition should be</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
				<p>included in this section. - Issue considered in main report.</p> <p>Also there is no explanation of where the requirement for a 'Site Waste Management Plans for developments over the value of £300,000' originates. This is mentioned in paragraph 10.12 and included in Policy CS28. This is a requirement from the 'The Site Waste Management Plans Regulations 2008' published by OPSI and should be referenced here.</p> <p>Mention is made in Policy CS28 of housing developments having to contribute to the provision of bring sites and that the contribution will be consistent</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
				<p>with the Waste Design Guide SPD. - Issue considered in main report.</p> <p>Also there is the requirement in the Policy CS28 for all residential and commercial development proposals to submit a completed RECAP Waste Design Guide Toolkit Assessment. The draft SPD needs to be revised to provide clearer information for both the planners and developers.</p> <p>(Page 61)</p>
Preferred option MW 39 Protecting surrounding area - Routing agreements Page 118	Routing agreements are seen as a good thing as a result of the consultation. However because these are usually done as legal agreements then no specific policy is to be included in the plan.	Include a reference in the policy to the need for routing agreements to reduce the impact of traffic movements on the local community.	Matters referring to traffic and highways are now included in a separate Preferred option CS28-Traffic and Highways-. This policy remains the same as was consulted on in December 2006. No mention is made of routing agreements	South Cambs is concerned that no plan-wide routeing strategy policy has been included in the MWCS.  Issue considered in main report. .

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
	<p>Routing agreements will be a major issue, particularly for minerals traffic to development sites in the Cambridge Sub-Region. It is therefore of key importance to ensure that minerals and waste traffic does not cause harm to amenity in existing or proposed communities. This should apply to any temporary facilities during the construction of developments, e.g. facilities to handle construction waste, as well as for permanent facilities.</p>		<p>in either the supporting text to this policy or CS31 – Protecting Surrounding Uses. (Page 155)</p> <p>The Council is now requesting a specific policy to be included in the MWCS on routing agreements .</p>	(Page 68)
<p>Preferred option MW 39 Protecting surrounding area Buffer zones Page 118</p>	<p>Buffer zones are to be used but supported by guidance on indicative depths of buffer zones for different types of development in supporting text to any policy. To be called separation zones since buffer zone implies it is a no-go area whereas in fact certain activities are restricted or prohibited.</p>	<p>Details about buffer zones or separation zones as they are to be called, should be included in the preferred plan.</p> <p>The detailed guidance should appear in the Core</p>	<p>The term separation zone has been replaced by buffer zone. Such zones will only be required where appropriate.</p> <p>Advice on appropriate depths for the buffer zone is still not included in the DPD but refers to ‘various sources including government guidance and research and the Council’s</p>	<p>No further information has been provided. Each development should be considered on its own merits.</p> <p>Support Policy CS34 since it includes consideration of no significant harm to the environment, human health or safety ...or loss to residential or other amenity and linked to</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
	<p>It is unclear where this guidance will appear and against which policies since it does not appear to be part of either the Core Strategy or Site Specific Proposals DPDs as they are currently drafted. The guidance must be included within the Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>Even if they are contained in a building, waste management operations are more akin to B2 than B1. Will noise / dust etc. escape when doors open to let lorries in? Lorry access is unsuitable for a facility, which is embedded within sensitive areas (e.g. new development areas).</p> <p>Buffer / separation zones will be needed wherever these facilities are provided to ensure that the impact of the site arising from such factors as transport, traffic and</p>	Strategy.	<p>SPD on the Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities.</p> <p>No further guidance is provided over buffer zones.</p> <p>Page 155</p>	<p>CS24 Design of sustainable minerals and waste management facilities and CS 32 Traffic &amp; Highways.</p> <p>However the main concern is that there is no specific mention of air quality in the context of National Air Quality Objectives pollutants and impact locally. Whilst this is mentioned specifically in Sustainability Appraisal under point 5 page 11 in MWCS it is not mentioned elsewhere and is inextricably linked / integrated with to CS 24 and 32.</p> <p>Issue to be covered in main report.</p> <p>(Page 70)</p>

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
	<p>access, dust, odours, vermin and birds, noise, litter, and visual intrusion will be contained within acceptable levels.</p> <p>The guidance in the plan should set out the function of buffer / separation zones in particular circumstances which will vary depending on the nature of adjacent land uses, and potentially the type and size of the waste facility. This may include specific targets to be achieved e.g. X dba noise limit, and address the appropriate design and character of buffer zones in particular circumstances.</p> <p>This level of detailed guidance has not been incorporated into the plan as requested during the issues and options consultation.</p>			

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
	It would be for the applicant to demonstrate in the context of a particular proposal, what width and design of buffer zone will meet the policy requirements.			
Preferred option MW 39 Protecting surrounding area Cumulative impact on communities Page 118	It is recognised that this is important but since this cumulative impact is addressed through Environmental Impact Assessment a policy has not been included in the Plan.	Include a reference in the policy to the cumulative impact of proposals being assessed through the EIA process.	No change has been made in the policy. However paragraph 11.15 refers to assessing the likely impact of the proposals including those arising from the intensification of an existing development.  Page 154	Additional information has now been included in the section about protecting the surrounding uses (Page 69) In paragraph 11.16 mention is now made of Environmental Impact Assessments processes. This is to be welcomed.
Preferred option MW 53 Planning obligations Page 133	Mention is made in paragraph 6.19.3 of the possibility of working jointly with district and city councils to produce SPD as regards planning obligations guidance for minerals and waste developments.	Support joint working.	No change – Support  (Page 180)	Support  (Page 81)
Paragraph 6.20.2 List of information needing to	Consideration for waste facilities should also consider how they fit into the waste hierarchy of policies - i.e. the waste strategy.	Add to list of considerations how a site fits into the waste strategy.	This consideration has not been included in the list.  (Page 182)	Still not included.

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment had been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008	Proposed Submission 2010- Whether changes have now been made
accompany planning application for waste or mineral development				

## Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment has been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008 - page numbers and preferred option numbers refer to those in current Preferred Options 2.	Proposed Submission 2010-Whether changes have now been made
2.3.2	<p>In this paragraph there is a list of the policies set out in the Core Strategy. The 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point indicates that a spatial strategy indicating general locations for mineral and waste is included. A strategy for waste is not in this document.</p> <p>Also 4<sup>th</sup> bullet implies that the level of future provision for waste management is set out in the Core Strategy, which it is not clearly done. The Core Strategy has allowed for flexibility and by so doing has not provided a clear strategy for waste management.</p>	Need for a clear waste management strategy to be included in plan.	<p>The strategy for household waste recycling facilities has been produced in preparing the Household Waste Recycling Strategy. The County Council has now adopted this strategy. It was determined by the Waste Management Strategy. – This Strategy does not form part of this draft DPD and is not included in the Core Strategy or the supporting documents.</p> <p>The strategies for the other types of waste facilities were assessed by Jacobs using the Netwaste Site Selection.</p>	<p>Remains same.</p> <p>Issue considered in main report.</p>
Section 3.11 Page 30 – 35	There is no clear explanation as to the purpose of each of the waste facilities. Instead a	Details on each of the different waste facilities should be included in the	No details have been included in the draft Core Strategy or the Site Specific	A glossary has now been included in the Site Specific Plan

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment has been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008 - page numbers and preferred option numbers refer to those in current Preferred Options 2.	Proposed Submission 2010-Whether changes have now been made
Section 3.11 Page 30 - 35	<p>reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'The Location and Design of Major Waste Management Facilities' adopted in April 2006. This provides detail on types of waste management facilities and their characteristics, including site requirements. Such basic information should be presented in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site requirement information that appears in the SPD is especially important since this could give guidance on the best location for the facility in a particular area. For example where an area of search has been included as an allocation such as in North-West Cambridge these criteria could be used to assess the best location in the masterplanning process.</p>	<p>Core Strategy.</p> <p>A policy needs to be incorporated into the Core Strategy to identify the criteria that will be used to assess the best location for a waste facility.</p>	Proposals DPD.	

Policy / Paragraph in Preferred Option 1 – December 2006	Comment made by S Cambs to Preferred Options 1 consultation - December 2006	Suggested change in December 2006	Whether amendment has been made in Preferred Option 2 documents 2008 - page numbers and preferred option numbers refer to those in current Preferred Options 2.	Proposed Submission 2010-Whether changes have now been made
Preferred option SSP14 Waste safeguarding areas  Page 38	Preferred option SSP14 creates waste safeguarding areas, which will protect allocated waste sites. However in many of the growth areas around Cambridge no specific sites have been allocated and it would appear from the Proposals Map that these broad areas of search have not been safeguarded under this policy – rather the whole site is allocated under Preferred Option SSP10.	Clarify which waste sites are subject to SSP14.	There are still no waste consultation areas surrounding the preferred allocations if it is to be an area of search. This has been done because the sites have not been specifically identified.	Waste Consultation Areas are now included around all allocated sites. South Cambs welcomes the clarification.