

My ref: 2022\Cambridge - Milton Ave, Cambridge North  
Your ref: [22/02771/OUT](#)  
Date: 14 December 2022

Contact: Matthew Breeze  
E Mail: [PlanningDC@cambridgeshire.gov.uk](mailto:PlanningDC@cambridgeshire.gov.uk)



Steve Cox,  
Executive Director  
**Place and Economy  
Planning Growth & Environment**

Box No ACL2613  
New Shire Hall  
Emery Crescent, Enterprise Campus  
Alconbury Weald  
PE28 4YE

Fiona Bradley  
Interim Management Support/Team Leader  
Greater Cambridge Partnership  
*by e-mail only*  
[fiona.bradley@greatercambridgeplanning.org](mailto:fiona.bradley@greatercambridgeplanning.org)

Dear Ms Bradley,

**22/02771/OUT – A HYBRID PLANNING APPLICATION [...] AT LAND NORTH  
OF CAMBRIDGE NORTH STATION MILTON AVENUE CAMBRIDGE  
CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

Thank you for consulting Cambridgeshire County Council, in its role as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA), on the additional information submitted in relation to above application. Having reviewed the available documentation, the MWPA wishes to make the following comments:

In my previously letter dated 28 July 2022, the MWPA objected to this proposal owing to a lack of information demonstrating the compatibility of the development with the safeguarded aggregates railhead (TIA), and the Cowley Road Waste Management Area (WMA).

It was requested that in order to determine whether the MWPA's objection can be overcome, the Applicant should prepare a statement and, if required, assessments prepared by suitably qualified experts, that included the following:

1. A description of the operations conducted at each of the safeguarded sites, highlighting locations of specific operations, where appropriate. The Applicant may also wish to review and detail whether there are any conditions restricting these operations.
2. A description and/or plan showing the different uses within the proposed development, the distances between those proposed uses and the

safeguarded sites. This should also detail if there are any barriers between the proposed uses and the safeguarded sites.

3. Details of the potential interactions or conflicts that may occur between the safeguarded sites and the different uses within the proposed development. This should consider potential effects in both directions, i.e., how a safeguarded site may affect a proposed use, and how a proposed use may affect a safeguarded site. Issues that arise regarding safeguarded facilities often relate to dust, noise, light, odour, traffic, and general amenity. Where instances of Use Class E are proposed, the assessment should consider the most sensitive relevant use that falls within that Use Class.
4. Where there are potential interactions or conflict, an assessment of the likely impact on the relevant receptor; whether this impact is considered acceptable without mitigation, or where mitigation is possible, with mitigation; and any mitigation being proposed to overcome the issues identified.

The above statement needed to directly address the requirements of both Policy 16 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) and the 'agent of change' as set out in paragraph 187 of the NPPF.

In response these comments the Applicant has prepared: 22/02771/OUT – Land North of Cambridge North Station, Milton Avenue, Cambridge: Statement in response to comments of Cambridgeshire County Council in its role as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA), which is supported by an additional assessment relating to noise, dust and odour.

Having reviewed the documentation provided the MWPA wishes to make the following additional comments:

It is noted that:

1. In relation to the activities undertaken within the Transport Infrastructure Area (TIA) the topics of noise, air quality/dust and traffic were identified as potential areas of interaction. In relation to the activities undertaken within the

Cowley Road Waste Management Area (WMA) topics of noise, dust, odour and traffic were identified as potential areas of interaction.

2. For the TIA, the statement concludes that:

*“...no adverse odour, noise or traffic impacts are anticipated to arise from the occasional operation of the TIA, so no further mitigation is considered necessary in relation to these aspects. The measures currently in place at the Roadstone Coatings Facility and TIA are considered appropriate to minimise the risk of fugitive dust emissions arising from the development.”*

This statement does not appear to correspond with the topics that were considered, i.e., odour was not considered to be a topic considered, whereas air quality / dust was. The Applicant may wish to revise this conclusion based on the content of the statement.

3. For the Cowley Road Waste Management Area (WMA) the statement concludes that:

*“... no adverse odour, noise or traffic impacts are anticipated to arise from the operation of the Veolia site, so no further mitigation is considered necessary in relation to this aspect. The measures currently in place at the Veolia site are considered appropriate to minimise the risk of fugitive dust emissions arising from the development.”*

4. The plan referred to in the statement that illustrates distances between the existing, proposed and safeguarded uses (Appendix C 630\_01 (MP) 020 Proximity to Mineral Safeguarded Areas P1), presents distances to the Tarmac operation, but does not include distances to the Frimstone / Mick George Aggregates Railhead operation referred to as the Great British Rail Freight operation (see page 3 of the statement). Although this operation is considered within the noise and dust assessments.
5. The noise assessment in relation to the Aggregates Railhead is set out between pages 12 and 14 of the Noise Assessment, it states at 5.2.4:

*The AR Freightliner site is no longer moving any freight traffic into the site, and the traffic is being moved by the Great British Rail Freight instead, circa one train delivery per week. This indicates that the night impact will be limited to circa one train delivery per week.*

The MWPA is broadly content with the conclusions of the dust and odour reports, but the noise report does not appear to address the interaction between the proposed Use Class E uses and, the Aggregates Railhead. Furthermore, it is based on current activity at the railhead rather than permitted activity. The following information is, therefore requested to establish whether it can remove its objection or not:

1. Are any of the activities that may be undertaken within Use Class E, (i.e., the activities to be undertaken in the buildings proposed to be located closest to the TIA), considered to be sensitive to noise? If yes, what are these activities?

In the event any of the Use Class E activities are considered to be sensitive, please can an updated noise assessment be undertaken, or those activities be restricted from the development?

2. The noise report assumed that the existing level of deliveries at the Aggregates Railhead will be maintained. As there are no restrictions to deliveries at the railhead, beyond those imposed by existing planning controls and physical limits of the site, would the noise assessment reach the same conclusions if the number of deliveries were to increase to, for example, five days a week?

If you have any questions regarding this response, please do contact me on the details above.

Yours sincerely

Matthew Breeze

Principal Planning Officer