

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL
Record of Executive Decision

**Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste
Local Development Framework- Core Strategy and Site
Specific Allocations Preferred Options**

Decision of: Councillor Reid, Executive Councillor for Planning & Transport.

Reference: 06/ENV/U10

Date of decision: 12 December 2006 **Recorded on:** 18 December 2006

Decision Type: Non Key

Matters for Decision: To agree the response the City Council makes to the consultation document from Cambridgeshire County Council on the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations Preferred Options.

Why the decision had to be made (and any alternative options):

The City Council has been asked by the County Council to comment on this document and responses were required before the 9 January 2007 meeting of the Environment Scrutiny Committee. This is the second stage in the Local Development Framework process, which will lead to a new Minerals and Waste Development Plan and follows two previous rounds of consultation relating to the issues and options stage. It sets out the County Council's preferred options in terms of policies, which will guide minerals and waste development until 2021 and includes site-specific proposals.

The Executive Councillor's decision:

Agreed:

The representations set out in Appendix A attached to this Record of Decision.

Reasons for the decision: See above

Scrutiny consideration: The consultation document was considered at the meeting of the Development Plan Steering Group on 12 December 2006, before the Executive Councillor made the decision.

Report: Agenda Item 6 of the Development Plan Steering Group, 12 December 2006.

Conflicts of interest: No conflicts of interest were declared by the Executive Councillor.

Comments: None

APPENDIX A PROPOSED REPRESENTATIONS ON THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

CORE STRATEGY

Preferred Option MW16

Object to the Preferred Option on the grounds that there should be an additional criterion. Criterion h) should read as follows:

“For the provision of permanent facilities on the existing temporary site at Milton”.

The City Council does recognise the need for a facility to serve the north of the City and did propose in its response to the first Issues and Options paper that the Milton site, north of the A14 should be retained in an appropriate waste management use over the longer term including a HWRC and bulking up facility. The City Council considers that this site has been rejected as a site for permanent use on grounds which give too much weight to its existing Green Belt status when compared to greenfield sites which have just been released from the Green Belt for residential and other uses and not for waste development. The end result of this faulty analysis if carried through would be the closure of the existing Milton site, which is distant from residential, with alternative sites in the City that would need to be immediately adjacent or closer to residential. The Milton site is suitable for continued permanent use for the following reasons:

- It is not close to exiting or proposed residential;
- There is good road access, queuing issues could be greatly improved by the development of efficient permanent facilities on this site;
- It is not visible from the surroundings and is capable of further screening and;
- The existing site is capable of improvement.

Therefore this is a reasonable alternative site that should be properly considered and subject to sustainability assessment as well as the North West and Northern Fringe allocations.

Preferred Option MW34

The City Council supports the aims of the policy but objects to the Preferred Option on the grounds that no definition of major development is provided and it is unclear what a waste audit will comprise and who will be responsible its preparation and assessment.

Preferred Option MW38

The City Council objects on the basis that it would prevent the ability of Milton to come forward for a permanent site as a HWRC and bulking up facility. The purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt are set out in Policy P9/2a of the Structure Plan 2003. These are to:

- Preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact dynamic City with a thriving historic centre;
- Maintain and enhance the quality of its setting; and
- Prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the City.

None of these purposes would be adversely affected by the permanent development of the Milton site, which is well away from the centre of Cambridge, not visible over long distances and not close to any built up area. The Structure Plan policy allows development for agriculture and forestry and other uses appropriate to a rural area. The City Council considers that the buildings that would comprise a permanent waste site at Milton would be similar to those found on local farms in the form of large barns and other covered structures. For many towns and cities around the country such waste facilities are often located in their immediate rural hinterlands and it is unreasonable for the plan to be seeking to close this facility.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 'Green Belts' states at paragraph 3.4 that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The above text considers and rejects the notion that the development of a permanent facility at Milton would conflict with the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. The openness of the site can be maintained by sinking the required building partially into the ground to ensure that its height is not materially greater than that of the substantial semi-permanent structures existing on the site. There is therefore no need to prove very special circumstances for the redevelopment of the site for a permanent waste management facility.

Preferred Option MW39

The City Council supports this Preferred Option on the grounds of good planning principles and the resulting policy must set out appropriate traffic routing agreements and the depth and nature of buffer zones appropriate for different types of waste facility.

Comments concerning Core Strategy Document, Preferred Options

Page 26 Sustainability appraisal the list at the end of the first paragraph should include noise and light.

Page 105 Vehicle noise impact can be reduced by re-routing and also by use of compressed natural gas vehicles which not only improves emissions to air but also can also reduce noise levels from engines.

Page 130 Nuclear waste. This section is only preventing waste from defence and nuclear installations disposal. Historically low-level radioactive waste has been disposed on in landfill locally and by incineration. The section makes no reference to this waste and the fact that radioactive waste disposal is regulated by the EA.

SITE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

Preferred Option SSP10 f) Cambridge North West

Potential uses include mixed stream recycling facilities, single stream recycling facilities and household waste and recycling centres (& Bulking up transfer facility)

The City Council objects to North West allocation on the following grounds:

Concerning land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road:

- The site is allocated for residential development in Cambridge Local Plan (2006) for 1,780 dwellings at an overall average density of 45dph.

- The provision of a waste facility would require provision of a significant buffer zone to protect residential amenity and so would compromise the ability of the site to meet its housing delivery target.
- If the site were to be located at either the Huntingdon Road and Histon Road ends the entrance to the residential development would be compromised and if in the middle would require access through a residential area.

Concerning land between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road the City Council accepts that this site could be appropriate for a suitable waste facility and is not objecting to this allocation but it nevertheless has the following concerns:

- The land released and to be from the Green Belt in this location is specifically to provide for the future growth needs of Cambridge University together with significant residential development. Structure Plan Policy P9/2 states that it is reserved for predominately University-related uses and only to be brought forward when the University can show clear need for the land to be released. The University will not be able to demonstrate a clear need for waste development to come forward on this site.
- The University's aspirations for the development may be difficult to fully provide for through the Area Action Plan. The majority of the development is to be for residential use, which would require the provision of a buffer zone to protect residential amenity. The inclusion of such a facility would therefore be likely to have a direct impact on the ability of the site to provide for the future long-term growth of the University

The City Council does recognise the need for such a facility to serve the north of the City and did propose in its response to the first Issues and Options paper that the Milton site, north of the A14 should be retained in an appropriate waste management use over the longer term including a HWRC and bulking up facility. The City Council considers that this site has been rejected as a site for permanent use on grounds which give too much weight to its existing Green Belt status when compared to greenfield sites which have just been released from the Green Belt for residential and other uses and not for waste development. Also see our representation in regard to MW38. The Milton site is suitable for continued permanent use for the following reasons:

- It is not close to existing or proposed residential;
- There is good road access, queuing issues could be greatly improved by the development of efficient permanent facilities on this site;
- It is not visible from the surroundings and is capable of further screening; and
- The existing site is capable of massive improvement by the provision of permanent, modern, covered facilities.

Therefore this is a reasonable alternative site that should be properly considered and subject to sustainability assessment as well as the proposed North West and Northern Fringe allocations.

Preferred Option SSP10 g) Cambridge Northern Fringe

Potential uses include mixed stream recycling facilities, single stream recycling facilities and household waste and recycling centres (& Bulking up transfer facility)

The City Council supports this allocation subject to consistency with the Cambridge Local Plan (2006) Policy 9/6. The site chosen should be located close to the A14, with a road access that minimises travel through residential areas. However such provision could decrease the development viability of the site and hence jeopardise the viability of the relocation of the existing Waste water Treatment Works (WWTW) to Honey Hill, Fen Ditton. If the relocation is proven to be unrealistic after thorough examination these concerns would cease to apply and the site would be suitable for a variety of waste facilities subject to the impact on the environment, residential amenity and transport.

Preferred Option SSP10 i). Former Bayer Crop Science Site (West), Hauxton
Potential use includes a household waste and recycling centre (HWRC) (& Bulking up transfer facility)

Support. The City Council supports the inclusion of the Bayer Crop Science Site (West) as an appropriate location for a HWRC to the South of the City because it is not allocated for other uses including residential, not adjacent to existing or future residential, is previously developed land and has adequate access to the A10 and is close to Cambridge.

Preferred Option SSP10 v). South of Newmarket Road, Cambridge
Potential uses include mixed stream recycling facilities, single stream recycling facilities and household waste and recycling centres (& Bulking up transfer facility)

Support. Acknowledge the need for such a facility and the scale of development on land South of Newmarket Road provides an opportunity to incorporate such facilities without detriment to the wider development. The search for a suitable site should be incorporated into the masterplanning process at an early stage.

Preferred Option SSP14 Waste Safeguarding Areas

Object to the Preferred Option on the grounds that this options seeks to establish a presumption against any development that will prejudice the development of the allocation sites for proposed waste management uses. In Cambridge the sites proposed for allocation are already allocated for development in the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 for residential and University related development. The site allocations have the potential to prejudice and blight these sites because they encompass far larger areas than will be required for the waste facilities. The City Council considers that these 'allocations' will need to be narrowed down as quickly as possible if other essential development is not to be jeopardised and will work closely with the County Council to assist this process.

Preferred Option SSP15 Land at Honey Hill, Fen Ditton

Relocation of the Milton Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW)

Support on the grounds that the relocation of the Milton Wastewater Treatment Works is important for the City as it will fundamentally influence the release of the site of the current WWTW for housing and other development. Consideration will need to be given to the design and specification of the new WWTW to minimise any adverse impacts on the proposed residential development to the North of Newmarket Road as set out in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.

Comments concerning Site Specific Proposals, Appendix D, Preferred Options Proposals Maps

As sites come forward necessary conditions should be applied to protect air quality, noise emissions from plant and vehicles, light nuisance and that operations should not give rise to off site land contamination issues especially by the natural underground migration of liquids and gases. It should be noted that the planning process should take into account future use of sites after land filling. That is land filled quarries may not be suitable for development dependant on the types of waste for many decades. There is experience of former tips having to be excavated out and refilled to allow development, which is not sustainable.

Comments concerning Site Specific Proposals, Preferred Options

Page 13 and 14 under protection for the environment does not seem to mention anywhere about protecting the environment from noise from operations, plant or vehicles.

Item 5 Protect and enhance air quality - talks about avoiding or minimising air pollution but the examples only talk about dust and odour but should consider all pollutants set out in National UK Air Quality Objectives.

Item 7 Protect and enhance soil quality - states it will reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality. This seems a little difficult when considering land filling operations and perhaps should relate to ensuring contamination does not go off site.

Item 9 Protect and enhance landscape - the light pollution section is weak. Light nuisance is now actionable under the Environmental Protection Act. This criteria should therefore be stronger to say there should not be light nuisance from sites.

Page 33 Whilst Addenbrooke's is a clinical waste incinerator it is also an energy from waste plant with energy from incineration being used for on site heating and should be listed in both locations.

APPENDIX B POLICY & SITE EXTRACTS FROM THE MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN IN THE SAME ORDER AS THE PROPOSED REPRESENTATIONS

CORE STRATEGY

Preferred Option MW16

Proposals for waste management development outside allocated areas will be considered favourably where this is consistent with this Plan and where they demonstrate that they will contribute towards sustainable waste management, moving waste up the waste hierarchy.

Waste recovery and recycling facilities may be permitted where they are:

- a. For on-site management of waste
- b. On land identified for industrial use (except outdoor composting)
- c. Co-located with complementary activities
- d. On previously developed land
- e. In redundant agricultural buildings and their curtilages, which do not require new buildings or structures (inert waste recycling and composting facilities only)
- f. Within a medical or research institution which is generating waste (bio-medical, research and clinical waste only)
- g. In strategic development areas (except outdoor composting).

Preferred Option MW34

All proposals that are likely to generate significant volumes of waste, through construction and operational phases, will be required to demonstrate through a Waste Audit how waste will be minimised and managed in a sustainable manner, in accordance with the Waste Hierarchy.

Temporary waste recycling facilities will be required in strategic development areas including Northstowe, Cambridge and Peterborough development areas. These should maximise the reuse, recovery and recycling of inert and sustainable waste streams, and be in place prior to the commencement of development and retained throughout the construction phases.

Preferred Option MW38

The Mineral Planning Authorities will grant planning permission for mineral development in the Green Belt where such development will not compromise the purpose of its designation.

Waste development in the Cambridge Green Belt will only be allowed where very special circumstances have been demonstrated, and these circumstances justify compromising the purposes of the Green Belt.

Preferred Option MW39

Minerals and waste development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that it is compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring land uses and there would be no unacceptable harm to the environment or to human health or safety, visual intrusion or loss to residential or other amenities.

All proposals must demonstrate that an adequate separation zone exists between the proposed development and neighbouring existing or proposed sensitive land uses.

SITE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

Preferred Option SSP10

The following sites, which are identified on the Proposals Map, are allocated for waste recycling and recovery:

- f. Cambridge North West*
- g. Cambridge Northern Fringe*
- i. Former Bayer Crop Science Site (West), Hauxton
- v. South of Newmarket Road, Cambridge*

(*denotes a site where an allocation has been made, but the precise location will be determined through a master planning and/or planning application process. Wherever possible these allocations will be further defined as the Plan preparation process continues).

Table 5: Potential uses for sites allocated for waste recycling and recovery

Waste Management Facilities	Allocations for Waste Recycling and Recovery
Mixed Waste Stream Recycling Facilities	Cambridge North West Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) South of Newmarket Road, Cambridge
Single Stream Recycling Facilities	Cambridge North West Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) South of Newmarket Road, Cambridge
HWRC (& Bulking up transfer facility)	Cambridge North West Cambridge Northern Fringe Former Bayer Crop Science (West), Hauxton South of Newmarket Road, Cambridge

Preferred Option SSP14 Waste Safeguarding Areas

The following areas, shown on the Proposals Map, are designated as Waste Safeguarding Areas:

- a. Existing waste management facilities that make a significant contribution in managing Cambridgeshire and Peterborough's waste
- b. Waste management allocations made in SSP10, SSP11, SSP13 and SSP15

Within Safeguarding Areas there will be a presumption against any development that could prejudice the existing or proposed waste management use. The Waste Planning Authority must be consulted on any planning proposal that may potentially prejudice the waste use.

Preferred Option SSP15 Land at Honey Hill, Fen Ditton

The following site, which is identified on the Proposals Map, is allocated for the relocation of the Milton Waste Water Treatment Works:

Land at Honey Hill, Fen Ditton

