

**RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED ON THE RECAP WASTE MANAGEMENT DESIGN GUIDE – SEPTEMBER 2011.**

First column - The SPD being referred to is that consulted upon in the Pre-Submission consultation 2010.

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
Introduction (paragraph 1.2)	002	Concerned that the SPD is being consulted upon prematurely before the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy has been adopted		<p><b>Disagree</b> - The purpose of consulting upon the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide at the same time as the Core Strategy was to demonstrate how the relevant Core Strategy policies would be implemented and to avoid a potential “policy vacuum” following the adoption of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>It is however accepted that the changes to the content of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies CS16 and CS28 as set out in the Inspector’s Report will need to be taken into account prior to adoption of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide and the document will go out for further consultation following the adoption of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>No amendments required in relation to early consultation. However, changes to the timescales for adoption will need updating within the text. Delete current paragraph text and replace with following:</p> <p><u>The intention is the adoption of the parent Minerals and Waste Core Strategy will take place and following further public consultation this Waste Management Design Guide will be adopted by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It is anticipated the Core Strategy will be adopted in mid 2011 and this document will be adopted as SPD in early 2012.</u></p> <p>Please see response to MWRECAP51.</p>	This objection has been overtaken by events since the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy has now been adopted and amendments to the SPD have been made in this consultation.
Cross referencing within SPD.	003	Cross referencing – Within the SPD there are many cross references which would be clearer to understand if a page number and /or a paragraph number was included so it was easier to find your way around the document.	Cross-referencing should refer to the relevant paragraph number / page number to make using the document more user friendly.	<b>Agree</b> – this is a sensible suggestion.	Please see responses to MWRECAP 10, MWRECAP 12, MWRECAP 15 and MWRECAP87.	Welcome the inclusion of cross-referencing to the revised SPD.
Introduction (paragraph 1.3)	004	Whilst recognising that this document has been in existence for a while it does not appear to have been reviewed thoroughly before it has been approved for consultation as a draft SPD. An SPD cannot create new policies but must support policies in an adopted Development Plan Document and it is not clearly stated within the SPD which		<p>It is agreed it is not for the SPD to make policy, which is why it is linked to policies CS16 and CS28 in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD.</p> <p>To date South Cambridgeshire District Council is the only Local Planning Authority, which has</p>	No amendments required.	Disappointed that consideration was not taken on how developers and planning officers had found using the earlier version of the SPD and whether it had resulted in waste and recycling issues being better included within planning applications. It is

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
		<p>policies the SPD is providing guidance to. The structure of the SPD must be revised so that this fundamental fact is made clear at the beginning of the document.</p> <p>The earlier version of the Waste Design Guide was adopted by South Cambs as Council Policy in March 2008 and planners have referred developers to the guide before they submit planning applications to the Council. South Cambs encourages pre- applications discussions with developers. There is no indication in the current SPD or in the accompanying report, which was prepared by County planners in September 2009 of the success of the guide, and details of which other local planning authorities within Cambridgeshire had adopted it as Council Policy. It would be useful to know what success there was been in improving the waste management content of planning applications as a result of the existence of the guide. The toolkit appears to be a useful way of assessing the waste needs of a development but are developers submitting these with their applications?</p>		adopted the 2008 version of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide as Council policy. Therefore the intention is that bringing forward the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide as a SPD linked to the Minerals and Waste Development Plan is to ensure that waste management collection, storage and recycling form part of new residential and commercial developments within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough		<p>hoped that this additional consultation will allow for such practical revisions.</p> <p>The experience in South Cambs is the toolkit is rarely used by developers and that planning officers would welcome more practical workshops in how to use the guide once it is adopted by the County Council.</p>
Executive Summary 1. Key point 1	005	Only refers to funding and provision of appropriate containers and without any justification	The draft SPD should make clear that as a general principle developers would be expected to contribute towards any additional costs incurred by the local authority arising out of residential developments.	<b>Agree (in part)</b> – Reference is made to a requirement to provide adequate space for the storage of waste (including within commercial premises) and appropriate containers for residential developments. However, it is accepted that the text could be amended to provide greater clarity in relation to the guidance outlined in the Design Guide.	<p>Amend the second sentence in point 1 as follows (text underlined):</p> <p>“In both cases, developers will also have to fund and provide appropriate containers <u>for residential developments where additional costs will be incurred by the Waste Collection Authority</u>”.</p> <p>For commercial developments....based on consultation with <u>the relevant Waste Collection Authority</u>”.</p>	Welcome the clarification.
Executive summary – paragraph 11 Key point 7	005	Within this section mention is made to Circular 05/2005 – This should read ‘in accordance with Planning Obligations Circular 05/2005...’ And all other	Mention of Circular 05/2005 should read as ‘in accordance with Planning Obligations Circular 05/2005...’	<b>Agree</b> – this is a sensible suggestion and would provide greater clarity.	Amend the existing wording in point 7 as follows (text underlined): “A network of Household	Welcome the revision in wording and the additional consideration of CIL where appropriate.

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
		references to this circular in the SPD should be displayed as such.			<p>Recycling Centres is operational across the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area. Continued development will put pressure on the existing facilities and require the expansion of the network. Financial contributions will be required in accordance with <u>Planning Obligations</u> Circular 05/05...as appropriate", which will take CIL into account.</p> <p>Amend the existing wording in point 8 as follows (text underlined): "Developers will be required to provide additional Bring Sites, upgrade existing facilities in the locality in accordance with <u>Planning Obligations</u> Circular 05/05...or upgrade (note also amended to take account of CIL).</p> <p>Amend the existing wording in paragraph 8.9 as follows (text underlined): "Although developers will not be expected to construct Household Recycling Centres, they will be expected to contribute finances in accordance with <u>Planning Obligations</u> Circular 05/05....included (note also amended to take account of CIL)."</p> <p>Other references to Circular 05/05 to be amended (as per the wording above and to take account of CIL) in the following areas: Paragraph 4.8 (External Storage Capacity); Paragraph 9.7 (Provision of Bring Sites in Future Developments); Glossary; and Bibliography.</p>	

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
Introduction 1.1	006	A specific objective of the SPD must be to assist in achieving policies set out in the MWDP. The SPD can only provide guidance – it cannot create new policies. This must be stated clearly in this introduction.  Whilst recognising that the design guide was published in a different format some while ago it must now as an SPD be primarily supporting policies in the MWDP. The review of the guide should not just be considering whether it is consistent with the MWDP but how it supports policies in the MWDP.	Reword the introduction to emphasis that the SPD is supporting policies in the MWDP.	<b>Agree</b> – please see response to MWRECAP9.	Please see proposed amendment relating to paragraph 1.6 (MWRECAP9).	Amendment clarifies the role of the SPD and is to be welcomed.
Purpose of the Guide 1.4.2	007	A SPD cannot be a strategic tool. It can only provide guidance/ support to adopted policies in the MWDP.  The word ‘ development application’ would be clearer if it were referred to as a planning application	Remove the words ‘ a strategic tool’ from the second purpose of the guide and replace with the words ‘ guidance’.  Replace the word ‘ development ‘ with ‘ planning ‘.	<b>Agree</b> – it is accepted that there is a need for greater clarity in relation to the status of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.	Amend the existing wording in paragraph 1.4 (point 2) as follows (text underlined):  “Provide <u>guidance</u> for use by Local <u>Planning Authorities</u> when assessing <u>relevant planning applications</u> ”	Welcome revision to wording to clarify the role of the SPD.
1.4.4	007	It must be recognised that for different scales of development there will be varying levels of contributions required. A developer should be able to pick up the SPD and have a clear idea of what contributions are expected.	There must be information in the SPD so that it is clearly set out when developers will be expected to contribute.  The draft SPD should make clear that as a general principle developers will be expected to contribute towards any additional costs incurred by the local authority arising out of residential developments.	<b>Agree</b> – it is accepted that there is a need to clarify that costs will be dependant upon the scale of development and that the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide outlines how these costs will be established.  Please also see responses to MWRECAP36, 37, 40, 41 and 42.	Amend the existing wording in paragraph 1.4 (point 4) as follows (text underlined):  Expand upon the requirements set out in <u>policies CS16 and CS28</u> of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy for developer <u>contributions</u> relating to the funding and provision of waste management infrastructure.	Additional information has been included in this latest draft of the SPD that cover some of the concerns South Cambs had expressed in the last consultation. This is welcomed.  See main report for further details.
1.4.5	007	The wording of this purpose seems to imply that it is possible for the SPD to provide detailed information for developers about financial implications of providing for waste facilities. This needs to be reworded	Amend 1.4.5 along the lines of...' Highlight to developers that there will be financial implications relating to the provision of waste management infrastructure. These will vary according to the nature and scale of the proposed development and associated supporting infrastructure and will be based on any additional costs likely to be incurred by the local authority arising out of the proposed	<b>Agree</b> – it is accepted that there is a need to clarify that costs will be dependant upon the scale of development and that the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide outlines how these costs will be established.  Please also see responses to MWRECAP36, 37, 40, 41 and 42.	Amend the existing wording in paragraph 1.4 (point 5) as follows (text underlined):  “Highlight <u>to developers that there will be financial implications relating to the provision of waste management infrastructure.</u> <u>This will vary according to the nature and scale of proposed development and will be based</u>	The words that South Cambs had suggested for inclusion in paragraph 1.4 have been used with some minor amendments. This is welcomed.

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
			development.'		<u>on any additional costs for the relevant local authority arising out of the need for additional or improved infrastructure which is related to the proposed development</u> ".	
1.5 Waste Audit	008	<p>This paragraph introduces a subject that does not seem to relate to the preceding paragraphs. Is a waste audit to be a purpose of this SPD? If not why is it in this section? This paragraph should be rewritten to explain clearly what a waste audit is</p> <p>Should this in actual fact be a reference to a waste strategy rather than a waste audit which will then be used by the developer to demonstrate their proposals for meeting the requirements of the Guide (a waste audit will not do this as it presumably simply shows what waste needs to be dealt with, not how it will be dealt with?). 'Waste Audit' and 'Waste Strategy' should be defined in the Glossary.</p>	<p>Consideration should be given to why mention is made to a waste audit at this stage. A clearer explanation is needed of what a waste audit is and justification of it appearing here in the purposes section of the SPD.</p>	<p><b>Agree (in part):</b> It is agreed that there is a need for greater clarity in relation to the use of waste audits and strategies in the context of the requirements outlined for the preparation of these documents in policy CS28 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. This is in addition to the requirement to complete relevant parts of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that the reference to waste audits is removed and that more detailed guidance is provided in other parts of the Design Guide.</p> <p>It is accepted that there is a need to include a definition of the term 'waste strategy' in the Glossary</p> <p>However a definition of the term 'waste audit' is already included in the Glossary.</p>	<p>Remove paragraphs 1.5 and 1.13 and renumber paragraphs 1.6 – 1.16 accordingly.</p> <p>Add additional paragraph to follow paragraph 1.10 (text underlined):</p> <p><u>"This requirement is distinct from the requirement to prepare a waste audit and strategy which applies to all developments over the value of £300,000. These documents will be used to inform the waste management requirements required for residential and commercial developments"</u>.</p> <p>Please also see response to MWRECAP40.</p> <p>Renumber paragraph 1.11 to become paragraph 1.12.</p> <p>Remove current definition of 'waste audit' in the Glossary and replace as follows: <u>Waste Audit – A formal structured process used to identify the type, composition and quantity of waste that will be produced during the construction and occupation phases of a development, usually forming part of a wider waste management strategy.</u></p> <p>Insert definitions for 'Waste Strategy' and 'Waste</p>	<p>Welcome the clarity regarding waste audits; waste strategy.</p> <p>There does need to be further clarity of why developments valued over £300,000 need an audit and that advice on preparing one can be sought from the Waste Planning Authority.</p> <p><b>Proposed change</b> Therefore there should be additional wording added to the new paragraph after 1.10</p> <p>"This requirement is distinct from the requirement to prepare a waste audit and strategy which applies to all developments over the value of £300,000 <u>as set out in Policy CS28 – Waste Minimisation, Re-use and Resource Recovery. Paragraph 10.10 of the adopted Core Strategy DPD outlines what information is required in an audit and also highlights that advice can be sought from the Waste Planning Authority when preparing an audit.</u> These documents will be used to inform the waste management requirements required for residential and commercial developments. "</p>

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<p>Hierarchy' in the Glossary as follows:</p> <p><u>Waste Strategy – A strategy for dealing with waste arising from the proposed development in accordance with the principles of the waste hierarchy, including specific measures to be incorporated into the developments design. The Strategy is likely to incorporate a Waste Audit and SPD Compliance Toolkit.</u></p> <p><u>Waste Hierarchy – The Government's framework for securing a sustainable approach to waste management, e.g. reuse of waste is preferable to landfill.</u></p>	
1.6 MWDP policies	009	It must be more clearly stated that the Guide is supporting these policies. As written the guide just launches into mentioning these policies without any explanation. At the very least there should be a paragraph explaining how these policies relate to the SPD rather than just listing them.	There must be a clearer explanation of why these policies from the MWDP are listed in this SPD.	<b>Agree</b> – this is a valid comment as there is a need to make clear that the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide is intended to provide further guidance in relation to policies CS16 and CS28 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.	<p>Add the following wording as separate paragraphs to follow Para 1.6 (text underlined) and replace Core Strategy policies CS28 and CS16 with the wording approved by the Inspector.</p> <p><u>This Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) forms part of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework (LDF).</u></p> <p><u>The SPD provides additional guidance on the design of waste management infrastructure to be provided for residential and commercial development. As outlined in Policies CS16 and CS28 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.</u></p>	Welcome the clearer explanation of the SPD and its role.

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<p><u>CS28 – Waste Minimisation, Re-use, and Resource Recovery</u></p> <p><u>The Waste Planning Authorities will encourage waste minimisation, re-use and resource recovery by requiring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>A waste management audit and strategy to put in place practicable measures to maximise waste minimisation, sorting, re-use, recovery and recycling of waste on all developments over the value of £300,000</u></li> <li>• <u>Submission of a completed RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit Assessment</u></li> <li>• <u>New development to contribute to the provision of bring sites. Contributions will be consistent with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide and additionally in Peterborough the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme or through the Community Infrastructure Levy in the event that this mechanism supersedes this provision</u></li> <li>• <u>Temporary waste recycling facilities in strategic development areas including the Cambridge and Peterborough</u></li> </ul>	

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<p><u>development areas, Northstowe, and St Neots. These should maximise the reuse, recycling and recovery of inert waste streams from construction and demolition operations, and be in place through the construction phases of these major development areas.</u></p> <p><u>CS16 – Household Recycling Centres</u></p> <p><u>A network of household recycling facilities easily accessible to local communities will be developed through the Site Specific Proposals Plan. New household recycling centres will be in the following broad locations as shown on the Waste Management Key Diagram:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Cambridge East</u></li> <li>• <u>Cambridge North</u></li> <li>• <u>Cambridge South</u></li> <li>• <u>March</u></li> <li>• <u>Northstowe</u></li> <li>• <u>Peterborough</u></li> </ul> <p><u>New development will contribute to the provision of household recycling centres. Contributions will be consistent with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide and additionally the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme or through the Community Infrastructure Levy in the event that this mechanism supersedes this</u></p>	



Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
1.11 Basis for Conditions	010	Throughout the SPD mention is made to 'Basic Conditions and Agreements' and at no point are this term explained clearly. (Mentioned in Table 1.1 page 9; paragraphs 4.8; 8.11; 9.7; 9.10; Table 11.1.)	Explanation as to what is meant by 'Basic Conditions and Agreements' when it first appears in the SPD on page 9.	<b>Agree</b> – it is accepted that there is a need to clarify what is meant by the term "Basis for conditions and/or Agreements".	<u>provision.</u> Amend the final column of Table 1.1 as follows (text underlined): "Dependant upon the nature of the development it <u>will</u> be appropriate to apply planning conditions or negotiate S106 agreements / <u>CIL for the provision of waste collection, waste storage containers, Bring sites, alternative methods of waste collection and Household Recycling Centres</u> ".	For clarity rather than placing this information in a table format to describe the contents of the toolkit it would be better done as bullet points to describe each tool in the toolkit!  <b>Proposed Change</b>  'The Toolkit is made up of 3 tools which are as follows' <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Design Standards Checklist - Developers will be expected ...</u></li><li>• <u>Assessment Criteria – Depending upon ...</u></li><li>• <u>Basis for Conditions and Agreements relating to planning permissions – Dependant upon ...</u></li></ul>
1.14 Consultation.	011	Mention is made of the Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and Public Realms and the consultation process included in this is suggested as the one to follow with this SPD.	It is not considered that the consultation process included in the Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and Public Realms has any relevance to this section and any reference to it should be removed.  The 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence should be amended with the words 'including pre-application discussions by the developer' inserted after 'on timely consultation...' Consultation should be with the Local Planning Authority.  The 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence 'In most cases, consultation...' should be removed.	<b>Agree (in part)</b> – It is accepted that the removal of the reference to the collaborative consultation process as outlined in Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and Public Realm would provide greater clarity. However it is anticipated that the identification of waste management requirements in conjunction with the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough authorities should wherever possible be part of a collaborative process between the developer and the relevant local authorities.  The suggested inclusion of reference to pre-application discussions is a valid comment as the expectation is that there will be discussions prior to submission of a planning application and completion of the RECAP Waste	Amend Para 1.14 by deleting the final sentence and amending the first sentence to read as follows (text underlined):  "This Guide puts significant emphasis on timely consultation with the relevant <u>Waste Collection and Disposal Authority including pre-application discussions</u> ".  Remove the third sentence in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph in the Executive Summary.  Amend the existing wording in the Executive Summary (third paragraph) as follows (text underlined):	Welcome the amendments but suggest that timely consultations with the Local Planning Authority should be included too. The planning department can then refer the developer/ applicant to the relevant officer responsible for waste matters.  <b>Proposed change</b> Therefore it would be of benefit to include in the revised wording.  "This Guide puts significant emphasis on timely consultation with the <u>relevant Local Authority responsible for Planning: Waste Collection and Disposal including pre-application discussions</u> ".

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
				Management Design Toolkit.	"This Guide puts significant emphasis on timely consultation with the relevant <u>Waste Collection and Disposal Authorities</u> ".	And also to similarly amend the wording in the executive summary.  "This Guide puts significant emphasis on timely consultation with the relevant Local Authority responsible for Planning; <u>Waste Collection and Disposal</u> ".
1.14	011	It is presumed that the reference to the relevant Local Authority is meant as the Local Planning Authority. South Cambs would support that early consultation is important when a developer is considering submitting a planning application. South Cambs encourages developers to take part in pre-application discussion with the planning officers.	Include reference to importance of pre- application discussions to ensure that developers are aware of SPD and requirements for waste management before a planning application is submitted.	The reference to consultation (by developers) is intended to refer to Waste Collection and Disposal Authorities.	See comments above	See comments above.
1.16	012	Mention is made of Assessment criteria but it is not stated where these are to be found.	Need for clear cross referencing of where Assessment Criteria can be found page 41 in Waste Management Toolkit Section 11	<b>Agree</b> – the inclusion of additional wording in paragraph 1.16 would provide greater clarity.	Add the following wording to the end of Para 1.16 (text underlined): "Any such schemes must, at the very minimum, be assessed against the criteria outlined <u>on page x of this Guide (RECAP Waste Management Design Toolkit)</u> ".	Welcome clarification.
Part 2 Policy and Context	013	Whilst there is reference to policy there should be additional reference to relevant and related legislation and guidance. Useful reference and benchmark.	Refer to The Building Regulations Approved Document H, Drainage and Waste Disposal (2002 edition), Part H6 Solid Waste Disposal, and British Standard BS5906:2005 'Waste management in buildings – Code of practice'  They establish general principles for location and design of waste storage facilities for various forms of development, including access (for users and the collection authority). They also contain detailed technical guidance on the provision and location of waste facilities.  For example BS 5906 In section 4	<b>Agree in part</b> – Building Regulations principles are separate to the principles shown within this document. However, reference is made to the BS 5906 document within the Bibliography and a web link can be added, which is considered to be sufficient.	Web link to be added to the Bibliography section for the BS 5906 document.	Accept that Building regulation information is in the bibliography and welcome addition of a web link to the BS 5906 document.

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
			sets out general principles of the design of facilities, stating that: 'Designers should consider: - easy and safe access for waste producers, including older persons or persons with disabilities; - easy and safe access for collectors and collection vehicles; - location and space (including avoidance of opportunity to cause nuisance or injury); - protection against animal scavenging of waste; - aesthetics of the development; - noise (e.g. glass handling); - ease of maintenance, including cleaning; - robust construction; - safety from fire risk and smoke; - lighting; - ventilation; - sound insulation; and - special requirements (e.g. separate storage and collection of healthcare waste and bulky waste)			
2.2 Waste Strategy	014	No mention of who has produced this strategy? Government department? Can a web link be placed in this document to direct the reader to the strategy?	Need to include mention of who has prepared this strategy and a web link to it if available. Suggest DEFRA Waste Strategy for England 2007 should be referred in subsequent sections as 'The 2007 Strategy' to differentiate it from other strategies e.g. waste management strategy.  <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/strategy/strategy07/documents/waste07-strategy.pdf">http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/strategy/strategy07/documents/waste07-strategy.pdf</a>	<b>Agree (in part)</b> - Please see responses to MWRECAP13 and MWRECAP16.  <b>Agree</b> – By referring to the '2007 strategy' this would provide greater clarity.	Please see responses to MWRECAP13 and MWRECAP16.  Amend the existing wording in paragraph 2.4 as follows (text underlined): "The <u>2007</u> Strategy...objectives:"  Amend the existing wording in paragraph 2.5 as follows (text underlined):  The main elements of the <u>2007</u> Strategy,...summarised as".	Welcome amendments.
2.4	015	Unclear what is meant by the reference to Part 3 in the brackets? It may be clearer to call the sections/ parts of the SPD chapters then it would clarify what is in SPD and what is in Tool kit.	Need for cross referencing of Part 3 – page number 15	<b>Agree</b> – the inclusion of additional wording in paragraph 2.4 would provide greater clarity.	Amend the existing wording in paragraph 2.4 as follows (text underlined): "The strategy sets a number of national targets for waste	Welcome that cross referencing will be added to paragraph 2.4

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					management <u>(which are outlined in Part 3 of the Guide (page x) and...</u>	
2.2 ; 2.6; 2.7; 2.11; 2.12	016	Again it would be useful to have a web link if possible to each document.	Need to include a web link if available	<p><b>Agree (in part)</b> – the existing text refers to the Government and Defra being responsible for the preparation of PPS 10 and Designing Waste Facilities: A guide to Modern Design of Waste. It is considered that there would be merit in including references to the bodies which prepared the other documents referred to in Part 2 of the Design Guide as it would provide greater clarity.</p> <p>It is also accepted that the inclusion of web links to these documents in the Design Guide would be helpful</p> <p>Please see responses to MWRECAP13 and MWRECAP18.</p>	<p>Amend the existing wording in paragraph 2.2 as follows (text underlined): “The Waste Strategy <u>published by Government</u> in 2007....2000.”</p> <p>Amend the existing wording in paragraph 2.7 as follows (text underlined):</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1) <u>which sets out the Government’s objectives for the planning system</u> refers....infrastructure.</p> <p>Please see response to MWRECAP18.</p> <p>Web links will also be added to the Bibliography for Waste Strategy for England, PPS10: Sustainable Waste Management, PPS1: Planning for Sustainable Development, Designing Waste Facilities: a guide to modern design of waste. See response to MWRECAP13.</p>	Welcome clarification and the additions to the bibliography.
2.12	017	<p>Need to have an indication of who has produced the East of England Plan and a brief description of what this plan is. The plan not only includes policies about waste but also detailed policies about the Cambridge Sub-Region indicating housing numbers.</p> <p>Need reference to current review of East of England Plan.</p>	Need to mention that the East of England Plan is prepared by the East of England Regional Assembly (EERA), which is the regional planning body for the East of England and has a statutory duty to prepare and implement the Regional Spatial Strategy known in this region as the East of England Plan.	Please see response to MWRECAP16 and MWRECAP18.	Please see responses to MWRECAP16 and MWRECAP18.	This objection has been overtaken by events since the Government is to revoke regional plans the East of England Plan will no longer need to be included in the SPD.
2.14	018	It is confusing to have supporting text for the policies in the East of England Plan in bold type – the same as is done when quoting from the actual adopted policies.	Need to differentiate clearly between what is policy and what is supporting text in the East of England Plan.	<b>Disagree</b> - the text in paragraphs 2.12 – 2.15 makes it clear whether the quote is from a policy or supporting text.	<p>Delete paragraphs 2.12 – 2.15.</p> <p>Please see responses to MWRECAP16 and</p>	See comments above for Rep no 017

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
				The Government announced on the 5 <sup>th</sup> July 2010 that with immediate effect the existing Regional Strategies including the East of England Plan would be revoked. It is therefore proposed to remove the text which appeared in the draft version of the Guide.	MWRECAP17. Plus the additional amendments section	
2.17	019	The detailed definitions of what is meant by Development Plan Documents etc should be included in an Appendix or glossary and does not appear to be relevant here.	Remove the definitions of DPDs; SPDs and SCI into a glossary or appendix.	<b>Agree</b> – this is a sensible suggestion as it would ensure that the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan features more prominently in this part of the Design Guide.	Delete Para 2.17 with the exception of the 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence and move definitions in final sentence to glossary of the Design Guide.	Welcome amendments.
2.18	020	There should be a clearer definition of what the Minerals and Waste Development Plan is and the documents it will include. These are currently out for consultation so at a further stage than is implied in the last paragraph on page 18 ‘are drafting ...’	Include a clear description about the Minerals and Waste Development Plan and the stage in preparation it has now reached. – Proposed Submission.	<b>Agree</b> – there is a need for a greater clarity in relation to the content and status of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan.  Please also see response to MWRECAP9.	Amend existing text in Para 2.18 as follows (text underlined):  “Matters relating to minerals and waste for the area are the responsibility of Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council.”  Replace existing text in Para 2.19 as follows (text underlined):  The <u>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan</u> which forms part of the Framework <u>consists of two parts as follows:</u>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Core Strategy:</b> which <u>sets out the vision for mineral and waste management development, the broad locations where it will take place, the amount that will be provided,</u></li> </ul>	Welcome clarification.  However in the suggested wording for paragraph 2.19 it implies that both the Core Strategy <b>and</b> the Site Specific Proposals Plan will both be adopted in 2011.  This amended wording has now been revised in the final draft SPD and correctly indicates that the Site Specific Proposals Plan may be adopted in 2012. This is to be welcomed.

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<p><u>and policies which will be used to determine planning applications. It also makes key allocations at Block Fen / Langwood Fen, Mepal and at Addenbrookes Hospital, Cambridge</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site Specific Proposals Plan:</b> which <u>makes all the other site specific allocations for mineral extraction and waste management development.</u></li> </ul> <p>Para 2.19 to be amended to include the following:</p> <p>It will be a comprehensive <u>Minerals and Waste Plan</u>, which when adopted in 2011, will supersede the Cambridgeshire (Aggregates) Minerals Local Plan and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan is the “parent” document to which the Design Guide is linked (please see part 1 of the Guide for further details).</p> <p>Please also see response to MWRECAP9.</p>	
2.21-2.24	021	Could a web link be included to each of these documents?	Include a web link for each document.	<b>Agree (in part)</b> – this is a sensible suggestion. However, it is considered that web links should appear in the Bibliography as opposed to the body of the Design Guide.	<p>Web links will be added to the Bibliography.</p> <p>Please also see responses to MWRECAP13, MWRECAP14, and MWRECAP16.</p>	<p>Welcome inclusion of web link but could a footnote be added to say that such links are included in the bibliography.</p> <p><b>Proposed change</b> Include an additional sentence at the end of the first</p>

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
						paragraph in this Part 2 of the SPD to say that web links are included in the bibliography for the documents listed in Part 2 of the SPD.
2.22 Cambridge-shire County Council Household Recycling Centre Strategy	022	It is not clear who it was who adopted this Strategy in December 2006 and what status does it has in planning terms.	Need to include who adopted this Strategy and its planning status.	<b>Agree</b> –This is a valid comment as it would provide greater clarity. This document was adopted as County Council policy at a Cabinet meeting on 5 <sup>th</sup> December 2006 and is therefore a material consideration in the determination of residential and commercial planning applications covered by the provisions of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.	Amend existing text in Para 2.22 as follows (text underlined): “This document <u>was adopted by the County Council</u> in December 2006, <u>which</u> sets out...targets”.	Welcome clarification relating to this strategy and the amendment to para 2.22.
2.23 Cambridge-shire Design Guide for Streets and Public Realm	023	It is not clear what the planning status of this document is? Has it been adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document by the County Council?	Need to clarify planning status of this document.	<b>Agree</b> –This is a valid comment as it would provide greater clarity. The Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and Public Realm was adopted as County Council policy at a Cabinet meeting on 16 <sup>th</sup> October 2007 and is therefore a material consideration in the determination of residential and commercial planning applications covered by the provisions of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.	Amend existing text in Para 2.23 as follows (text underlined): “The Design Guide <u>was adopted as County Council policy in October 2007,</u> <u>which</u> ..... Supplementary Planning Document”.	Welcome clarification relating to this strategy and the amendment to para 2.23.
2.25	024	If it is the intention for the SPD to be adopted in June 2011 why was it consulted on so early before the MWDP has been adopted?		The purpose of consulting upon the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide at the same time as the Core Strategy was to demonstrate how the relevant Core Strategy policies would be implemented and to avoid a potential “policy vacuum” following the adoption of the Core Strategy.  However, It is accepted that any changes to the content of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies CS16 and CS28 will need to be taken into account prior to adoption of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.	No amendments required.	This objection has been overtaken by events since the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy has now been adopted and amendments to the SPD have been made in this consultation.
3.1	025	There needs to be mention in this section of the fact that Cambridgeshire comes within the area identified by Central	Need to describe the step growth in housing that is planned for the Cambridge Sub Region in the East	<b>Agree (in part):</b> it is accepted that the recent growth in population within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough	Amend existing text in paragraph 3.1 as follows (text underlined):	Welcome this amendment.

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
		Government as an area where there will be a step change in growth and that this is planned for in the East of England Plan up to 2021 and beyond. It is not just the 'popularity of the area' that has led to an increase in its population but it has been specifically identified as a growth area where there will be a planned step increase in house building.	of England Plan.	has come about through the Growth agenda and the planning process rather than attractiveness of the area.	"The <u>designation</u> of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area <u>as a Growth area</u> has led to a significant increase in population in recent years".	
Generation of municipal waste section Page15	026	Much of the information about waste at the local level and national targets is included in the MWDP and does not need to be repeated in detail in this SPD.	Amend section that is outlining waste at a local level and the national targets since this is repeating information contained within the MWDP.	<b>Disagree</b> – this information provides the context for the scale of waste arising from households, which is expected to be addressed by the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and the SPDs particularly the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.	No amendments required.	Disagree that the national targets and local information on waste needs to be repeated in the SPD when it is already included in the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. The SPD is providing guidance to this adopted plan so does not need to repeat its content.  <b>Proposed changes</b> That the detailed information already included in the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy should be removed from the SPD.
3.6	026	The first paragraph is confusing and in the wrong tense. It states that there will be an increase in waste in 2005 – surely we will know this now I 2010?	Amend first paragraph.	<b>Agree in part</b> – Whilst it is agreed there is an issue with the tense and dates quoted within Paragraph 3.6, it focuses on the East of England Plan so it should now be deleted from the document.	Delete paragraph 3.6 to take account of the forthcoming repeal of the RSS (East of England Plan) as a result of the Localism Bill.  Please see additional amendments section	This objection has been overtaken by events since it refers to the East of England Plan
External storage capacity 4.7	027	It states that as a minimum developers will be required to provide that appropriate amount of space...However if there is a proven need what penalties are there if a developer does not pay for additional waste capacity?	Need for clarification.	<b>Agree</b> – the expectation is that the space required for containers will form part of the design of residential and commercial developments as set out in the plans and supporting documents which form part of planning applications.  The expectation is that the requirement to provide sufficient space for waste storage will be	Amend existing text in paragraph 4.7 as follows (text underlined): "As a guide to...Appendix A. <u>This requirement should be reflected in the design of developments and will be secured by Local Planning Authorities through the application of appropriate planning conditions.</u> "	Welcome revised wording



Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
				secured through planning condition(s) to secure compliance with approved plans.	<p>Add additional text to Table 11.5 in a new row to appear in Waste Storage Container Section as follows (text underlined to be added):</p> <p><u>Sufficient space for waste containers as outlined in Part 4 of the RECAP Design Guide.</u></p> <p>Finance will be provided by the developer sufficient to allow for the provision of appropriate waste storage containers by the local authority.</p> <p>Provision of appropriate waste storage containers shall be made by the developer sufficient to meet the needs of the development.</p>	
Part 5 page 23	028	Need for paragraph numbers in this part/ chapter of the SPD.	Include paragraph numbers in this part of the SPD.	<b>Agree</b> – Paragraph numbers will be inserted, this is a typographical error.	Add paragraph numbering to Part 5 of the Guide.	Welcomed.
Part 5: Waste Storage Points	028	No reference to noise and odour associated with storage. The Design Standard checklist (which has been included as a supplement on the consultation version of the SPD to be inserted after paragraph 11.9) and assessment guidance sheet refers to protection of Environment –Nuisance and Amenity	Include paragraph to highlight these issues e.g. - The siting and design of bin storage areas and in particular communal and underground storage including screened hard-standings and enclosed stores, should also have regard to the impact of noise and odour nuisance etc on the occupiers of neighbouring properties, existing and proposed. Should have basic lighting and should have drainage facilities to assist cleaning.	<p><b>Agree</b> –Design Standards Checklist to be included within the document, this is a typographical error.</p> <p><b>Disagree</b> – there is existing guidance provided in Appendix D relating to the design of waste storage compounds which covers issues of noise and odour and the issues identified.</p>	Add Design Standards Checklist to the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit.	Agree that this matter is covered in Appendix D.
Page 26 Collection frequency	028	It may be better to suggest at this point that to find out information on the frequency of collections that developers contact the relevant individual local authorities. By including an appendix with the latest information this may become out of date and could not easily be amended. It would take some time to review the SPD due to the procedures	<p>Amend the paragraph on Collection Frequency so that developers should contact the relevant waste collection authority to find out about the current collection frequencies.</p> <p>Delete 1<sup>st</sup> sentence ‘ Current collection frequencies...’</p>	<b>Agree</b> – this is a valid comment as waste collection frequencies within Cambridgeshire and Peterborough will be subject to further change in the future.	Delete first sentence of final Para in Part 5 of the Guide and amend as follows (text underlined): “As <u>collection frequencies</u> are subject to change <u>it is therefore recommended that applicants contact</u> the relevant Waste Collection Authority for the	Welcome amendments.

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
		that are have to be followed as it is an official planning document.			<p>most up to date information.</p> <p>Then in the Glossary amend the second sentence of the definition of 'collection frequency' for clarity to state: <u>Further details relating to current collection frequencies are available from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Collection Authorities.</u>"</p> <p>Remove Appendix C – Current Local Authority Waste Collection Frequencies</p>	
Part 6 Waste Storage Infrastructure	029	<p>This section should be restructured so that it deals clearly with above ground storage (design and construction) and underground storage (design and construction).</p> <p>No mention is made of Appendix D, which indicates the design specifications for a storage compound and should be mentioned near the beginning of this part of the SPD.</p> <p>An additional section must be included in this part about what should be considered in the design of a storage compound. At present the design specifications are included in Appendix D. A summary of this should be within the main body of the SPD</p>	<p>Restructure this section of the SPD so that the information relating to above-ground and underground storage is placed together.</p> <p>Mention should be made of Appendix D in paragraph 6.3</p> <p>A summary of Appendix D should be included in Part 6 of the SPD.</p>	<p><b>Agree</b> – The restructuring of this section is a sensible suggestion which would provide greater clarity.</p> <p><b>Disagree</b> – paragraph 6.3 is intended to set out the general principles which would apply to waste storage as opposed to the design of Waste Storage compounds which appears in Appendix D.</p> <p><b>Disagree</b> – Para 6.3 should not summarise Appendix D as it relates to the requirements in addition to those in Appendix D. Please also see response to MWRECAP32.</p>	<p>Reorder existing text as follows:</p> <p>Para's 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.12, 6.13 to be renamed as Para's 6.4 – 6.8.</p> <p>Para's 6.7, 6.9 and 6.14 to be renamed as Para's 6.9 to 6.12</p> <p>Para's 6.10 and 6.11 to be renamed as Para's 6.13 and 6.14.</p> <p>Please also see response to MWRECAP32.</p>	<p>Welcome the restructuring of this section however there needs to be more information about design specifications in this section rather than leaving it in an appendix. Whilst recognising that Appendix D only relates to above ground waste facilities the design of underground storage compounds also must be considered. It would appear the functional requirements of both above ground and underground waste storage are being given greater emphasis than the design elements. Both are equally important if new residential and commercial property developers are to better provide for waste management within new developments. Good design and well functioning waste areas are vital to improve recycling and reducing waste for collection.</p> <p><b>See main report for detailed comment.</b></p>

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
Waste Storage Infrastructure (Questions 3 and 4)	030	Question 3 and 4 The SPD in considering the practical needs of how to assist a developer in planning for waste management in residential and commercial developments is welcomed by South Cambs. It will assist planners to recognise the need to consider waste within proposed developments. However the emphasis seems to be upon the technical/ functional specifications needed for waste facilities at the expense of considering the aesthetic design of such facilities to fit into their surroundings. This should be addressed in the SPD.		<b>Agree</b> – it is accepted that there is a need to give greater emphasis to urban design principles within the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.  Please see response to MWRECAP31.	Please see responses to MWRECAP31.	Welcome acceptance of need to include more urban design principles within SPD  <b>See main report for detailed comment</b>
6.3	031	An additional general principle should be added. The design of waste storage compounds should consider the local character and should be designed to fit in with its surroundings. Whilst appreciating that such compounds must be functional consideration must be given to their appearance. 'The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities SPD' uses the term 'local distinctiveness'.	An additional general principle should be added to consider the appearance of the waste storage compound and how it fits in with its surroundings. I.e. Sensitivities to Urban Design considerations/ Local Distinctiveness.	<b>Agree</b> – it is accepted that there is a need to give greater emphasis to urban design principles within the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.	Amend existing text in paragraph 6.3 as follows (text underlined):  "5. Environmental protection <u>6. Urban design principles, including the local character, place making and local distinctiveness of an area</u> "  Please see response to MWRECAP75.	Welcome inclusion of additional principle.
6.12 Specific requirements for above ground storage compounds.	032	This should be reworded to highlight the construction outcomes to be achieved e.g. easily cleanable, accessible, proof against rodents, easily ventilated etc	This should be reworded to highlight the construction outcomes to be achieved e.g. easily cleanable, accessible, proof against rodents, easily ventilated etc	<b>Disagree</b> – it is considered that there is sufficient guidance in relation to these issues in the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide (Assessment Criteria) and Appendix D.	No amendments required.  Please see response to MWRECAP29.	Disagree and reaffirm that this needs to be included in the SPD.  <b>Proposed change</b> Amend paragraph 6.6 in revised SPD to include additional construction outcomes – easily cleanable; accessible; proof against rodents; easily ventilated.
7.3 Key aspects of highway design	033	Whilst agreeing that highway design is a key to vehicles collecting waste in a new development there are a number of other considerations that sometimes may conflict with this, such as street design and local character. Although mention is made in the introduction paragraphs 7.2 to the Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and Public Realm this section	Include consideration of street design and local character and specific reference to Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and Public Realm with web link	<b>Agree</b> – this is a valid comment as reference is made to the need to take account of the character of the area as part of highway layouts set out in the Cambridgeshire Design Guide for Streets and Public Realm.	Amend paragraph 7.3 (text underlined):  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offer convenience to users</li> <li><u>Take account of local character and distinctiveness of an area.</u></li> </ul>	Welcome this amendment.

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
		should include reference to the need to consider local character in highway design.				
Part 8 Household Recycling Centre 8.7- 8.11	034	The future planning of this is contained within the MWDP and therefore this section should be re-written to reflect what is included in the current MWDP.	The future planning of this is contained within the MWDP and therefore this section must reflect what is included in the current MWDP.	<b>Disagree</b> – the text in paragraph 8.7 is consistent with policy CS16 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy in relation to the provision of Household Recycling Centres.	No changes proposed.	In the current consultation draft of the SPD Policy CS16 has now been added to the paragraph, which is to be welcomed.
8.8	035	It would be clearer if the actual policy relating to HRC were included in this paragraph since it relates directly to this section.	Include Policy CS16 in this paragraph.	Agree – this is a sensible suggestion. The text in paragraph 8.8 is a summary of Policy CS16 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. However, it is accepted that the inclusion of the full text would provide greater clarity and make it clear that this section of the RECAP Design Guide is directly related to the content of policy CS16.	Remove existing text in paragraph 8.8 and replace with the following wording (text underlined):  “ <u>CS16 – Household Recycling Centres</u>  <u>A network of household recycling facilities easily accessible to local communities will be developed through the Site Specific Proposals Plan. New household recycling centres will be in the following broad locations as shown on the Waste Management Key Diagram:</u>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Cambridge East</u></li> <li>• <u>Cambridge North</u></li> <li>• <u>Cambridge South</u></li> <li>• <u>March</u></li> <li>• <u>Northstowe</u></li> <li>• <u>Peterborough</u></li> </ul> <u>New development will contribute to the provision of household recycling centres. Contributions will be consistent with the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide and additionally the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme or through the Community Infrastructure Levy</u>	Welcome inclusion of policy wording.

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<u>in the event that this mechanism supersedes this provision."</u>	
8.9	036	Is there a threshold of number of houses in a development when a developer will have to contribute to a HRC? Or will this depend on where the housing is to be and what the existing provision of recycling there is. At present this does not give any idea of what contribution may be expected. Has the County Council produced any guidelines that may assist in negotiations? This information should be included in the SPD.	Need for clarity in what size of development would attract contributions to a HRC. The SPD should include further information on when contributions may be asked for.	<p><b>Agree (in part)</b> – To ensure that developer contributions for additional Cambridgeshire Household Recycling Centres and/or improvements that will be sought are directly related to proposed developments further revisions to the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide are required.</p> <p>Further work has been undertaken by the County Council's Waste Management Service to determine the scale and nature of the developer contributions, which will be sought for the upgrading of existing Recycling Centres (Alconbury, Wisbech, Whittlesey and Thriplow) and additional capacity/ Recycling Centres (March, St Neots, Witchford and Cambridge area.)</p> <p>Based upon current assumptions relating to the level of expected housing growth it is not considered that developer contributions will be required for the other Recycling Centres within the County.</p> <p>The basis for developer contributions including waste management infrastructure in the Peterborough City administrative area is set out in the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD which was adopted by Peterborough City Council in February 2010. However, this will need to be amended to take account of CIL in Para 8.10.</p>	<p>Add new sub titles above paragraphs 8.7, 8.10 and 8.11, amend existing text in paragraphs 8.7, 8.9 and 8.10 and add additional paragraphs following 8.7 and 8.10 as follows (text underlined to be added and text with strikethrough to be removed):</p> <p>(Add new sub title above paragraph 8.7 and below the 'Future Provision of Household Recycling Centres' title as follows)  <u>Cambridgeshire</u></p> <p>(Amendments to Paragraph 8.7)  To adequately serve the growing population of the area, the current network of centres is to be upgraded by improving sites, relocating sites and constructing additional sites between now and 2026. <u>New sites in Cambridgeshire will typically be on 1.2 hectares of land, allowing enough flexibility to manage traffic flows of the site, by accommodating split-level easy access for unimpeded traffic movement through the site. This site size will also allow for effective landscaping, as well as the ability, where appropriate, to provide further environmental mitigation in more populated areas by putting the operations under a roofed area, or in a building. Upgrades to existing sites on the other hand will increase the site capacity by:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Extending the site size</u></li> </ul>	<p>Whilst welcoming the revisions and additional paragraphs within the SPD there is still insufficient information available.</p> <p><b>See main report for further details.</b></p>

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<p><u>to improve both skip capacity and traffic circulation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Where possible make the site split level</u></li> <li>• <u>Improving the existing provision and contract arrangements</u></li> </ul> <p>(New paragraph to be inserted after 8.7)  <u>In Cambridgeshire a county wide network of Household Recycling Centres (HRC) is being developed to meet the pressures of growth, and stringent targets for diversion of waste from landfill. There is a need for:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>New HRCs to replace those which have temporary planning permissions</u></li> <li>• <u>Upgrades giving increased capacity at existing HRCs</u></li> </ul> <p><u>The network of HRCs to serve Cambridgeshire will comprise:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Witchford – a permanent replacement for existing temporary site at Grunty Fen</u></li> <li>• <u>March – a permanent replacement for an existing temporary site</u></li> <li>• <u>Thriplow – upgrade of existing site giving increased capacity</u></li> <li>• <u>Whittlesey – upgrade of existing site giving increased capacity</u></li> <li>• <u>Wisbech – upgrade of existing site giving increased capacity</u></li> <li>• <u>St Neots – a permanent</u></li> </ul>	

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<p><u>replacement for original temporary site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Cambridge – four new sites giving increased capacity as permanent replacements for existing temporary site at Milton</u></li> <li>• <u>Alconbury – minor changes in capacity required at this site</u></li> <li>• <u>Bluntisham – no change in capacity required at this site</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Table 8.1 and Map 1 at the end of this schedule show the Recycling Centre Catchments which indicates both the locations of sites and the catchment covered. The catchments are grouped by political ward, and allocate the existing and projected population to each site.</u></p> <p>(Amendments to Paragraph 8.9)</p> <p>Although developers will not be expected to construct Household Recycling Centres, they will be expected to contribute finances in accordance with <u>Planning Obligations Circular 05/05 or through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in the event that this mechanism supersedes this provision</u>, proportionate to their development, <del>or as required as part of the Community Infrastructure Levy (where waste management infrastructure is included).</del> At strategic locations developers will be required to provide land and/or provide:</p>	

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance for upgrading existing Household Recycling Centres;</li> <li>• Finance for new Household Recycling Centres</li> </ul> <p>New sites will be constructed and other improvements made to existing sites in a timely manner, to enable both the existing and new populations to benefit from the service. The timetable for new waste infrastructure development is linked to both planned growth and funding.</p> <p>(Amendments to Paragraph 8.10)  <del>In Peterborough financial contributions will be consistent with the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme. In Cambridgeshire financial contributions will be calculated on a per dwelling basis. Within Cambridgeshire the type of contribution which will be sought within a particular locality will relate to the need for new or improved Household Recycling Centres within the service areas identified above. Financial contributions will be calculated on a per dwelling basis.</del></p> <p>(New paragraph to be inserted after 8.10): <u>Outline costs for a covered facility in Cambridgeshire on 1.2 hectares are based on an independent assessment of site costs. As at 2010, a new site will cost £5.5 million taking into account location and layout. Outline costs for</u></p>	



Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<p>upgraded facilities will be based on an independent assessment of site costs, and on real costs incurred. Outline costs include all reasonable activities associated with the development of a site including site investigations, indicative land costs, legal fees, landscaping, environmental mitigation, design, construction and planning costs. The requirement for developer contributions within these service areas is set out in Table 8.1[please see table at end of the schedule]. The delivery of new dwellings in the County will increase the demand for recycling facilities. Therefore developers will be required to contribute towards the delivery of the new network of recycling facilities by providing a financial contribution on a per dwelling basis in relation to the HRC network. Developer contributions established in principle in this document will be subject to suitable indexation and inflation applied as appropriate. The methodology used for determining the financial contributions can be seen in Table 8.2 [please see table at end of the schedule]. However, it should be noted that if when CIL is adopted by the District Councils it includes the County's Waste requirements this table will be superseded.</p> <p>(Add new sub title above paragraph 8.10 as follows) Peterborough</p>	

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<p>In Peterborough financial contributions will be consistent with the <u>requirements of the adopted Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme or through CIL in the event that this mechanism supersedes this provision.</u></p> <p>(Add new sub title above paragraph 8.11 as follows)  <u>Planning Conditions and Legal Agreements</u></p>	
Household Recycling Centres (paragraph 8.11)	037	<p>The Council is concerned at the lack of information within the Design Guide to justify the request for contributions to household recycling centres. Planning obligations cannot be used to ask developers to simply provide contributions to extra sites. There are five tests that have to be satisfied to allow obligations to be sought.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Relevant to planning;</li> <li>2. Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;</li> <li>3. Directly related to the proposed development;</li> <li>4. Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and</li> <li>5. Reasonable in all other respects.</li> </ol> <p>In the MWDP Core Strategy in Policy CS16 it states that '...New housing development will contribute to the provision of household recycling centres. Contributions will be consistent with RECAP Waste Guide....'. South Cambs is concerned that the DPD cannot require such contributions from planning obligations and as drafted the SPD does not contain sufficient information about this matter to provide guidance to developers.</p>	Proposed change to SPD – Need to contain more information / guidance relating to how contributions to HRC will be calculated in order that Policy CS 16 can be implemented successfully.	<p><b>Agree</b> – To ensure that developer contributions for additional Cambridgeshire Household Recycling Centres and/or improvements that will be sought are directly related to proposed developments further revisions to the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide are required.</p> <p>The basis for developer contributions including waste management infrastructure in the Peterborough City administrative area is set out in the Planning Obligations Implementation Scheme SPD which was adopted by Peterborough City Council in February 2010.</p> <p>However, this will need to be amended to take account of CIL in Para 8.10.</p>	<p>Please also see proposed amendments to paragraphs 8.7, 8.9 and 8.10; two new paragraphs inserted after paragraphs 8.7 and 8.10; and new sub titles above paragraphs 8.7, 8.10 and 8.11 (MWRECAP36) and the Basis for Conditions and/or agreements.</p> <p>Amend existing text in paragraph 8.11 as follows (text underlined):</p> <p>Section 106 agreements or other suitable legal agreements <u>such as CIL</u>, will be used to secure contributions and ensure adequate infrastructure exists. Reference should also be made to the Basis for Conditions and/or Agreements which form part of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit which details potential conditions and agreements that a developer may, in discussion with the Local Planning Authority, be legally obliged to satisfy.</p>	<p>Although additional information has been included in the latest draft it is still not clear what a developer may be expected to contribute to HRCs.</p> <p><b>See main report for details.</b></p>

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<u>Prior to the submission of residential planning applications developers are advised to agree these requirements with the County Council as Waste Disposal Authority.</u>	
Part 9	038	It must be clearly stated that Bring sites are the responsibility of District Councils.		<b>Agree (in part)</b> – this is a sensible suggestion however Peterborough City Council and the Cambridgeshire Districts are both responsible for the provision of Bring sites. It is therefore proposed to include reference to Waste Collection Authorities.	Amend existing text in paragraph 9.1 as follows (text underlined): “Bring Sites <u>which are provided by the Waste Collection Authorities</u> are an essential element of the RECAP Waste Strategy”.	Welcome clarification but it could be added that the Waste Collection Authorities in Cambridgeshire are all the District Councils.  <b>Proposed Change</b> Amend paragraph 9.1 as follows (text underlined): “Bring Sites are an essential element of the RECAP Waste Strategy <u>and are provided by the Waste Collection Authorities which in Cambridgeshire are all the District Councils.</u> ”.
9.2	039	What is the definition of ‘1 Bring site ‘ – i.e. how many containers etc? Is it the same across all Local Authorities?  Are there any accessibility standards to consider regarding the location of Bring sites (i.e. all residents should live within ‘x’ metres of a Bring site etc)?	Need for clear definition of a Bring Site and where this is the same for every Local Authority.  Should include any accessibility standards especially as this may help a developer consider these sites in the waste audit for a new development.	<b>Agree</b> – it is accepted that there is a need clarify what is meant by the term ‘Bring Site’ to provide greater clarity.  <b>Disagree</b> – locational guidance relating to the location of Bring sites is provided in paragraph 9.9 of the Design Guide.  Please also see response to MWRECAP41.	Amend existing text in paragraph 9.2 as follows (text underlined):  “ <u>Bring sites are places where members of the public can bring their waste and separate it into large containers (e.g. bottle and paper banks at local supermarkets)</u> which are generally located within publicly accessible areas such as supermarket or public car parks.  Please also see response to MWRECAP41.	Welcome inclusion of definition.
9.6	040	Mention is made that the location of Bring Sites should be included by a developer in a waste audit. –  How are developers to understand the capacity contained within existing bring site provision? Should there be a statement explaining how District Council	There will need to be further information available about bring sites and where developers can find out about the existing provisions within a district if this is to be included in a waste audit.	<b>Agree</b> – there is a need for greater clarity in relation to the preparation of documents to be prepared by developers and the information relating to Bring Sites held by the Waste Collection Authorities.  Please see response to	Amend paragraph 9.6 as follows (text underlined): “This should be done through <u>the preparation of a waste audit and strategy having sought the advice of the relevant Waste Collection Authority relating to the current capacity of existing</u>	Welcome the amendment. Early discussions with the Waste Collection Authority (WCA) will enable developers to understand what to include in the waste audit and for the WCA to let them know whether the scale of development

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
		<p>will publish this information?</p> <p>Should there be sufficient capacity to incorporate new residents (ie existing bring sites are under used ) then presumably no contribution would be sought?</p> <p>What occurs in the scenario where there is insufficient bring site space to cope with existing demand ? The applicant is not required to alleviate existing issues therefore what is the calculation for the section 106 contributions?</p>	<p>There needs to be clarity in the SPD as to how section 106 contributions will be calculated.</p>	<p>MWRECAP41.</p>	<p><u>Bring Sites</u>".</p> <p>Please see response to MWRECAP41.</p>	<p>proposed and the quantities of waste it may generate would result in the need for an additional Bring site.</p>
9.7	041	<p>Need for clearer guidance for developers where possible as to thresholds and location criteria as to where a bring site should be located. Otherwise there will be lots of negotiations on a site-by-site basis and need for continuity.</p>	<p>Suggest making it clear that these will vary according to the nature and scale of the proposed development and associated supporting infrastructure and will be based on any additional costs likely to be incurred by the local authority arising out of the proposed development. Each development will have to be individually assessed. Early pre-application consultation with the Local Planning Authority is therefore essential.</p>	<p><b>Agree</b> – there is a need for greater clarity in relation to how developer contributions for Bring Sites will be identified and sought by the relevant local authority. This ideally forms part of the pre-application discussions together with the other issues identified in the RECAP Design Guide.</p> <p>Please see response to MWRECAP40.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 9.7 as follows (text underlined):            "Developers will be required....upgrade. <u>The nature and scale of the contributions which will be sought will be based on the additional costs arising from the proposed development.</u>            Developers should discuss these issues with the Local Planning Authority and Waste Collection Authority <u>as part of pre-application discussions</u> prior to submitting their planning application. Reference should also be made....agreements".</p> <p>Please see response MWRECAP5 which takes account of CIL within Para 9.7.</p>	<p>Welcome the amended wording to the SPD.</p>
9.8	042	<p>The requirement for one Bring site facility per 800 households should be more clearly highlighted in the text. Also the requirement for a temporary site on the occupation of the 50<sup>th</sup> property            At present this is all lost in the paragraph and yet it is an important requirement.</p>	<p>Highlight the requirement for one Bring Site facility per 800 households as a separate paragraph in bold text.</p> <p>Highlight the requirements for a temporary site.</p>	<p><b>Agree</b> – this is a sensible suggestion as it would emphasis some of the key messages within the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 9.8 to form two separate paragraphs as follows (text underlined):</p> <p><b><u>"Standards for the provision of Bring Sites for residential developments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>A</u> maximum density of one Bring site per 800 households will be sought.</li> </ul>	<p>Welcome amendments to SPD</p>

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where on site provision...agreement).</li> <li>Temporary facilities....operational.</li> </ul> <p>However, ... adequately met".</p>	
Part 10	043	South Cambs welcomes the consideration of education schemes to encourage recycling and waste reduction. However this information could be placed in an appendix rather than in the main body of the SPD.	Put Part 10 as an appendix of the SPD.	<b>Agree</b> – this is a sensible suggestion as these are complementary waste management measures which are open to developers rather than requirements. It is therefore agreed that Part 10 of the Guide should become an appendix to the Guide.	Part 10 of the Guide to be moved so that it appears after Appendix B: Compactor Use, descriptions and specifications and renamed as Appendix C: Education Schemes and additional options. This will replace current Appendix C (see response to MWRECAP28)	Welcome the amendment.
Toolkit	044	There needs to be clarification of whether it is expected that all scales of both residential and commercial development would be expected to use the toolkit...This is a requirement of Policy CS28 and it may be clearer to have this stated at the beginning of this section of the SPD..	<p>Make clear that all developments will require submission of the Toolkit with supporting information proportionate to the nature and scale of the development.</p> <p>Clarify how Toolkit will be used and that it must be submitted with each planning application. Stress again importance of early pre-application consultation with LPA</p>	<p><b>Agree (in part)</b> – it is accepted that there is a need to clarify the applicability of the RECAP Waste Management Design Toolkit. In doing so it is important to emphasise that it only applies to residential and commercial developments.</p> <p>Please also see responses to MWRECAP45, MWRECAP46, MWRECAP85 and MWRECAP89.</p>	<p>Add the following text to paragraph 11.1: “The <u>purpose of the RECAP Waste Management Design Toolkit (referred to as the Toolkit)</u> is to allow the effective evaluation of the waste management requirements for <u>residential and commercial</u> developments.</p> <p>For all such developments a completed version of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide Toolkit should be submitted with the planning application as set out in policy CS28 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy”.</p> <p>Please also see responses to MWRECAP45, MWRECAP46, MWRECAP85 and MWRECAP89.</p>	<p>Welcome amendments but suggest that in order to emphasis that it is all scales of both residential and commercial developments that will have to use the toolkit that paragraph 11.1 states this.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.1 to be reworded as follows -: “The <u>purpose of the RECAP Waste Management Design Toolkit (referred to as the Toolkit)</u> is to allow the effective evaluation of the waste management requirements for <u>all scales of both residential and commercial</u> developments</p>
11.1 How to use the guide.	044	If the Toolkit is to be an extractible easy to use element of the SPD there would need to be additional wording included in the introduction to the toolkit so that it can stand alone	Add information as to what toolkit is and where it is applicable so that if it becomes a stand-alone document there is sufficient information within it to explain what it is and how to use it.	See above		

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
Toolkit	045	<p>If it is expected that a toolkit be completed by every developer submitting a planning application consideration needs to be given to the format of the SPD so that it is easy to find and use. Currently it is difficult to identify the section, which is the Toolkit.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to putting the Toolkit section at the end of the SPD so that it is easier to find and it could have a different coloured font or background so that it is differentiated from the rest of the SPD. A pocket could be included in a page version of the SPD and the Toolkit placed within it as an easy to find and use item of the SPD. On an electronic version it could be identified separately to the main SPD and be possible to interactively fill in the information. It is important that it can be easily extracted and completed as required.</p> <p>The checklist is referred to early in the SPD, therefore could be a 'user-friendly' extracted document as an appendix, especially important for the electronic version to be able to</p> <p>It is not obvious the toolkit CHECKLIST is ultimately being introduced because of the emphasis on the toolkit components. It is not immediately apparent that the breakdown will follow.</p>	<p>There needs to be consideration of how the Toolkit section fits into the SPD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Toolkit section could be placed at the end of the SPD</li> <li>- Consider using a different coloured background or font</li> <li>- A paper version of the SPD could include a pocket to contain a Toolkit as a separate document.</li> <li>- An electronic version of the SPD could have the Toolkit as a separate document and make it easy to interactively complete the forms and submit them.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree</b> – this is a sensible suggestion given the importance of the RECAP Waste Management Design Toolkit.</p> <p>Please also see responses to MWRECAP44, MWRECAP46, MWRECAP85 and MWRECAP89.</p>	<p>The RECAP Waste Management Design Toolkit will be presented as a pullout sheet which will sit at the front of the guide and cross refer to the relevant parts of the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide.</p> <p>Please also see responses to MWRECAP44, MWRECAP46, MWRECAP85 and MWRECAP89.</p>	<p>Welcome this amendment.</p> <p>However no mention is made of the suggestion for the electronic version of the SPD and that the Toolkit could be a separate document so as to make it easy to interactively complete the forms and submit them.</p> <p><b>Proposed Change</b> The electronic version of the SPD should have the Toolkit as a separate document.</p>
Part 12  An integrated approach to waste management in flats and apartments	046	<p>It is a good section as it considers future development and encourages exemplar projects but is disjointed from the rest of the SPD. It does not sit well in this section of the SPD.</p> <p>Suggestion that it could be best put in as an appendix or it could be introduced as a separate section earlier in the document, e.g. previous to section 10.</p>	<p>This section should be placed either as an appendix to the SPD or before section 10.</p>	<p><b>Agree</b> – It is proposed to make the RECAP Waste Management Design Toolkit more prominent and to make Part 10 an appendix to the Design Guide. Therefore as a consequence of these changes this section will come before Part 10 of the Guide.</p>	<p>Please see responses to MWRECAP28, MWRECAP43, MWRECAP44 and MWRECAP85.</p>	<p>Welcome amendment to SPD.</p> <p>The use of practical examples within the SPD is good and more would be welcomed by South Cambs to show developers how waste facilities can be planned into a new development. Further examples should be added to the section on case studies – section 12 of the draft SPD</p>

Relevant section of SPD (2010)	Rep no. (MWRE CAP)	Comments by South Cambs in Pre Submission consultation (March 2010)	Proposed change to SPD asked for by South Cambs (March 2010)	Response by Cambridgeshire County and Peterborough City Councils (April 2011)	Proposed amendment to SPD (April 2011)	South Cambs response to amendment and proposed change (Sept 2011)
						<p>Could an example be added of how within a new residential development waste bin areas have been successfully included within the overall design? And a photograph and /or a design layout of the scheme would be beneficial.</p> <p><b>Proposed change</b> Increase the number of best practice examples with illustrations of waste facilities being planning for within new developments especially residential success stories in section 12 Case Studies.</p>