

**APPENDIX 2**

**SCHEDULE OF MINERAL SITES ALLOCATED IN SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE February 2010**

**BORROW PITS NEED PRIORITIZING**

Site ref – This includes the name of each site as well as the proposals map inset number.

P/NP – This refers to whether the site was a preferred (P) or non-preferred (NP) site in the earlier consultation.

S/O – This is whether the allocation is being supported or objected to.

MWSSP – Minerals and Waste Site Specific Proposals DPD

MWCS – Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD

PO2 2009 – Indicates site included in second round of consultations on new sites carried out in 2009

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
Map inset 1	Cottenham	Sand and gravel extraction  CS4 The Scale and Location of Future Sand and Gravel – Principal broad locations for sand and gravel  CS25 Mineral Safeguarding Areas	In the previous consultation this was considered as two separate sites- Site one was identified for sand and gravel extraction and site two was safeguarded for future sand and gravel. These two sites have now been joined as a Strategic allocation for sand and gravel extraction. This is to provide a long-term reserve and will need to be phased over the plan period. The approximate timetable indicated in the MWSSP is that extraction is expected to commence around 2014 and last for approximately 15years.	O	There has been a change in the way the policy is worded. Cottenham is no longer identified in the Core Strategy as a strategic allocation but is listed as ‘ a broad location for sand and gravel extraction.’  In order to ensure that there is a steady supply of sand and gravel across the Plan period the MMWCS has divided the Plan area into three. Cottenham is within the Central/ Southern Zone along with Needingworth. There is also a strategic allocation in the Earith/ Mepal area, which is also to serve the Central/ Southern Zone. This will mean that there will be sufficient supplies to meet the growth agenda in this zone.

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
		<p>SSP M1A – Specific site allocations for sand and gravel</p> <p>SSP M9E - Mineral consultation areas</p>	<p>This larger scale of operation could potentially generate increased traffic and the Council would want this mineral traffic to be kept away from the B roads and onto the A10. Routing agreements are essential to ensure that the additional lorries generated by the larger scale of operation are not allow to travel through the village of Cottenham. These additional traffic movements should not adversely affect the residents of Cottenham or the Travellers on the nearby Smithy Fen.</p> <p>There are a number of sensitive receptors very close to the proposed site and the Council is concerned at the expansion of the allocated site for extraction.</p> <p>Natural England has identified this site as one that a full appropriate assessment under the Habitat Regulations Assessment will have to be undertaken.</p>		<p>The actual site identified in the MWSSP is now smaller and is only the site originally identified for sand and gravel extraction. The second safeguarding site is no longer included within the plan.</p> <p>It should be noted there is a policy for safeguarding mineral areas (Policy CS25), which includes areas for sand and gravel, and this now is incorporated onto the inset maps. There is a large safeguarding area shown on Map 13 in the Cottenham area. These safeguarded areas (MSAs) show the extent of particular minerals in an area so that future development does not sterilise these resources. There is no presumption that the resource defined in MSAs will be worked.</p> <p>The actual site identified in the MWSSP in Cottenham is of a smaller scale than proposed in 2008.</p> <p>It was noted in October 2008 that the proposal for mineral extraction at Cottenham/Land beach was one that English Nature (EN) had identified as needing a full Appropriate Assessment (AA) to be carried out to test whether if the site were used it</p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p><b>Environmental Health comments to site one:</b> There are a number of farmhouses within 200m of the site so there could be a potential impact on these properties in terms of noise and dust. The impact on residents should be assessed further and appropriate measures taken to mitigate the effects if necessary.</p> <p><b>Environmental Health comments to Site two</b> There are a number of sensitive receptors adjacent to the site; residential development including a travellers' site is in close proximity to the area identified. Without details of vulnerable receptors and an environmental and health impact assessment it is difficult to evaluate this site.</p> <p><b>Conservation comments:</b> There would have to be mitigation and strengthening of field patterns along</p>		<p>would significantly affect any European or Ramsar wildlife sites. This assessment has now been carried out and it has been found that no mitigation measures need to be undertaken.</p> <p>The Council therefore welcome the fact that a smaller site has been identified but there are still concerns about the traffic generated by this allocation. The comments made at the earlier consultation in 2008 still are applicable</p> <p>-</p> <p><i>The Council would want this mineral traffic to be kept away from the B roads and onto the A10. Routing agreements are essential to ensure that the additional lorries generated by the larger scale of operation are not allow to travel through the village of Cottenham. These additional traffic movements should not adversely affect the residents of Cottenham or the Travellers on the nearby Smithy Fen.</i></p> <p>The MWSSP states that a planning application for this site would need to address a number of issues including ' Access should be via A10 only via private haul road or conveyor'. South Cambs welcomes this</p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>B1049 to link Twenty Pence Pit, Bean Ditch and river corridor. Measures would be needed to protect and enhance to reduce impact on Cottenham Load corridor. Also there would need to be mitigation and enhancement to reduce impact on river Great Ouse corridor.</p> <p><b>Object to the allocation until such time as more detailed information is provided on the full environmental impact of the larger site now being identified for extraction. Until this information is available it is not possible to evaluate this site. A full environmental assessment is essential at this stage before the Council can determine whether this site should be allocated as a preferred site for extraction.</b></p> <p><b>The Council would need to be assured that the mitigation measure identified by</b></p>		<p>statement but there should be mention of the need for routing agreements to ensure that lorries generated by the extension to the existing quarry do not impact upon the village of Cottenham adversely affect the residents of this village or the gypsies and travellers on the nearby Smithy Fen. This should be included in a site specific policy for this allocation at Cottenham.</p> <p>A policy about routeing agreements has not been included in the MWDP. Issue considered in main report.</p> <p>The comments made by Environmental Health on site one relate to this site.</p> <p><b>Environmental Health comments to site one:</b> There are a number of farmhouses within 200m of the site so there could be a potential impact on these properties in terms of noise and dust. The impact on residents should be assessed further and appropriate measures taken to mitigate the effects if necessary.</p> <p>The Council is concerned that there are a number of sensitive receptors very close to</p>

Site ref	Name	Policy ref and number	Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009 Summary of S Cambs DC comments	S/ O	Current proposed Submission consultation 2010 S Cambs Proposed Response
			<p><b>Environmental Health and Conservation could be adopted to minimise impact on sensitive receptors.</b></p> <p><b>Routing agreements are essential to ensure that the additional lorries generated by the larger scale of operation do not adversely affect the residents of Cottenham or the Travellers on the nearby Smithy Fen.</b></p>		<p>the allocated site.</p> <p>The MWSSP states for this allocated site that ‘ Detailed assessment of development impacts and mitigation techniques will be required as part of any individual development proposal through the planning process. ‘ This information needs to be incorporated into the MWSSP in order that there is clarification of the impact of the development and what mitigation measures would need to be included in a planning application for this site. Without this more detailed information South Cambs cannot properly assess the site.</p> <p><b>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 Council can determine whether this site should be allocated as an allocated site for extraction.</b></p>

			Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009		Current proposed Submission consultation 2010
Site ref	Name	Policy ref and number	Summary of S Cambs DC comments	S/ O	S Cambs Proposed Response
					<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p>
Map inset 2	Needingworth	<p>Sand and gravel extraction</p> <p>CS4 The Scale and Location of Future Sand and Gravel – Principal broad locations for sand and gravel</p> <p>SSP M1B –</p>	<p>This site is now a preferred site and has the same boundaries as the safeguarding site, which was identified in the previous consultation in December 2006.</p> <p>In the Site Specific Proposals DPD it states “ Phasing will need to be considered for this site as it is seen as a long-term extension to the existing quarry. “</p> <p>The approximate timetable for</p>	O	<p>The site is the same as that which was included as a preferred option site. Needingworth is no longer identified in the Core Strategy as a strategic allocation but is listed as ‘ a broad location for sand and gravel extraction.’</p> <p>In order to ensure that there is a steady supply of sand and gravel across the Plan period the MMWCS has divided the Plan area into three. Needingworth is within the Central/ Southern Zone along with Cottenham. There is also a strategic</p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
		<p>Specific site allocations for sand and gravel</p> <p>SSP M9O - Mineral consultation areas</p>	<p>extraction is included in the MWSSP - Extraction is expected to commence in 2010 and last for approximately 3 years.</p> <p>The evaluation of the site in the draft Site Specific Proposals DPD states - "Amenity issues need to be considered given the site's proximity to outlying residential dwellings associated with Over and Willingham."</p> <p>The Council is concerned that this site is now being identified as a preferred site especially given its proximity to Willingham and Over. The Council is also concerned about the traffic implications of addition lorries having to use the existing road network. Given that the proposed housing growth, which will need the resource, is in and around Cambridge these vehicles are likely to be travelling southwards through the settlement of Willingham. There will need to be routing agreements so that these lorries avoid going through the village of Willingham or Over. This further</p>		<p>allocation in the Earith/ Mepal area, which is also to serve the Central/ Southern Zone. This will mean that there will be sufficient supplies to meet the growth agenda in this zone.</p> <p>In the description of the sites characteristics it states – Site is proximate to outlying residential dwellings associated with Over and Willingham.</p> <p>The Council retains its concerns that this site as it is now being identified as a site for sand and gravel extraction especially given its proximity to Willingham and Over.</p> <p>The comments made previously about the traffic implications of this site are still valid. –</p> <p><i>The Council is also concerned about the traffic implications of addition lorries having to use the existing road network. Given that the proposed housing growth, which will need the resource, is in and around Cambridge these vehicles are likely to be travelling southwards through the settlement of Willingham. There will need to be routing agreements so that</i></p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>emphasises the need for a bypass for Willingham and should be a requirement if this site is to be identified as a preferred site for the extraction of sand and gravel.</p> <p><b>Environmental Health comment:</b> This site is within 1km of Willingham and there are sensitive receptors within 200 metres of the preferred site. Therefore dust, noise, issues would need to be assessed to ensure appropriate mitigation measures could be adopted to minimise impact on sensitive properties. Given the proximity of some properties in Over and Willingham more information would need to be provided before an informed decision could be made about this site.</p> <p><b>Conservation comments:</b> Future extraction planned together with mitigation to retain and strengthen strong edges and field patterns along Long Lane, The Pound County Wildlife Site, Hither Way, Furtherford, Middle Way, Further Way</p>		<p><i>these lorries avoid going through the village of Willingham or Over. This further emphasises the need for a bypass for Willingham and should be a requirement if this site is to be identified as a preferred site for the extraction of sand and gravel.</i></p> <p>In the MWSSP it states that a number of issues would need to be addressed within a planning application. This includes – No vehicular access to Over, Willingham Road for gravel lorries; Protect any future alignment for Willingham Bypass. The highlighting of these issues is to be welcomed. However the Council has specific concerns relating to these transport issues -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There needs to be a firmer commitment to routing agreements so that they will be put in place to protect the villages of Willingham and Over from gravel lorries. Such agreements must be a requirement before planning permission can be given to extend the existing quarry and should be listed specifically in paragraph 7.4.</li> </ol>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>and Lords Ground. Mitigation needed south of the pound to reduce impact to buildings on Long Lane, Over. Mitigation needed north of Highgate farm to reduce impact to buildings on Over road, Willingham.</p> <p><b>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</b></p> <p><b>The settlements of Willingham and Over are very close to the proposed 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.</b></p> <p><b>Routing agreements would need to</b></p>		<p>2) Greater emphasis should be made for the need for a bypass for Willingham. This should be a requirement of this site being identified in the MWSSP and as such should be listed in paragraph 7.4.</p> <p>These issues need to be included in a site-specific policy for this allocation at Needingworth in order to have greater weight when a planning application is submitted.</p> <p>The MWSSP states for this allocated site that ‘ Detailed assessment of development impacts and mitigation techniques will be required as part of any individual development proposal through the planning process. ‘ This information needs to be incorporated into the MWSSP in order that there is clarification of the impact of the development and what mitigation measures would need to be included in a planning application for this site. Without this more detailed information South Cambs cannot properly assess the site.</p> <p>The comments made by Environmental Health and by Conservation still are valid</p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p><b>be made to ensure that lorries do not go through the villages of Willingham and Over.</b></p> <p><b>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 if this site were to be identified as a preferred site for sand and gravel.</b></p>		<p>since the boundaries of this site have not altered. However in paragraph 7.4 of MWSSP the issues to be addressed within a planning application for the site include the following –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise and dust mitigation required;</li> <li>New landscaping will be required;</li> <li>Stand offs required from outlying residential dwellings and mitigation addressing amenity.</li> </ul> <p>This inclusion is to be welcomed but it should be included in a site-specific policy for this allocation.</p> <p><b>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</b></p> <p><b>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</b></p>

			Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009		Current proposed Submission consultation 2010
Site ref	Name	Policy ref and number	Summary of S Cambs DC comments	S/ O	S Cambs Proposed Response
					<p>sensitive receptors. The MWSSP should include a site-specific policy to include 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>
PO2 2009	Land at Hinxton (South of A 505 near Whittlesford Bridge)	Sand and Gravel extraction Site: 4.4 ha, reserves estimated at 170,000 tonnes Access by existing haul road on to the A1301	Object to this proposal due to the additional traffic it would place on roads that are already busy.	S	<p>This proposal has not been included in MWDP</p> <p><b>South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this site from the proposed Submission MWDP.</b></p>
PO2 2009	Covell's Drain, Swavesey	Sand & gravel borrow pit for the	Object to this site.	S	No longer included in current proposed Submission MWDP. Other sites identified as

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
		A14 upgrade. (Site currently has permission to extract sand and gravel for the guided busway, but does not have permission to be taken off site)	<p>The use of this borrowpit would result in the sand and gravel having to be transported some distance through Swavesey or Fen Drayton. This would impact on the local roads and affect these local communities.</p> <p>Extraction work is likely to have a detrimental impact on the adjoining wildlife site.</p> <p>This would make the use of this borrowpit unacceptable to South Cambridgeshire District Council especially if other borrowpits are available in more environmentally acceptable locations.</p>		<p>borrow pits for the A14 upgrade.</p> <p><b>South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this borrowpit from the proposed Submission MWDP.</b></p>
PO2 2009	Corpus Christi, North of Offord Cluny (BP1)	Clay borrowpit for A14 upgrade. Site 15ha	<p>Object to site</p> <p>The County Council must carry out a full Appropriate Assessment for this site before it can be considered for inclusion in the plan. The use of this site as a borrowpit would be unacceptable if it resulted in the deterioration of Portholme Meadows.</p>	S	<p>No longer included in current proposed Submission MWDP. Other sites identified as borrow pits for the A14 upgrade.</p> <p><b>South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this borrowpit from the proposed Submission MWDP.</b></p>
Map inset 16	New Barns Farm,	Engineering Clay Borrow Pit for A14	Site is adjacent to A14. To south of road.	O	This site has been included in current proposed Submission MWDP. The details

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
	Conington	upgrade  Policy CS12 Engineering Clay  Policy SSP7C Mineral consultation areas	<p>In flood zone 1. Clay will be transported to the A14 off road thereby reducing its impact on the local road network.</p> <p>The site is very close to the settlement of Connington.</p> <p><b>Environmental Health comments</b> New Barns Farm is immediately adjacent to the West and there are two other residential premises approximately 200 to 250 m away.</p> <p>Clay is to be transported directly to a boundary A14 embankment by on-site haul roads avoiding use of the public highway. This should reduce traffic noise off site.</p> <p>However, noise and dust from on-site operations have the potential to have an adverse impact. Assessment is required but with appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to</p>		<p>comments made in 2009 are still valid.</p> <p>Since there is no indication given within the MWDP or by the Highways Agency how many borrowpits will be needed for the A14 improvements South Cambs has produced a hierarchy of sites. This indicates which sites should be used first (1) and which should be left until last (4). This site is considered as level 3. (See main report)</p> <p><b>South Cambs would object to this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered to be level 3 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</b></p> <p><b>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 /</b></p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level.</p> <p>Air Quality impact may be acceptable if this proposal is considered in isolation / individually. However the collective impact of all the A14 borrowpits may have a detrimental impact on local air quality. See main report for comments.</p> <p><b>Conservation comments</b> Costain provided a detailed assessment of this site and was concerned for the impact on the ecology of the area. A previous ecological assessment relating to a proposed wind farm development showed that the agricultural land provides wintering habitat for a significant number of golden plover (crop type dependent)</p> <p><b>South Cambs would object to this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations. If the site were used for extraction the impact</b></p>		<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<b>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.</b>		
Map inset 15	Brickyard Farm, Boxworth	Engineering Clay Borrow Pit for A14 upgrade  Policy CS12 Engineering Clay  Policy SSP7B Mineral consultation areas	Site is adjacent to A14. To south of road. SW of Buckingham Business Park, Swavesey. In flood zone 1. It is north of Boxworth.  <b>Environmental Health comments</b> Friesland Farm is immediately adjacent to the West and there are other residential premises approximately 300 m away at Grapevine Cottages to the South and Wayside House on the opposite side of A14.  Clay is to be transported directly to a boundary A14 embankment via on-site haul roads avoiding use of the public highway. This should reduce traffic noise off site.  However, noise and dust from on-site operations have the potential to have	S	This site has been included in current proposed Submission MWDP. The details comments made in 2009 are still valid.  Since there is no indication given within the MWDP or by the Highways Agency how many borrowpits will be needed for the A14 improvements South Cambs has produced a hierarchy of sites. This indicates which sites should be used first (1) and which should be left until last (4). This site is considered as level 1. (See main report)  <b>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</b>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>an adverse impact. Assessment is required but with 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.</p> <p>Air Quality impact may be acceptable if this proposal is considered in isolation / individually. However the collective impact of all the A14 borrowpits may have a detrimental impact on local air quality. See main report for comments.</p> <p><b>Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health</b></p>		<p><b>to control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level. There are also concerns about air quality to be taken into account.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered to be level 1 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</b></p> <p><b>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</b></p>
Map inset 14	Boxworth End Farm, North of Trinity Foot Junction	<p>Engineering Clay Borrow Pit for A14 upgrade</p> <p>Policy CS12 Engineering Clay</p>	<p>Site very close to A14. To north of road. To NW of Buckingham Business Park. In flood zone 1.</p> <p><b>Environmental Health comments</b> Wayside a residential property is</p>	S	<p>This site has been included in current proposed Submission MWDP. The details comments made in 2009 are still valid.</p> <p>Since there is no indication given within the MWDP or by the Highways Agency how many borrowpits will be needed for the A14</p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
		Policy SSP7A Mineral consultation areas	<p>approximately 150 m away and there is a light industrial estate with a 100 to 800m radius.</p> <p>Clay is to be transported directly to a boundary A14 embankment via on-site haul roads avoiding use of the public highway. This should reduce traffic noise off site.</p> <p>However, noise and dust from on-site operations have the potential to have an adverse impact. Assessment is required but with 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.</p> <p>Air Quality impact may be acceptable if this proposal is considered in isolation / individually. However the collective impact of all the A14 borrowpits may have a detrimental impact on local air quality. See main report for comments.</p>		<p>improvements South Cambs has produced a hierarchy of sites. This indicates which sites should be used first (1) and which should be left until last (4). This site is considered as level 1. (See main report)</p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered to be level 1 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</b></p> <p><b>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</b></p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<b>Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health.</b>		
Map inset 21	South Trinity Foot Junction- East	Engineering Clay Borrow Pit for A14 upgrade  Policy CS12 Engineering Clay  Policy SSP7H Mineral consultation areas	Site close to A14. To south of road. To NE of Lolworth.  <b>Environmental Health comments</b> There are residential properties at Lolworth are approximately 150 m away and The Grange approximately 110 m away.  Clay is to be transported a short distance directly to the A14 embankment via on-site haul roads avoiding use of the public highway. This should reduce traffic noise off site.  However, noise and dust from on-site operations have the potential to have an adverse impact. Assessment is required but with appropriate buffer zones in conjunction with careful design / layout of site operations and specific mitigation / abatement measures it should be possible to	O	This site has been included in current proposed Submission MWDP. The details comments made in 2009 are still valid.  Since there is no indication given within the MWDP or by the Highways Agency how many borrowpits will be needed for the A14 improvements South Cambs has produced a hierarchy of sites. This indicates which sites should be used first (1) and which should be left until last (4). This site is considered as level 2. (See main report)  <b>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</b>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>control noise and dust impact to an acceptable level.</p> <p>Air Quality impact may be acceptable if this proposal is considered in isolation / individually. However the collective impact of all the A14 borrowpits may have a detrimental impact on local air quality. See main report for comments.</p> <p><b>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</b></p>		<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered to be level 2 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</b></p> <p><b>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</b></p>
Map inset 22	South Trinity Foot Junction - West	<p>Engineering Clay Borrow Pit for A14 upgrade</p> <p>Policy CS12 Engineering Clay</p> <p>Policy SSP71 Mineral consultation areas</p>	<p>Site close to A14. To south of road. To N of Lolworth</p> <p>Lolworth is relatively close to the borrowpit.</p> <p><b>Environmental Health comments</b> Clare College farm is adjacent to the site and there are residential properties relatively close at Hill Farm</p>	S	<p>This site has been included in current proposed Submission MWDP. The details comments made in 2009 are still valid.</p> <p>Since there is no indication given within the MWDP or by the Highways Agency how many borrowpits will be needed for the A14 improvements South Cambs has produced a hierarchy of sites. This indicates which sites should be used first (1) and which should be</p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>Cottages on the opposite side of A14 at approximately 100 m. Lolworth lies approximately 400 m to the South East.</p> <p>Clay is to be transported directly to the A14 embankment via on-site haul roads avoiding use of the public highway. This should reduce traffic noise off site.</p> <p>However, noise and dust from on-site operations have the potential to have an adverse impact. Assessment is required but with 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.</p> <p>Air Quality impact may be acceptable if this proposal is considered in isolation / individually. However the collective impact of all the A14 borrowpits may have a detrimental impact on local air quality. See main</p>		<p>left until last (4). This site is considered as level 1. (See main report)</p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered to be level 1 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</b></p> <p><b>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</b></p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			report for comments.  <b>Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health.</b>		
Map inset 17	North Bar Hill, Noon Folly Farm	Engineering Clay Borrow Pit for A14 upgrade  Policy CS12 Engineering Clay  Policy SSP7D Mineral consultation areas	Site close to A14. To north of road. To E of new Bar Hill junction. Bar Hill 150m away but it is the industrial park so lesser impact than if residential properties.  <b>Environmental Health comments</b> Noon Folly Farm lies approximately 200 m to the North and Bar Hill is approximately 160 m on the opposite side of A14.  Noise and dust from on-site operations have the potential to have an adverse impact. Assessment is required but with 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.	S	This site has been included in current proposed Submission MWDP. The details comments made in 2009 are still valid.  Since there is no indication given within the MWDP or by the Highways Agency how many borrowpits will be needed for the A14 improvements South Cambs has produced a hierarchy of sites. This indicates which sites should be used first (1) and which should be left until last (4). This site is considered as level 1. (See main report)  <b>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</b>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>Air Quality impact may be acceptable if this proposal is considered in isolation / individually. However the collective impact of all the A14 borrowpits may have a detrimental impact on local air quality. See main report for comments.</p> <p><b>Conservation comments</b> Near enough to Cambridge Airport to have potential impact on safety because of bird strike. The watercourse flowing from Bar Hill provides habitat for water voles.</p> <p><b>Support this borrowpit in principle but would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation</b></p>		<p><b>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 also needs to be given to the impact on the ecology of the area.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered to be level 1 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</b></p> <p><b>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</b></p>
Map inset 18	North Dry Drayton Junction, Slate Hall Farm	Engineering Clay Borrow Pit for A14 upgrade  Policy CS12 Engineering Clay	<p>Site close to A14. To north of road.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the Cambridge Crematorium and South Cambs would not consider this an appropriate location for a borrowpit.</p>	O	<p>This site has been included in current proposed Submission MWDP. The details comments made in 2009 are still valid.</p> <p>Since there is no indication given within the MWDP or by the Highways Agency how many borrowpits will be needed for the A14</p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
		Policy SSP7 Mineral consultation areas	<p><b>Environmental Health comments</b> Hackers Fruit Farm and residential at Catch Hall Farm Cottages (6 properties) are approximately 90m away.</p> <p>Cambridge Crematorium is approximately 100 m away and should be afforded a reasonable degree of peace and tranquillity.</p> <p>Clay is to be transported directly to the A14 embankment via on-site haul roads but there may be some movements South via Dry Drayton over the nearby bridge.</p> <p>Noise and dust from on-site operations have the potential to have an adverse impact. Assessment is required but with 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.</p>		<p>improvements South Cambs has produced a hierarchy of sites. This indicates which sites should be used first (1) and which should be left until last (4). This site is considered as level 4. (See main report)</p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered to be level 4 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</b></p> <p><b>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</b></p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>Air Quality impact may be acceptable if this proposal is considered in isolation / individually. However the collective impact of all the A14 borrowpits may have a detrimental impact on local air quality. See main report for comments.</p> <p><b>Conservation issues</b> - Near enough to Cambridge Airport to have potential impact on safety because of bird strike. It is believed that there are some veteran oak trees, which would need to be assessed for biodiversity value.</p> <p>The site is located within Green Belt. Whilst recognising that borrowpits are temporary in nature South Cambs would not support locating borrowpits within the Green Belt if other less sensitive borrowpit locations could be used instead.</p> <p><b>Object to site given its proximity to the Crematorium and the site being within the Green Belt.</b></p>		<b>about air quality to be taken into account. Consideration needs to be given to the biodiversity of the area.</b>
Map	North Junction	Engineering Clay	Site close to A14. To north of road	O	This site has been included in current

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
inset 19	14, Grange Farm	Borrow Pit for A14 upgrade  Policy CS12 Engineering Clay  Policy SSP7F Mineral consultation areas	and close to Girton junction  Site within Flood zone 2 and 3, adjacent to Beck Brook so could impact surface water of area. 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. The future restoration of this site could provide the opportunity for a wetland reserve to be created.  Near enough to Cambridge Airport to have potential impact on safety because of bird strike  The site is located within Green Belt. Whilst recognising that borrowpits are temporary in nature South Cambs would not support locating borrowpits within the Green Belt if other less sensitive borrowpit locations could be used instead. <b>Environmental Health comments</b> Residential properties are in close proximity at Grange Farm and Catch		proposed Submission MWDP but with a slightly revised boundary. The details comments made in 2009 are still valid.  Since there is no indication given within the MWDP or by the Highways Agency how many borrowpits will be needed for the A14 improvements South Cambs has produced a hierarchy of sites. This indicates which sites should be used first (1) and which should be left until last (4). This site is considered as level 3. See main report)  <b>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</b>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>Hall both approximately 40-50 metres away.</p> <p>Clay is to be transported directly to a boundary A14 embankment via on-site haul roads avoiding use of the public highway. This should reduce traffic noise off site.</p> <p>However, noise and dust from on-site operations have the potential to have an adverse impact. Assessment is required but with 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.</p> <p>Air Quality impact may be acceptable if this proposal is considered in isolation / individually. However the collective impact of all the A14 borrowpits may have a detrimental impact on local air quality. See main report for comments.</p>		<p><b>into account.</b></p> <p><b>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</b></p> <p><b>It is considered to be level 3 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</b></p> <p><b>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</b></p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<b>South Cambs would not support this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations however if used it would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and to concerns about the impact on the watercourses in this area once the land is restored after the A14 upgrade is completed.</b>		
Map inset 20	South Junction 14 /Girton/ Madingley	Engineering Clay Borrow Pit for A14 upgrade  Policy CS12 Engineering Clay  Policy SSP7G Mineral consultation areas	Site close to A14. To south of road and close to Girton junction. Site within Flood Zone 1  A right of way crosses the site and its future would need to be safeguarded.  The restoration of this site could provide an opportunity to provide a wetland reserve with public access.  Near enough to Cambridge Airport to have potential impact on safety because of bird strike  The site is located within Green Belt. Whilst recognising that borrowpits are	O	This site has been included in current proposed Submission MWDP. The details comments made in 2009 are still valid.  Since there is no indication given within the MWDP or by the Highways Agency how many borrowpits will be needed for the A14 improvements South Cambs has produced a hierarchy of sites. This indicates which sites should be used first (1) and which should be left until last (4). This site is considered as level 2. (See main report)  <b>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</b>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>temporary in nature South Cambs would not support locating borrowpits within the Green Belt if other less sensitive borrowpit locations could be used instead.</p> <p><b>Environmental Health comments</b> Beck Brook Farm is approximately 200 metres away.</p> <p>Clay is to be transported directly to the A14 / M11 junction and the A14 embankment via on-site haul roads.</p> <p>Noise and dust from on-site operations have the potential to have an adverse impact. Assessment is required but with 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.</p> <p>Air Quality impact may be acceptable if this proposal is considered in isolation / individually. However the</p>		<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered to be level 2 in the hierarchy of borrowpits devised by South Cambs.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>collective impact of all the A14 borrowpits may have a detrimental impact on local air quality. See main report for comments.</p> <p><b>South Cambs would not support this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations. However if used it would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and its restoration when construction of the A14 is completed could provide an opportunity to provide a wetland reserve with public access.</b></p>		
PO2 2009	Milton Landfill Site, Milton	Clay extraction for the A14 upgrade—quantity 200,000m3	South Cambs would not support this site if other borrowpits were available in more environmentally acceptable locations. However if used it would have to be subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health	S	<p>No longer included in current proposed Submission MWDP. Other sites identified as borrow pits for the A14 upgrade.</p> <p><b>South Cambs supports the non-inclusion of this site from the proposed Submission MWDP.</b></p>
Map Inset 13	Barrington Quarry, Barrington	Chalk marl extraction  CS9 The Scale and Location of	The site is the same as was considered in December 2006. The site is identified as a strategic allocation in the MWCS		This site is identified in the MWCS to make future provision of chalk marl for cement manufacture in the area adjacent to Barrington Quarry. The Government recommends that Mineral Planning

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
		<p>Future Chalk Marl Extraction.</p> <p>SSP M4A – Specific site allocation for chalk marl extraction</p> <p>SSP M9B - Mineral consultation areas</p>	<p>Natural England has identified this site as one that a full appropriate assessment under the Habitat Regulations Assessment will have to be undertaken.</p> <p><b>Environmental Health comments:</b> The operations in this area would need to be assessed for the impact of noise, dust and vibration on the health and amenity of residents.</p> <p><b>Conservation comments:</b> The impact on landscape character is also likely to be an issue in considering extensions to the quarry. Would need to protect and retain strong boundary planting to the North and strengthen planting to the east. Also strengthen off site planting along Whale Way.</p> <p>The nearby road verge and possibly habitats in the site are used for foraging by at least one barn owl that is now regularly seen. The small copses are used as breeding display areas by buzzards that have recently returned to the district. It is probable</p>		<p>Authorities should aim to maintain cement plants with a stock of reserves of at least 15 years.</p> <p>It is recognised that production at Barrington quarry has ceased but that the quarry has considerable reserves of high quality chalk marl. It is not known if the cement works will re-open but if it does then a reserve would need to be allocated in addition to the existing quarry. This is the allocation in the MWDP.</p> <p>The comments made by Environmental Health and by Conservation still are valid since the boundaries of this site have not altered.</p> <p>There are a number of issues that are states in the MWSSP that would need to be addresses within a planning application for the site. These include – Noise and dust mitigation; New landscaping; Restoration to a stable final landform with sustainable after uses; Potential impacts on the Eversden and Wimpole SAC.</p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p>that buzzards breed in the woodland nearby.</p> <p>There is great local concern over the proposals to increase capacity at this site. Any such decision should only be made in the light of a full Health Impact and Environmental Assessment with full public consultation at every stage.</p> <p><b>No objection to the mineral allocation subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation.</b></p>		<p>South Cambs consider that these issues should be incorporated into a site-specific policy for this allocation.</p> <p>It was noted in October 2008 that the proposal for mineral extraction at Barrington was one that English Nature (EN) had identified as needing a full Appropriate Assessment (AA) to be carried out to test whether if the site were used it would significantly affect Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC. This assessment has now been carried out and it has been found that no mitigation measures need to be undertaken since the woods will not be affected.</p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>A site-specific policy could include a requirement to consider these matters.</b></p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
Map inset 157	Barrington Cement Works Railhead	SSP T2A Transport Protection Zone	<p>The transport protection zone is also the same boundary and this has been identified as a Strategic allocation in the MWCS. The Council supports the use of transporting minerals by rail from this site since this will relieve the existing local roads.</p> <p><b>The Council supports the protection of the railhead so that minerals can be transported by rail from this site since this will relieve the existing local roads.</b></p>		<p>This site is the same as was included in previous consultations. It is however no longer included as a strategic allocation being identified in the MWSSP as a designated Sustainable Transport Protection Zone.</p> <p><b>The Council supports the protection of the railhead so that minerals can be transported by rail from this site since this will relieve the existing local roads.</b></p>
Map inset 33	Steeple Morden	Specialist minerals  SSP M9AV Mineral consultation areas	<p>The site boundary remains the same as was consulted on previously in December 2006.</p> <p><b>Environmental Health comments:</b> There are several properties located around the site. A number of farmhouses are within 300m of the site so there could be a potential impact on these properties in terms of noise and dust. The impact on residents should be assessed further and appropriate measures taken to mitigate the effects if necessary.</p>		<p>The size of the quarry has been extended since it was first included in earlier stages of the MWDP. The boundaries now include those areas previously identified for future safeguarding. This no longer needs to be safeguarded in the MWDP.</p> <p><i>Policy SSP M9 Mineral Consultation areas</i> designates a MCS around the quarry. The MPA are required to be consulted on all planning applications with the exception of minor householder applications and advertisements within the MCA.</p>

			<b>Preferred options 2 Consultations in 2008 and 2009</b>		<b>Current proposed Submission consultation 2010</b>
<b>Site ref</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy ref and number</b>	<b>Summary of S Cambs DC comments</b>	<b>S/ O</b>	<b>S Cambs Proposed Response</b>
			<p><b>Conservation comments:</b> If the site were used there would have to be protection and enhancement of southern edge of Morden Grange Plantation. Protection and Enhancement of the Bell Barrow to the south of the site. Mitigation including strengthening of planting on existing track linking chalk pits to reduce impact of open views from Station Road. Mitigation including strengthening planting along footpath to Morden Grange farm.</p> <p><b>No objection subject to measures to mitigate the matters raised by Environmental Health and Conservation.</b></p>		