

FD.EVR25

Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Policy 25: Aerodrome Safeguarding

(was Policy 27 at the Preliminary Draft stage)

March 2019

Introduction and National Policy Context	2
Introduction	2
National policy	2
Local Context in Relation to Policy 25: Aerodrome Safeguarding	2
Minerals & Waste Local Plan Policy	3
Alternative Reasonable Options	3
Conclusion	4

1. Introduction and National Policy Context

Introduction

- 1.1. Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council are reviewing their joint adopted Minerals and Waste Development Plan and supporting documents. These comprise the following documents (with adoption date):
 - Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) (July 2011)
 - Site Allocations DPD (February 2012)
 - Block Fen and Langwood SPD (July 2011)
 - Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities SPD (July 2011)
 - RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD (February 2012)
- 1.2. The above Local Development Documents are to be replaced by a single Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP) covering the period to 2036. The new Local Plan will set the overall spatial framework and development management policies for sustainable mineral and waste management development across the plan area.
- 1.3. This Evidence Report provides a narrative on the development of and justification for Policy 25: Aerodrome Safeguarding in the emerging new Local Plan.

National policy

- 1.4. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provide the basis of national planning policy. Of specific relevance to Policy 27 are the following areas of the NPPF:
 - Paragraph 204 - *“Planning policies should:... h) ensure that worked land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, taking account of aviation safety, and that high quality restoration and aftercare of minerals sites takes place.”*
 - Paragraph 205 - *“When determining planning applications, great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy. In considering proposals for mineral extraction, minerals authorities should: ...b) ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health or aviation safety, and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality;...”*

2. Local Context in Relation to Policy 25: Aerodrome Safeguarding

- 2.1. The Plan area contains a number of airports, aerodromes and flight paths. Most notable is Cambridge International Airport, but there are also a number of military based airports.
- 2.2. Accordingly, a wide range of planning proposals (not just minerals and waste) are often considered for any implications they may have on the safe and operational use of such aerodromes.
- 2.3. Overall, there is justification, in principle, for a policy on the matter.

3. Minerals & Waste Local Plan Policy

- 3.1. The Preliminary Draft Plan was published on 16 May 2018 and consulted on over a six week period to 26 June 2018. That draft Plan included Policy 27: Aerodrome Safeguarding, and was broadly a carry over of the current adopted policy in relation to aerodrome safeguarding.
- 3.2. During the Preliminary Draft Consultation one representation was received on this policy which was supportive of the principle of the policy but suggested that the policy make it clear that the decision maker should form a view on the implications of any development on aerodrome safety following consultation with the Civil Aviation Authority.
- 3.3. In response to this suggestion, it is not considered necessary to stipulate in a policy precisely who will be consulted on any particular proposal, (or, for that matter, what weight should be given to any particular consultee). That said, clearly the views of the CAA will be a very important consideration in determining a planning application, and their views will be sought where appropriate. However, CAA advice (Guidance on Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) Planning Consultation Requirements – 2 August 2012) is that aerodrome safeguarding responsibility rests with the aerodrome licence holder/operator not the CAA. As such, their views will also be important considerations.
- 3.4. Also, safeguarding areas (as agreed or set by the CAA or operators) are included on the constraint mapping of LPAs, so that any application within such areas are ‘triggered’ at the validation stage, so that decision makers can determine what information is needed and what views should be sought prior to a decision being determined.
- 3.5. Overall, other than amending the policy number changing from 27 to 25, the policy has been carried forward, unchanged, into the Further Draft version of the Plan. However, minor changes to the supporting text have been included, for clarity (but does not alter the meaning or intent of such text).

4. Alternative Reasonable Options

- 4.1. The following alternative options have been considered (including in the Sustainability Appraisal Report):
 - Option 1 (preferred option): Include a specific policy, and in doing so retain the existing policy approach as set out in the adopted Plan (i.e “business as usual”). This is the preferred option, although there have been some wording amendments from the adopted policy for clarity and effectiveness. Including a policy is considered important to address what is clearly a locally relevant issue and ensure the safe and operational use of aerodromes.
 - Option 2: To not have a specific policy, and rely on national policy. This option has been rejected, as it is not considered to provide an adequate, locally specific policy approach. At worst, to have no policy could increase the risk of hazards posed to aviation.
 - Option 3: To have a more positively prepared or flexible policy is not considered appropriate, due to the considerable negative health and safety implications which could arise.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1. This evidence report demonstrates the rationale for the inclusion of this policy in the Further Draft Plan, and also demonstrates a summary of the issues raised at the earlier Preliminary Draft stage, and how the Councils have considered those issues raised.
- 5.2. Any representations received at the Further Draft consultation stage will be carefully considered, and this Evidence Report will be updated prior to the third and final consultation stage due in late 2019.