

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning & Economic Development  
Portfolio Holder

**AUTHORS:** Director of Development Services

---

15<sup>th</sup> July 2005.

**CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH  
MINERALS & WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
ISSUES & OPTIONS**

**Purpose**

1. To determine the Council's response to the County Council's consultation on the issues and options arising from the preparation of the new local development framework for minerals and waste.

**Effect on Corporate Objectives**

High quality, accessible, value for money services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assist the preservation and enhancement of the natural and built environment.</li><li>• Assist the effective delivery of sustainable development at Northstowe and other major developments on the edge of Cambridge and development of sustainable communities.</li><li>• Assist working with partners to help the early and sustained development of necessary infrastructure.</li></ul>
Quality village life.	
A sustainable future.	
A better future through Partnerships.	

**Background**

2. The County Council has published for participation the first stage in the preparation of a new plan for minerals and waste. Representations are required to be submitted by 15<sup>th</sup> July. In the new Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework, the County will include:
  - Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (already prepared)
  - Minerals and Waste Development Plan
  - Statement of Community Involvement (in preparation)
  - Location & Design of Major Waste Management Facilities (Supplementary Planning Document)
  - Annual Monitoring Report

- Saved policies in the existing Structure Plan and Waste Local Plans (until superseded by the new policy documents).
3. The Minerals and Waste Development Plan will consist of:
- Core Strategy
  - Site Specific Policies
  - Earith/Mepal Area Action Plan.

These documents will be supported by a Proposals Map.

4. The Plan is to be prepared over the next three years. The key stages are:
- Informal Consultation in Jun/July 2005
  - Preferred Options Plan by Mar/Apr 2006
  - Submitted Plan to Sec of State Jan/Feb 2007
  - Examination from Jun 2007
  - Adoption expected by Mar 2008

#### Current Stage – Issues & Options

5. The County is consulting on the Issues and Options for the Minerals and Waste Development Plan. The issues and options paper forms the basis of stakeholder and public consultation, taking place between 6 June and 15 July 2005. The Issues and Options Paper outlines key topics for debate and shares suggestions for new mineral extraction and waste management sites.
6. The key issues for South Cambridgeshire arising from the consultation document are as set out in Appendix A. These primarily concern:
- The lack of a strategy for the provision of Waste Management facilities including site specific allocations ranging from household waste recycling centres (HWRC) to major waste management facilities to serve the Cambridge area.
  - Whether the Minerals & Waste Development Plan should identify sites for waste management in Northstowe and the urban extensions to Cambridge, if determined to be appropriate through the above strategy, to allow them to be tested at public examination rather than for them to remain as areas of search as in the current Waste Local Plan, which would prolong uncertainty regarding provision and delay its achievement.
  - Whether sites in the Green Belt should be included in the search.
  - The criteria relating to the possible relocation of the Milton Wastewater Treatment Works, which is important for the District, both as it will fundamentally influence the ability to release the site of the current works for housing and other development and also because a replacement site would most likely be within South Cambridgeshire.

#### Legal Implications

7. None directly for this Council.

### **Staffing Implications**

8. The continued involvement of Planning Policy, Conservation and Environmental Health officers will be needed to the plan as it goes through its next stages. This will be essential to protect the Council's interests and the interests of its residents and their environment.

### **Risk Management Implications**

9. The Minerals and Waste LDF is a key document for clarifying the current uncertainty over a strategy for waste management provision in the Cambridge area, particularly as it affects the major developments being planned by the District Council. Clarification of the strategy and identification of specific sites would assist in the masterplanning and consideration of planning applications.

### **Consultations**

10. Environmental Health and Conservation

### **Recommendations**

11. That the comments set out in the attached table are agreed and submitted to Cambridgeshire County Council by the deadline of 15 July 2005.

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

Minerals & Waste Development Plan, Issues & Options Paper, Cambridgeshire County Council/Peterborough City Council, June 2005.

**Contact Officer:** Keith Miles – Planning Policy Manager  
Telephone: (01954) 713181

## Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan

Issues and Options Paper: June 2005

### Detailed comments on specific questions

Question Number	Question	Comment
<b>Topic CS1: Strategic Vision and Objectives for Sustainable Minerals Development</b>		
CS1	<p>Are these the right strategic objectives?</p> <p>Are there any additional strategic objectives that you think should be incorporated in the Plan?</p>	<p>Support strategic objectives subject to the following comments:</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> bullet – question why environmental impact of transport is kept to a minimum <i>as far as possible</i>. As an objective it should not be qualified in this way.</p> <p>8<sup>th</sup> bullet – same comment on biodiversity benefit <i>where possible</i></p> <p>9<sup>th</sup> bullet – should “distinct” landscapes be “distinct” landscapes?</p> <p>13<sup>th</sup> bullet – question why rail is not included as a form of sustainable transport to be encouraged.</p> <p>There is no mention of air quality in relation to minerals. The Region has a high level of fine particles and the LDF should therefore seek to minimise the contribution of fine particles from minerals and waste processes. A sustainable soil strategy as part of the LDF suite of documents would help to stabilise soils and reduce emissions of dust.</p>
<b>Topic CS2: Strategic Vision and Objectives for Sustainable Waste Development</b>		
CS2a	Subject to updating, does the existing policy vision / objectives provide a sound basis on which to pursue sustainable waste management?	4 <sup>th</sup> bullet – why is the phrase plan <i>periods</i> used in the plural?
CS2b	Are there any additional strategic objectives that should be incorporated?	<p>5<sup>th</sup> bullet – need clarification that the draft plan will identify a strategy for waste management which will include site specific proposals for waste management facilities, eg. a site for replacement of Milton WWTW, not just left as criteria.</p> <p>There is no mention of air quality in relation to waste management. The</p>

		Region has a high level of fine particles and the LDF should therefore seek to minimise the contribution of fine particles from minerals and waste processes. A sustainable soil strategy as part of the LDF suite of documents would help to stabilise soils and reduce emissions of dust.
<b>Topic CS4: Sustainable Transport for Minerals and Waste</b>		
<b>CS4a&amp;b</b>	<p>Are the sustainability issues set out above the most important ones, or are there any that should be added or deleted?</p> <p>How can the Plan encourage individuals, communities, businesses and organisations to take more responsibility for the waste that they produce?</p>	Existing alternative facilities such as rail should be safeguarded and there should also be a policy to require that their use is maximised. This should apply to the Barrington Cement Works
<b>Topic CS5: Protecting Residential Amenity &amp; Surrounding Uses</b>		
<b>CS5a</b>	In seeking to protect residential / other amenities should routing agreements be used in respect of minerals and waste traffic?	Routing agreements will be a major issues, particularly for minerals traffic to development sites in the Cambridge Sub Region. It is therefore of key important to ensure that minerals and waste traffic does not cause harm to amenity in existing or proposed communities. This should apply to any temporary facilities during the construction of developments, eg. facilities to handle construction waste, as well as for permanent facilities.
<b>CS5b</b>	<p>Would buffer zones around mineral or waste workings be advantageous or are they unnecessary or too restrictive?</p> <p>If they were a good idea, what depth would be appropriate?</p>	<p>Even if they are contained in a building, waste management operations are more akin to B2 than B1. Will noise/dust etc escape when doors open to let lorries in? Lorry access is unsuitable for a facility which is embedded within sensitive areas (eg new development areas).</p> <p>Buffer zones will be needed wherever these facilities are provided to ensure that the impact of the site arising from such factors as transport, traffic and access, dust, odours, vermin and birds, noise, litter, and visual intrusion</p>

		<p>will be contained within acceptable levels.</p> <p>Rather than attempt to set arbitrary maximum or minimum buffer zones, the plan should set out the function of buffer zones in particular circumstances which will vary depending on the nature of adjacent land uses, and potentially the type and size of the waste facility. This may include specific targets to be achieved eg. X dba noise limit, and address the appropriate design and character of buffer zones in particular circumstances.</p> <p>It would be for the applicant to demonstrate in the context of a particular proposal, what width and design of buffer zone will meet the policy requirements.</p>
<b>CS5c</b>	<p>Should the cumulative impact of minerals and waste development on communities be considered? Is there a point where 'enough is enough'? If there is, how can we define / identify when this point is reached?</p>	<p>Cumulative impacts should be considered. Factors to be taken into account should include the scale and nature of the facilities and their catchments in relation to the role and function of the settlement, as well as the physical impacts eg from transport movements and air quality.</p>
<b>Topic CS8: Location of Future Mineral Extraction</b>		
<b>CS8a</b>	<p>Should we continue the existing strategy of moving mineral extraction out of river valleys to less environmentally sensitive areas?</p>	<p>River valleys are sensitive areas eg Harston/Hauxton (site specific policy SS2 site 2). Agree mineral extraction should be on less environmentally sensitive areas.</p>
<b>CS8b</b>	<p>Should new mineral extraction be focused on extensions to existing sites where this is appropriate, rather than on new greenfield development? Even if these smaller greenfield sites are closer to areas of further development?</p>	<p>There is a balance to be struck between continuing extraction at existing sites where effective mitigation measures may already be in place but where residents may have experienced disruption for many years, with the impacts of new mineral workings on greenfield sites. Whilst there may be some sustainability benefits of locating minerals operations closer to areas of further development eg on the edge of Cambridge, there is a need to</p>

		protect the rural character and setting of the historic city as protected by Green Belt, which is fundamental to its attractiveness as a centre for the high technology industry and its economic success.
<b>CS9: Borrow Pits</b>		
<b>CS9a,b&amp;c</b>	<p>Should we continue to allow borrow pits to serve major proposals if there is a source of suitable material in the adjacent area, even though this may give rise to restoration problems / more longer term sites in the future?</p> <p>Should we require major proposals to be supplied by existing quarries, and not allow borrow pits in the future? Even though this may mean higher grade material is used and mineral may have to be transported a longer distance?</p> <p>Should priority be given to maximising the use of recycled and secondary aggregate in the first instance, before borrow pits are considered?</p>	<p>The principle of making use of on-site reserves in major developments is contained in the Northstowe Area Action Plan where use of existing minerals reserves on the site as part of the construction of the site is identified as a possible way forward. However, crucial to this approach is certainty that borrow pits capable of restoration which is compatible with local landscape character. The AAP also requires that construction waste from the site is reused within the development as far as possible.</p>
<b>Topic CS10: Restoration and afteruse of Minerals Sites</b>		
<b>CS10a&amp;b</b>	<p>How much weight should be put on biodiversity / recreation / amenity / countryside enhancement projects – should they be given greater priority or placed above other alternative afteruses?</p> <p>Or should a combination approach be developed e.g. favouring agricultural restoration in fenland areas, and recreation / biodiversity / amenity uses closer to centres of populations?</p>	<p>A combination approach is supported. However, biodiversity objectives need not be contained to locations close to centres of population. Consideration of local landscape character should also be an important factor in deciding afteruse of minerals workings. Recreation and amenity uses may also be appropriate in locations well accessible by public transport eg. along the Guided Bus route. However, it is important that the approach is tailored to local circumstances rather than to any arbitrary priorities.</p>
<b>Topic CS11: Recycled and Secondary Aggregates</b>		
<b>CS11a</b>	Do you agree that priority should	Agree.

	be given to using existing resources i.e. recycled and secondary aggregates, in preference to extraction of new land won aggregates?	
<b>CS11b</b>	Do you favour any or all of the options above, are there other ways of increasing the production and use of recycled and secondary aggregate?	Support the principle of reuse and recycling of material on sites where development is taking place. The South Cambridgeshire LFD documents propose that planning applications for developments should recycle construction waste, including reuse of materials currently on the site, such as redundant buildings or infrastructure. This will be particularly relevant in the major developments, eg Northstowe and Cambridge East, where temporary on-site recycling facilities may be appropriate.
<b>Topic CS12: Provision for Sustainable Waste Management</b>		
<b>CS12a</b>	Should the existing allocations in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan (Policy WLP 18) be carried forward? (See also Topic SS4)	<p>There is no clear strategy included in the WLP or proposed in the issues and options report for provision of major waste management facilities. A strategy is essential to provide a clear framework for site specific allocations for all scales of waste management facilities, from major waste management facilities to household waste recycling centres, and also any supporting uses such as waste transfer stations. This should make clear the number, nature and scale of uses proposed and their intended catchment. It should also identify the broad locations for such facilities to meet the objectives of the strategy. This will enable a more detailed site selection process to be undertaken within the context of a clear strategy.</p> <p>The site selection process should consider any potential within the City for waste management facilities required to serve it, eg is there any potential south of Coldhams Lane? If the strategy determines it is necessary to consider facilities outside the City and within the Green</p>

		<p>Belt, eg to serve rural South Cambridgeshire, the site search should focus on existing waste operations and brownfield sites, and should only consider greenfield sites where this is crucial for delivering the strategy and no more appropriate sites are available (see also CS12c).</p> <p>It is understood that the County Council intends that the next stage in the Waste LDF process will include preferred options for specific sites. The District Council is concerned that this is a big step from the general approach being explored here without an intermediate consultation stage on both the overall strategy and site options. The District Council would hope to be consulted on both the strategy and options for site specific allocations before preferred sites are identified that affect South Cambridgeshire, including the major developments.</p> <p>The Waste Local Plan 2003 includes both specific sites and broad areas of search. Subsections (i) and (n) of WLP Policy WLP18 should not be carried forward.</p> <p>The major development sites are identified in the Structure Plan 2003 for predominantly residential development. In the case of the urban extensions to Cambridge, there are no general industrial areas proposed and they are intended to be high density, high quality developments.</p> <p>In the case of Northstowe, the Structure Plan is clear that the role and function of the new town is to include facilities to serve its own needs and those of the immediately surrounding villages. It would therefore not be an appropriate</p>
--	--	--

		<p>location for a major waste management facility serving a sub-regional function.</p> <p>Naming such broad locations for major waste management facilities will conflict with the delivery of these sites and it is not clear what the mechanism would be to deliver sites in these areas. The District Council's LDF documents cannot include waste policies, which is the responsibility of the County Council, as confirmed by ODPM. Specific sites would need to be identified in the Minerals and Waste LDF early if it were to be in time to feed into and influence the masterplanning process for the majority of the major developments.</p> <p>It is noted that there is no specific reference in the issues and options report to household waste recycling facilities and suitable locations for them. By virtue of their function and scale, there may be different criteria for identifying suitable locations for these facilities and they should be separately identified as part of an overall strategy for waste management facilities. For example, the District Council has recognised that it would be appropriate for a HWRC to be located in Northstowe to deal with household waste close to where it arises. A general employment area is proposed in Northstowe which could accommodate such a facility without harm to residential amenity. The Northstowe Area Action Plan acknowledges this potential.</p>
<b>CS12b</b>	If we need more allocations for waste management facilities, where should they be? Should we continue to seek provision in major new development areas?	See CS12a. The principle should be to achieve an appropriate balance between locating waste management facilities close to where it arises but whilst ensuring that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on

		residential amenity or the character and attractiveness of existing residential areas and the major new developments. Provision could be made in the areas of major development if suitable specific sites can be identified which are consistent with the visions and specific policy frameworks for those areas as set out in Area Action Plans and the Cambridge Local Plan.
<b>CS12c</b>	Should waste development in the future be accommodated in the Green Belt?	Modern major waste management facilities are usually contained within large buildings and as such are not appropriate uses within the Green Belt. Given the objective about locating such uses close to where the waste is generated and concerns about the potential for suitable sites within the built up area and major developments, there may be a case for considering sites within the Green Belt for waste management facilities as a last resort and as the final stage in any search sequence. It might be an appropriate reuse as part of redevelopment of certain brownfield sites in Green Belt. This approach should only be considered where it is in the context of a clear defensible strategy for waste management. It would need to be demonstrated that the sites proposed are the most sustainable options and could be accommodated without unacceptable adverse impacts on residential amenity of nearby rural communities and on the countryside character and the setting of Cambridge (see also CS12a).
<b>CS12d</b>	If we need more allocations for waste management facilities, where should they be? Should we continue to seek provision in major new development areas?	See CS11b.
<b>Topic CS13: Types of Waste Management Facility</b>		
<b>CS13</b>	Should we continue to be flexible about types of waste facility to be developed on allocated sites,	The difficulty with such an open approach to waste management facilities in the WLP is that there is no

	or should we be more prescriptive?	strategy for how the waste planning authority envisages waste being managed. Whilst the fast moving nature of waste management technology suggests that some flexibility is appropriate, there also needs to be sufficient certainty in an overall strategy with site specific allocations where the nature and general character of the proposed uses and their impacts on the local area are known, that there is confidence that it can be delivered.
<b>Topic CS14: Safeguard Waste Management Facilities</b>		
<b>CS14a</b>	Should we continue to safeguard existing and proposed waste management facilities?	Existing and proposed waste management facilities should continue to be safeguarded, but subject to a review of their continued suitability and that they are well located to serve the catchment area.
<b>CS14b</b>	Should 'waste consultation areas' be established?	Agree that waste consultation areas should be established, where the waste planning authority would be consulted on significant planning applications which if approved may permit development that would adversely affect a waste management facility.
<b>Topic CS15: Catchment Restrictions for Major Waste Management Facilities</b>		
<b>CS15</b>	Should we continue the current policy of normally applying catchment area restrictions on major waste management facilities?	Support the continuation of the current policy intended to minimise the long distance transport of waste.
<b>Topic SS1: New and Allocated Minerals Sites</b>		
<b>SS1a</b>	Please comment on the proposals set out in the following maps.	<p>Site 4 Needingworth Sand &amp; Gravel – if any extension of the existing quarry was proposed by the Waste LDF, the impact on Over &amp; Willingham would need careful consideration. It would bring extraction closer to both villages and would need careful mitigation. The suggested approach towards buffer zones would ensure that appropriate separation and protection was provided.</p> <p>Site 8 Barrington Existing Cement</p>

		<p>Works – this would be a large extension that would bring extraction uncomfortably close to Orwell. The western extent should be reduced. The impact on landscape character is also likely to be an issue. Sustainable transport of material another issue. The existing rail facility should be maximised in existing and any proposed extension to the operations.</p> <p>Site 16 Cottenham (Sand &amp; Gravel/Clay) – this would be largely a continuation of existing quarry north of Landbeach. The suggested approach towards buffer zones would ensure that appropriate measures were included to protect the environment, including the river corridor.</p>
<p><b>Topic SS2: Mineral Safeguarding Areas</b></p>		
<p><b>SS2a</b></p>	<p>Please comment on the proposals set out in the following maps.</p>	<p>Site 1 Cottenham (sand &amp; gravel) – The site is detached from existing quarry which is north of Landbeach on A10. Although relatively remote from settlements, it raises the issue of how materials would be transported. It would not be acceptable through Cottenham village. This issue would need to be resolved if this site were to be identified.</p> <p>Site 2 Hauxton (Sand &amp; Gravel) – Object. This would result in two large workings in the Green Belt. One is close to Hauxton village. The other is close to Button End Harston and adjoins the M11. The impacts on River Cam valley and the countryside proposals as part of the major development at Cambridge Southern Fringe are of considerable concern. Also concerned at the potential environmental impact on the setting of Cambridge on the approach from the south.</p> <p>Site 4 Needingworth (Sand &amp; Gravel) This would be a modest extension of</p>

		an existing quarry. It impacts on Willingham alone but the same comments apply as for SS1/Site4.
<b>Topic SS4: New Waste Management Sites</b>		
<b>SS4</b>	Please comment on the proposals set out in the following maps.	<p>Site 5: Cottenham Any new sites for waste management facilities must be identified within the context of a clear strategy. This site adjoins an existing business area and is relatively close to Northstowe. As such, it may not be well located to serve the wider northern rural part of the District if a facility is identified as required in the recommended strategy.</p> <p>Site 8: Existing waste management locations at all major developments – object to carrying forward what are effectively areas of search and not allocations. See comments to CS12. However, in principle the area of search at Anglian Water Site, Cowley Road/Chesterton Sidings Cambridge (as identified in WLP Policy WLP18 site (j)) is supported as a location potentially suitable for a waste management facility, subject to the identification of a suitable site.</p> <p>Site 18: Great Wilbraham Quarry Any new sites for waste management facilities must be identified within the context of a clear strategy. This site is not likely to be well located to the area it would serve and also has inadequate access.</p>
<b>Topic SS5: Milton Wastewater Treatment Works</b>		
<b>SS5</b>	Are these criteria appropriate, are there any others that should be considered?	<p>The County Council's intention is not clear from the consultation document, but the LDF must identify a specific site for relocating the Milton WwTW. A criteria based policy in the LDF would not be appropriate.</p> <p>In identifying an appropriate site, further criteria should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• visual impact</li> <li>• impact on the Green Belt</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• impact on the natural and built environment, including biodiversity, conservation and archaeology.</li></ul>
--	--	--