



# **Statement of Pre-Submission Consultation**

## **Appendix 1**

**Proposed MBT Facility**

**Waste Management Park, Ely Road, Waterbeach**

## **Proposed Mechanical Biological Treatment Facility at Waterbeach Waste Management Park, Ely Road, Waterbeach**

### **Pre-Submission Consultation**

#### **Introduction**

- 1.1 This statement sets out the consultation and community involvement which has taken place prior to the submission of this planning application. It takes into account the Cambridgeshire County Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which was adopted in October 2006.

#### **Local Liaison Meetings**

##### **Membership**

- 1.2 The membership of the group includes the local County Councillors, District Councillors, Cottenham, Waterbeach and Landbeach Parish Councils, nearest local residents on Long Drove, Cottenham and Chittering, representative from the Cambridge Research Park, planning officers from the County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, the Environment Agency, Recycling Officers from South Cambridgeshire District Council and representatives from the Company including Operations Manager, Planning Manager, and Directors.

##### **Local Liaison Meetings Summary**

- 1.3 The Waterbeach site has a regular Liaison Meeting which in general meets every six months. The liaison meeting was established following the submission of the previous proposal for an integrated waste management facility in 1999. The first meeting was held in November 2000. At every liaison meeting the company provides an update on current operations and also on future proposals. The liaison members also have an opportunity to provide their views on the site and any future plans. The meetings sometimes also include a tour around the current facilities.
- 1.4 The group has been kept informed of progress on the pending waste PFI contract for dealing with the County's household waste. Donarbon informed the group of their intention to bid the contract and kept them informed of progress. In February 2006 a special meeting of the group was set up in order to present to the meeting Donarbon's bid proposal and what it would mean for the Waterbeach site. At the meeting in June members were informed that Donarbon were now in exclusive negotiation with the County Council with respect to their bid and that a decision on whether they would be preferred bidder would be made in September. At the following liaison meeting at the end of September members

were informed that that decision had been confirmed by the County Councils Cabinet meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> September. At that meeting the members were asked if they thought a public exhibition before any planning application was submitted would be useful and where they would like that to be held. It was agreed that 3 separate local meetings should be held in each of the parishes.

### **Effectiveness of the Liaison Meetings**

- 1.5 These meetings allow the site managers to liaise with the public and keep them informed of developments and plans for the site, they are also an opportunity for the local community to feedback their complaints and/or support of our business and operations. The liaison meetings allow continual and regular communication with the local residents and parishes in order for the company to explain current operations and aspirations and for the members to raise any concerns or queries about the site and any plans. It fosters an understanding of each others issues and seeks to resolve issues before they become a major problem.
- 1.6 The group however, is only reaching a small element of the local community, although it is understood that the parish representatives do pass on information to the rest of the parish and report to the group any issues which have been raised from any other members of the parish, it was felt that a public exhibition would attract a larger number of local residents to come and see the future proposals at the Waterbeach site.

### **Public Exhibitions**

- 1.7 Following discussions with the three Parish Councils it was agreed that the exhibitions would be held on the 17<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> September at Cottenham Village College, Waterbeach Primary School and Landbeach Village Hall from 5pm until 8.30pm.

### **Publicity**

- 1.8 Posters - Each Parish Chairman offered to notify all Parish Councillors. A poster was prepared by the Company which was displayed at the offices and weighbridges of the Waterbeach site and around the three villages including the venues at which the exhibitions were to be held. The Parish Councils helped to distribute the posters where they felt they would be most widely seen by the villagers including public notice boards, in post offices, shops at the Parish Halls etc. Unfortunately timing meant that they had missed the parish newsletters. A poster was also put up at Denny Abbey Farmland Museum and the Notice Board at Chittering. A copy of the poster is included as Document 1 attached.

- 1.9 Local Press – A press release was prepared by the Company which was sent to the Cambridge Evening News. An article was reported on 17<sup>th</sup> September. A copy of which is included as Document 2. This article was also put on the company web site and the local Waterbeach village web site waterbeach.net.
- 1.10 Direct – Letters were sent to every member of the local liaison group and the nearest residents on Long Drove, and along the A10 including cottages around Denny Abbey and residents of Chittering. Councillors directly involved in the PFI process were also notified of the event.

### **Exhibition Material**

- 1.11 The displays at the public exhibitions included display boards from the County Council Planning Officers and Waste Management Team. This provided policy background to waste management in the County and to the site. It outlined the amount of waste produced in the County and the need for facilities to deal with it. It also highlighted the Waterbeach site as being allocated as a Major Waste Management Facility in the County's Waste Local Plan and the planning issues that would need to be taken into consideration in any planning application.
- 1.12 Display boards from Donarbon included background information on the company and the site and the current operations. It explained the MBT process and included the proposed drawing and elevations of the facility. A copy of the Donarbon display is included in Document 3.
- 1.13 A video was shown continually of the different elements of the MBT process and the conceptual design of the buildings and layout.
- 1.14 Literature was available on the company, the technology providers, County Council leaflets on the PFI process and the design of the plant. Copies of the County Councils planning policy documents on waste and the design of major waste management facilities were also available for inspection.

### **Manning and Attendance**

- 1.15 All three exhibitions were manned by at least three representatives of Donarbon and two officers of the County Council planning department. All three exhibitions were well attended with the least number at the Cottenham event. However this event also included a brief presentation to the Parish Council meeting which was also held on the same evening at the same venue. Attendees at the three events included local residents of Cottenham mostly along Long Drove, Chittering including properties around Denny Abbey, residents of Waterbeach and Landbeach. Local Parish Councillors, local district councillors and the Environment Agency.

### **Issues Raised**

- 1.16 A number of concerns were raised from residents along Long Drove, at Denny Abbey Farm and cottages and residents in Chittering of the current problems with smell from the existing composting operation.
- 1.17 The issues that were raised concerning the new MBT proposal include the following:
- Increase in traffic
  - Risk of odours from the plant
  - Potential for increase in noise and disturbance
  - The size of the facility and the reasons for its location
  - Whether the facility would take London's Waste
  - Layout of the plant
  - Whether the process included any burning
  - Whether the process involved energy generation
  - The potential for recycling particularly plastics
  - Impact on the landfill with regard to the reduction of litter, gulls and odours
  - Timing of the proposed facility
- 1.18 In general there was a lot of support and interest in the proposal and the type of technology. The need for the facility was recognised and the potential for recycling as part of the process was supported. The Education Centre was seen as a very important and interesting part of the proposal.

### **Response to the issues raised**

- 1.19 A noise and odour assessment will be submitted with the planning application in order to demonstrate that the proposed facility is controlled within the buildings and will not cause a nuisance to neighbouring properties. This will show what measures are necessary in order to minimise odour, noise and dust. It will be made clear in the application the proposed means of vehicular access into the site together with the scale of any increase in traffic that would result from the implementation of the new proposal. The reasons for the proposed layout of the site including keeping operations as far away from properties, will be set out and

clear explanations of the proposed technology provided including the types and source of the waste. There will be no proposed change to the current catchment restrictions which currently prohibit the site from taking in London's waste. The impact on current operations including the landfill will also be examined. Following discussions with English Heritage and nearby residents, a detailed landscaping scheme will be submitted with the application.

### **Pre-Application discussions and assessment**

#### **Waste Planning Authority**

- 1.20 Discussions have taken place with the County Council Planning Officers to obtain their informal views on the outline proposal. The design of the facility was discussed in detail particularly in respect of guidance set out in the Council's recently adopted Design Guide for Major Waste Management Facilities. The layout and the potential impact of the change to the original development already permitted was discussed. This discussion resulted in a formal request for a Screening Opinion from the County Council on the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment which included the draft designs and a summary report on the proposed development and use of the facility. A response to this request dated 2 October was received which confirmed that an EIA was not required in support of the planning application. The request and the Council's response is included as Document 4.

#### **Other consultees**

- 1.21 Pre-application discussions were also held with other consultees whose comments on the new proposal were felt to be important to incorporate at an early stage. A meeting was held with officers from **English Heritage** due to the close proximity with Denny Abbey, a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The outline proposals were discussed to establish initial views and to incorporate any changes that may be necessary to mitigate any impact. The issues raised related to the design and visual impact, disturbance from noise and odours and any increase in traffic. It was agreed that the application should be accompanied by a detailed landscaping scheme. It was noted that all the operations were enclosed and that noise and odour assessments would also be included. It was confirmed that the increase in traffic would be minimal. County Council Planning Officers also attended the meeting.
- 1.22 Discussions have also taken place with the **Environment Agency** with regard to the changes required for a PPC Permit or Waste Management Licence.
- 1.23 Discussions have also taken place with the **Internal Drainage Board** with regard to the drainage requirements.

## **Other Assessments**

### Ecology

- 1.24 An ecological assessment took place spring 2006 along the A10 by consultants Andrew McCarthy Associates in relation to a proposed development at Stretham. As Great Crested Newts were known to exist south of the site and the current permission requires the surveying of all ponds on site prior to their disturbance, an opportunity was taken to allow the surveying of two ponds in the reception park of the site for Great Crested Newts in advance of the proposals. The results revealed none present and therefore as the site is not within any known sensitive area, it was considered that there was no need for any further detailed ecological assessment.

### Archaeology

- 1.25 A Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) Training Survey was carried out in November 2005 within the area fenced off in the reception park. The area is fenced off due to its having been previously assessed as potentially of archaeological interest which has to be further investigated prior to development. The survey was carried out as a training exercise in the use of GPR. The survey confirmed the area of potential archaeological importance and its current protected status. A copy of the report was provided to the Cambridge Archaeological Unit who carried out the original assessment work and will complete the full investigation on the site. It was agreed to submit the report to the County Archaeologist to assist in the assessment of this area as part of this application.

### Future Liaison

- 1.26 It is proposed to continue regular site liaison meetings and it was agreed that a meeting would be held early in the new year once the planning application was submitted in order for the Members to express any concerns early on in the process and for the Company to respond to any issues raised. It was also agreed that a further public exhibition could be held at the Waterbeach site if necessary.