



**Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan
Supplementary Planning Document**

**Statement of Consultation
(Representations and Responses)**

Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England)
Regulations 2004 (as amended), Regulation 18(4)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Statement has been produced in order to set out the main issues arising from public consultation on the Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan, and to show how representations have been considered or addressed in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

1.2 The Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan, supplements policies in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. The Master Plan provides additional guidance on the following:

- € The Phasing and Working of Mineral Reserves
- € Waste Recycling and Disposal
- € Enhancement Habitat
- € Water Storage
- € Recreation and Leisure
- € Traffic
- € Sustainable Use of Soils

2.0 CONSULTATION

2.1 Consultation on the draft SPD took place between 15 February and 29 March 2010. This took place alongside consultation on the Proposed Submission stage of the 'parent' Plan, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. Consulting at the same time enabled people to see how the two Plans relate.

2.2 During the public consultation on the SPD the Council received around 220 individual comments, made by 51 individuals / organisations.

3.0 MAIN ISSUES RAISED

3.1 Around 70 representations (made by 31 parties) were received which raised concerns about HCV / traffic issues. This was the main issue raised and covered the following:

- € concerns about the volume of traffic and the routes that the lorries will take, particularly through local villages (including adversely affecting the stability / condition of properties), safety, pollution, residential amenity
- € concerns about the condition of the local roads and their ability to accommodate existing and future lorry movements
- € concern that the Cambridgeshire Advisory Freight Map is only advisory, and that routing agreements are not enforceable
- € that all HCVs should be directed to the A141, A10 and A142 with signs at all possible entry on/off's in the surrounding roads
- € mineral and waste transport should be by water or rail
- € there should be weight restrictions / traffic regulation orders through villages

- € suggestion that cameras should be installed to monitor if routing agreements are being observed
- € concern that companies cannot oblige sub contractors to observe routing agreements
- € the Council should require fitting of GPS monitors which would allow them to inspect records / monitor compliance
- € what will happen if routing agreements are not observed? Are they enforceable?

3.2 In response to these concerns the Council set out a detailed reply which covered the following:

- € the relevant policy in the Minerals and Waste Core strategy
- € how the traffic impacts will be reduced
- € what progress has been made
- € the Cambridgeshire Advisory Freight Map
- € weight Limits
- € bypasses
- € enforcement
- € movement by water / Rail

Details of the representations and the Councils full response are set out at the beginning of the following schedules (Part One: Main Issues).

3.3 A second issue that was raised in 12 of the representations was that of consultation and membership of the Earith / Mepal Stakeholder Group. Concerns were raised regarding the membership of the Stakeholder Group, in particular it was suggested that the Stakeholder Group was flawed as it did not include parish councils, all drainage broads, National Farmers Union, East Cambs HCV Group, Northstowe Joint Action Group, residents, and the District Councils.

3.3 In response to these concerns the Council set out in detail a reply which covered the following:

- € clarification of membership of the Stakeholder Group
- € that the output of the Group was the Block Fen / Langwood Fen proposals
- € how the Block Fen / Langwood Fen proposals were subject to consultation
- € that consultation exceeded that required by regulations and the Councils Statement of Community Involvement
- € that all Parish Councils were statutory consultees

Details of the representations and the Councils full response are set out at the beginning of the following schedules (Part One: Main Issues).

3.4 A wide range of other representations were received these are also set out in the following Schedule.

4.0 CHANGES TO THE SPD

4.1 As a result of the two main issues raised it was suggested that:

- € Section 8 of the SPD (Traffic) be amended to reflect the adoption of the Cambridgeshire Advisory Freight Map, and the requirements of the adopted Policy CS32 Traffic and highways in the Core Strategy
- € That no changes be made in respect of the representations concerning the Earith / Mepal Stakeholder Group.

5.0 SCHEDULES OF REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES

5.1 The following schedules provide a summary of the representations made, and how they have been considered. They also include any changes which are suggested in response to the points raised. The schedule is in two parts:

- € the first part summaries the two main concerns raised and gives the Councils response and suggested changes
- € the second part summaries all the representations made and gives the Councils response and suggested changes.

SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'
Part One: Main Issues

A large number of representations have been received which relate to similar concerns. In order to prevent this schedule being repetitive and unduly lengthy, and to draw out the main concerns, these are dealt with first, and generic responses for these main concerns have been prepared. Other matters raised are covered in detail the following Schedule.

Representation No's	SPD Ref	Rep No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD4	Section 8	004	Summary of concerns raised regarding HCV / traffic movements through local communities:	<u>Generic Response A – Traffic and Highways</u>	Amend Section 8
MWBFLSPD26	Traffic, and various, see Schedule Part 2 for full details	006	€ Concerns raised about the volume of traffic and the routes that the lorries will take, particularly through local villages (including adversely affecting the stability / condition of properties), safety, pollution, residential amenity	The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out the level of HCV movements which will be associated with the minerals and waste development at Block Fen / Langwood Fen. This is an issue which has cannot be resolved entirely through the Minerals and Waste Plan. It requires careful co-ordination between relevant organisations including the Local Planning Authorities, the Highways Agency and the County Council as Local Highways Authority.	Traffic to reflect the Councils adoption of the Advisory Freight Map, and the requirements of Policy CS32
MWBFLSPD27		007	€ Concerns about the condition of the local roads and their ability to accommodate existing and future lorry movements		Traffic and Highways in the Core Strategy
MWBFLSPD30		009	€ Concern that the Cambridgeshire Advisory Freight Map is only advisory, and that routing agreements are not enforceable		
MWBFLSPD34		011	€ Concerned about the robustness of traffic surveys and forecast lorry movements, and that Earth has not been taken into account	<u>The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy</u>	
MWBFLSPD35-39, 49-50, 52, 54		012	€ All HCVs should be directed to the A141, A10 and A142 with signs at all possible entry on/off's in the surrounding roads	The 'parent' plan of this SPD is the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Plan Core Strategy. This Plan (policy CS32) sets out planning policy which makes it clear that development at Block Fen / Langwood Fen, will require binding agreements covering lorry backloading, routing agreements and HCV signage for lorries to use those roads considered suitable for freight (as defined in the Councils Advisory Freight Map).	
MWBFLSPD48		014	€ Movement should be by water or rail		
MWBFLSPD55,87,111		015	€ There should be weight restrictions / traffic regulation orders through villages		
MWBFLSPD56		016	€ Traffic survey / monitoring		
MWBFLSPD70		017	€ Suggestion that cameras should be installed to monitor if routing agreements are being observed		
MWBFLSPD102		019	€ Concern that companies cannot oblige sub		
MWBFLSPD119		020			
MWBFLSPD120		021			
MWBFLSPD121		022			
MWBFLSPD122		023			
MWBFLSPD123, 125, 127		024			
MWBFLSPD128		025			
MWBFLSPD131-132		027			
MWBFLSPD133		028			
MWBFLSPD134, 139, 141		029			
MWBFLSPD140, 146-149, 151		030			
MWBFLSPD157,		032			

SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'
Part One: Main Issues

Representation No's	SPD Ref	Rep No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
158, 167, 169 MWBFLFSPD159-164, 166 MWBFLFSPD170 MWBFLFSPD171 MWBFLFSPD176 MWBFLFSPD192 MWBFLFSPD203-211, 213 MWBFLFSPD215 MWBFLFSPD217 MWBFLFSPD218		033 034 035 039 044 047 048 050 051	<p>contractors to observe routing agreements</p> <p>€ Should require fitting of GPS monitors which would allow Council to inspect records / monitor compliance</p> <p>€ What will happen if routeing agreements are not observed? Is it enforceable?</p> <p>€ What does off peak deliveries mean?</p>	<p>expressed about the detailed matters, notably the impact of traffic. He concluded that the proportional increase in HCV traffic 'is unlikely to have a materially greater effect on the amenity of the residents'. He noted that the Plan identifies implementation issues to be addressed at the site including:</p> <p>€ the need for consistency with the Block Fen / Langwood Fen Master Plan</p> <p>€ the evaluation and mitigation of impacts on sensitive receptors</p> <p>€ the conclusion of binding agreements relating to traffic routeing, backloading and HCV signage</p> <p>€ the need for ecological, archaeological and hydrological investigation and mitigation.</p> <p>He concluded that he was 'satisfied that there are no matters which cannot reasonably be addressed through the consideration of future planning applications'.</p> <p>Section 8 of the SPD which deals with Traffic will need to be updated to reflect the Councils adoption of the Advisory Freight Map, and the requirements of Policy CS32 Traffic and Highways in the Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>So how will traffic impacts be reduced?</u> There are a number of measures being proposed to reduce the impact of lorry traffic. Together these should reduce the number of mineral / waste related HCV movements through local communities, thereby minimising impacts on their residential amenity,</p>	

