



**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>	

**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
				<p>safety and environment. The package of measures in the Core Strategy includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• encouraging better signing of strategic primary routes for HCVs heading to the major growth areas to/from quarries and recycling sites. These signs will direct all HCV (not just those related to quarries and recycling/landfill traffic) to use strategic primary routes</li> <li>• agreeing bespoke traffic routing arrangements with developers of mineral and waste sites, so that their HCVs do not use routes through local communities except when delivering / collecting materials for local construction projects. All routing agreements will be consistent with the Cambridgeshire Advisory Freight Map, recently adopted by the Council</li> <li>• agreeing bespoke traffic routing arrangements with developers of new housing and employment development to avoid or minimise the use of routes through local communities when sourcing or disposing of construction materials</li> <li>• locating sites close to A Class roads forming part of the strategic road network</li> <li>• requiring backloading (where HCV deliver mineral and return with waste for recycling/disposal) to reduce the number of HCV trips</li> <li>• considering off – peak deliveries of construction materials in appropriate cases where highway capacity may be constrained. (Off peak deliveries would occur outside normal operating hours, and deliveries would be via the Strategic Routes for HCV movements. In some cases mineral storage depots close to development areas may receive the</li> </ul>	

**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
				<p>materials, which would be located in suitable locations i.e. remote from sensitive uses such as residential properties)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensuring that site infrastructure can accommodate larger delivery vehicles to facilitate back loads</li> <li>• establishing temporary mineral/waste management depots on major new development</li> <li>• using temporary borrow pits for major infrastructure projects, including the A14 Upgrade. Using locally sourced materials will minimise the need to import materials from other quarries and the amount of traffic on local roads</li> <li>• safeguarding railheads in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough so sustainable transport of mineral and waste can be encouraged</li> <li>• using conveyors for internal movement of mineral over relatively short distances where this is practical</li> </ul> <p><u>What progress has been made?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• funding has been secured to provide new and enhanced HCV route signage on the A142/A10 as principal routes. The Scheme has been designed and the infrastructure requirements have been scoped. It is anticipated that the HCV signage will be implemented in spring / summer 2011</li> <li>• mineral and waste operators have signed planning obligations to use strategic routes unless delivering aggregates or collecting waste locally</li> <li>• traffic routing arrangements are in place to ensure that an element of waste traffic will not access Block Fen / Langwood Fen via Sutton from an existing recycling facility at St. Ives. An alternative route,</li> </ul>	

**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
				<p>principally on A Class roads, is used instead. The County Council has received indications of support for routing agreements from key local minerals and waste companies in the County who will be pursuing new long term development proposals in the Block Fen/Langwood Fen area.</p> <p><u>The Cambridgeshire Advisory Freight Map</u>  The Cambridgeshire Advisory Freight Map was adopted by the County Council in April 2010. This Map sets out the Route Hierarchy, showing which routes are strategic routes, and which should be used for the movement of freight. It also identifies the roads which are designated as local routes. Many of the roads which were previously designated as Main Distributor Roads are now local routes; this includes the A1123, A1421, B1040, B1049, and B1050. Routing agreements will require freight moments to use the Strategic Routes (e.g. A14, A141, A142, A10) except for local deliveries.</p> <p><u>Weight Limits</u>  Environmental weight limits can only be put in place if they are justified in terms of environmental impact or safety. The Council is in the process of preparing a more robust policy on the application of Environmental Weight Limits. It is anticipated that this will be considered by the Council's Cabinet in spring/early summer 2011.</p> <p><u>Bypasses</u>  The provision of expensive bypasses is unlikely to be</p>	

**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
				<p>justified on the basis of mineral and waste traffic alone. The majority of construction traffic will be able to approach growth areas by primary roads. Any bypasses would have to be considered in the context of the review of the County Council's Local Transport Plan, taking into account wider traffic matters.</p> <p><b>Enforcement</b></p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Advisory Freight Map is not enforceable, it is intended to inform and influence the decisions taken by HCV drivers. It will be used in determining the routes that will be used in routing agreements. The latter is a legally binding agreement that would require the operator to issue written instruction to their employees / contractors to use only the routes agreed (unless local deliveries are necessary), and to take reasonable steps to ensure that this is observed. 'Reasonable steps' is at the discretion of the operator. However, one local operator operates a disciplinary policy which can lead to the dismissal of drivers for disregarding the routing agreement, and has provided a phone number for receiving complaints. The Council also encourages the reporting of breaches of planning control (including lorry routing agreements) on its website, it has a simple form for reporting any breaches and will follow up any complaints received. All Parish Councils have been advised of the form. (<a href="https://forms.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/customer/servle/ep.app?ut=X&amp;type=404092">https://forms.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/customer/servle/ep.app?ut=X&amp;type=404092</a>).</p> <p>Putting in cameras / fitting GPS monitors to monitor the movement of lorries is not an option which would</p>	

**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
				<p>be pursued.</p> <p><u>Movement by Water / Rail</u>                      The Councils consider the market for aggregates is generally local, with over 85% of material being sold within 25 miles of the quarry. This is not conducive to the use of rail distribution as the minimum distance for financial viability is believed to be 100 miles. The SPD considered rail options at Manea (existing rail line) and Chatteris (old rail formation) and concluded that neither were deliverable.</p> <p>The Plan area has a number of navigable waterways. These are almost exclusively used by significant leisure traffic particularly in the summer months. Some sections of waterways are tidal (part of River Great Ouse) and also subject to flood events with high flows. This can stop river craft movements by reducing bridge headroom and the availability of locks. All this would compromise the reliability of this mode for the delivery of construction materials. The majority of the existing locks on the river system are incapable of accommodating a standard size aggregate barge. The existing waterway network is not well related to the major growth sites in the County, and there are no significant sustainable benefits that this mode of transport can offer the bulk movement of mineral and waste.</p>	
MWBFLSPD51, 53, 65 MWBFLSPD77, 80, 89, 94, 97	Various, see Schedule Part 2 for	015 018	Summary of concerns raised regarding consultation / membership of the Stakeholder Group: € Stakeholder group flawed as it did not include Parish Councils, all Drainage Boards, National	<p><u>Generic Response B – Consultation / The Stakeholder Group</u></p> <p>The Stakeholder Group was formed to consider the</p>	No amendment required

**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
<p>MWBFLFSPD144, 152 MWBFLFSPD205, 212</p>	<p>full details</p>	<p>030 047</p>	<p>Farmers Union, East Cambs HCV Group, Northstowe Joint Action Group, residents, District Councils                      € not consulted on the formulation of the Plan                      € no parish councils have been involved as stakeholders in the formulation of the master plan</p>	<p>technical feasibility / deliverability of proposals. Membership included officers from the Environment Agency, the Middle Level Commission, the Sutton and Mepal Drainage Board, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, The Wildfowl and Wetland Trust, Fenland and East Cambridgeshire District Councils, Natural England and the minerals and waste industry.</p> <p>The output of the Stakeholder Group has been the proposals for Block Fen / Langwood Fen which have been set out in the Minerals and Waste Plan, and which have been subject to extensive public consultation numerous times. An emerging version of the SPD which was also published as a background paper in 2008, prior to the draft SPD being published in February 2010. Full details of the consultation undertaken on the Minerals and Waste Plan is available on the Councils website. The consultation on both the Minerals and Waste Plan and the SPD have exceeded the requirements set out in the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (also on the website).</p> <p>Anyone who made comments at earlier stages of either document has been kept informed of progress. All Parish Councils, as statutory consultees, have been consulted at all the consultation stages in the development of the Minerals and Waste Plan and the emerging SPD.</p>	

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLFSPD1	Paragraph 1.1	001	<p>Many thanks for giving Anglian Water the opportunity to comment on this consultation. At this time we have no comments to make with regards to this document.</p> <p>However, Anglian Water is keen to continue to be involved in all future LDF consultations. Please contact the Planning Liaison Team at Anglian Water if you have any further queries or we can be of assistance.</p>	Noted	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD2	Paragraph 1.19	002	<p>It is stated that the area contains no listed buildings. This is incorrect. Fortrey's Hall is a listed building located adjacent to the development area alongside the Old Bedford River. Fortrey's Hall is named after the fenland "Adventurer" who renovated the property in ~1680. The house, a 3 story timber framed building, is believed to substantially predate Fortrey. Fortrey was also the builder of Kew Palace in London. These factors combine to give the building historic significance.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.19 should be amended to reflect the presence of this listed building.</p> <p>(Amendments proposed also take into account the Councils response to representation MWBFLFSPD44)</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 1.19 to read:            In terms of cultural and historic interest the area contains isolated listed buildings and schedule monuments along the roads, waterways and fields of the Block Fen / Langwood Fen area.            One such listed building is Fortrey's Hall, which is located alongside the Old Bedford River. The area also lies in proximity to towns and villages such as Chatteris, which contain numerous listed buildings and</p>

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLFSPD4	Paragraph 8.4	004	Enforceable routing agreements should be put in place to include both own and sub contractor vehicles to avoid villages except where required for access. It should be ensured that sub contractor lorries do not come through the villages.	See generic response A	designated conservation areas. The area is of high archaeological importance and includes a number of Scheduled Monuments. It is known to contain prehistoric remains and there are extensive remains of Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman Settlements in the area, some of which may prove to be of national importance.  No additional amendments required
MWBFLFSPD5	Paragraph 1.4	003	Mepal Parish Council welcomes the innovative proposals of this plan which will ensure that a significant wildlife water supply/flood alleviation and recreation resource can be secured as a result of minerals extraction and waste refill. Mepal village lies immediately north of the A142 across the Bedford Rivers and	Noted. It is the Councils intention to establish a local Liaison Forum for this site. This is practised successfully for sites elsewhere. A liaison forum is an informal meeting of representatives / including those from the companies / operators concerned, Parish Council representatives (including Mepal Parish	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			Washes from Block Fen. The Parish Council is already aware of piecemeal private attempts to generate local benefit from visitors to the Washes (fishing, bird watching, dog walking). We view the coherent development of the Block Fen area as a significant opportunity to improve the economy of our village and parish through tourist and recreational activity. We should therefore wish to play a part in the long-term development process which this plan envisages.	Council), local residents and the Councils Development Control Officer. The purpose of the Forum is to keep all parties informed of progress and to consider any issues arising. Forums elsewhere have been beneficial in encouraging good working relationships between all parties.	
MWBFLFSPD6	Paragraph 1.7	003	The Parish Council congratulates the Planning Authority on its forethought and wishes to take advantage of the timescales to work with the Authority to develop a plan beneficial to the district and county and also to our village.	Noted	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD7	Paragraph 1.26	003	Given the proximity and importance of the development to Mepal parish, the Parish Council would be grateful to be included as a Stakeholder in future meetings.	See the Councils response to representation MWBFLFSPD5	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD8	Paragraph 1.29	003	Please add Mepal Parish Council to future meetings and consultations.	See the Councils response to representation MWBFLFSPD5	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD9	Paragraph 2.3	003	The Parish Council believes that greatest benefit for all will be achieved if we (and Coveney Parish Council if they are willing) are joined in this exercise.	Membership of liaison forums is normally limited to those Parishes most directly affected. Although if certain initiatives were being considered it is possible to invite others to attend. For example if a circular walk via Coveney was being considered (see MWBFLFSPD10	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLFSPD10	Paragraph 5.10	003	The location of significant habitat creation opportunity at Coveney presumably with attendant quiet leisure opportunity creates potential for a medium distance circular way from Mepal across the Washes, through the Block Fen area across to Coveney and back down the Barrier Bank to Mepal.	below), Coveney Parish Council could be invited to attend. Noted. The SPD encourages the provision of a network of paths and if opportunities exist to create circular footpaths this would be positive enhancement of the local area. The SPD should be amended to encourage circular footpath and links to other footpath networks. Consideration of such opportunities would be most appropriate at the planning application stage when firm proposals come forward for the restoration and afteruse of the sites.	Add to paragraph 7.13: In the Block Fen / Langwood Fen area footpaths are often linear. If opportunities exist to create links with other footpaths, and / or to create circular walks, these should be investigated.
MWBFLFSPD11	Paragraph 7.3	003	With properties adjoining both the New & Old Bedford Rivers, including an existing public house on the New River, Mepal welcomes the potential increase in water-born leisure activity and would be grateful to work with relevant stakeholders to maximise mutual benefit.	Noted	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD12	Paragraph 7.7	003	The linear routes along the Old (and the New) Bedford Rivers provide excellent walking and bird watching opportunity but are at present much under used partly for relative difficulty of access and partly for lack of a circular route for want of footbridges across the rivers.	Noted. See Councils response to representation MWBFLFSPD10	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD13	Paragraph 7.8	003	These facilities are potentially valuable but remain under used. Recent development of a motor-cross track	The SPD encourages afteruses such as fishing, walking, bird watching and water sports. It is unlikely that bunding would	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			(possibly without planning permission - under investigation) has caused local concern as a result of the noise generated. It is important, if noisy activity is to be encouraged, which may be sensible, that earth banks or other measures are used to prevent noise nuisance.	be required, but if mitigation were appropriate it would be secured through the planning application process which considers the final form of restoration and afteruses.	
MWBFLSPD14	Paragraph 7.9	003	We are anxious to work with stakeholders to ensure that appropriate policies are adopted at parish level and to assist with implementation of plans to give effect to these policies.	Noted	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD15	Paragraph 7.13	003	The provision of ways across the rivers and counter drain should form part of early planning.	The development at Block Fen / Langwood Fen would not provide additional crossings over the Ouse Washes / Drains. Such a requirement would not be justified or reasonable under the legislation which provides for contributions for off site works.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD16	Paragraph 7.14	003	We welcome these developments and the potential for economic activity which they offer to our village which badly lacks local occupations especially for the spouses of those who travel outside of the village to work.	Noted	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD17	Paragraph 7.15	003	Whilst Mepal will of course benefit from additional green space, as a rural village it is likely to gain its main benefit from participation in the economic opportunity the plans offer. Participation will however be reliant on provision of ways across	Noted, see Councils response to representation MWBFLSPD15	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD18	Paragraph 7.16	003	<p>the rivers and washes and the plans need to be matched by planning for smaller visitor use of the village and its riverside facilities.</p> <p>Mepal Parish Council is at present working with neighbouring parishes to attempt to provide a cycleway to Witchford. This would join with the cycleway to Ely and thus to the Sustrans route. Work to provide cycle access from Mepal to the Block Fen area could be either by improvement of the A142 (especially the viaduct across the rivers which is barely safe for pedestrians and cyclists at current traffic levels) or by provision of access routes through the village and across the rivers and washes.</p>	<p>Noted, Paragraph 7.16 of the SPD encourages access to the site for recreational purposes by public transport or cycling. The expansion of the Sustrans work will assist in this. However, the Block Fen / Langwood Fen development would not fund improvements to the A142 or the viaduct or for new crossings over the Ouse Washes / Drains. Such a requirement would not be justified or reasonable under the legislation which provides for contributions for off site works.</p>	<p>No amendments required</p>
MWBFLSPD19	Paragraph 8.6	003	<p>The Parish Council accepts that exploitation of the resource which Block Fen provides will necessitate addition to the already increasing heavy vehicle use of the A142. We are however concerned (1) that there is a need for further amelioration to the junction from the village on to the A142 and for consideration of the safety of the people from outlying dwellings who access the A142 directly or via Drovers and (2) that noise and possible traffic pollution levels are already endangering the quality of life of people living close to the A142</p>	<p>This matter was considered by the independent planning Inspector who held the Examination into the Core Strategy. He concluded that          'The existing access to the village [of Mepal] from the A142 has good visibility and is safe. There is no justification for it to be widened or for any alterations to be made in response to the minerals (and waste / recycling) development allocations.'</p>	<p>No amendments required</p>

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLFSPD20	Paragraph 8.18	003	<p>especially those on the village's Meadow Way estate.</p> <p>The Parish Council welcomes the suggestions for back loading to minimise traffic increase but the concerns raised at 8.6 still stand.</p>	Noted, see Councils response to representation MWBFLFSPD19	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD21	Paragraph 8.23	003	<p>The Parish Council welcomes this long-term development but is concerned that the highway infrastructure (particularly the viaduct across the rivers, which also serves people living in outlying parts of the parish) will need upgrading for visitor use. This would suggest that upgrades should be made in advance of the increased traffic load imposed by extraction and refill vehicles and will have a long-term use.</p>	Noted, see Councils response to representation MWBFLFSPD18	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD22	Paragraph 10.1	003	<p>Mepal Parish Council welcomes the plans and would add to the expected benefits economic improvement for Mepal village. We shall be pleased to nominate a representative on a stakeholder group to ensure that development has local as well as wider advantage.</p>	Noted.	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD23	Paragraph 10.2	003	<p>The Parish Council congratulates the Planning Authority on its forethought and would be pleased to work with them.</p>	Noted.	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD24	Paragraph 10.3	003	<p>The Parish Council requests that it be added to the stakeholder group to facilitate processes (especially the local planning process in which statutory</p>	Noted, see response to representation MWBFLFSPD5	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD25	Paragraph 2.1	005	<p>consultee) and to achieve best possible benefit for the local as well as the wider area.</p> <p>The Wildlife Trust supports the overall Vision, Objectives and restoration strategy for Block Fen/Langwood Fen described in this document.</p>	Noted.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD26	Paragraph 8.1	006	<p>Bluntisham Parish Council wishes to emphasize the impact of traffic movements to and from this site on the local community and environment. Extension of the site would allow the use of small poorly constructed fen roads with routes through villages to continue. The steadily increasing volume of HCV traffic on our roads significantly affects the daily lives of residents who have to tolerate considerable problems of vibration and pollution. Clearly any escalation of heavy vehicle traffic will exacerbate these problems.</p> <p>The council recommends that, as a planning condition, all new sites should have routing agreements for all minerals and waste movements in the county that require operators to fit current GPS monitors to their vehicles, and allow county officers to inspect their electronic records on a regular basis in order to monitor compliance.</p>	See generic response A.	No additional amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLFSPD27	Paragraph 1.1	007	Somersham Parish Council has no objection to any documents associated with the Minerals & Waste Plan documents. However, Councillors remain concerned with the access route and road junctions used by the heavy HCV's and that consideration is made to residents living along the route to Warboys through Wood Hurst and Pidley.	Noted, lorry movements associated with Block Fen / Langwood Fen would be subject to routing agreements, see generic response A. They would, in any event, be unlikely to use these routes.	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD28	Paragraph 2.5	008	We support the principle of preparing a Draft Supplementary Planning Document and the need to set out a long term aim for development in the future. However, we are concerned that as working farmers of a considerable area of land affected by the DPD, the post extraction proposals for much of our land appears to involve restoration as wetland rather than back to agriculture. We fear that the viability of our farm holdings may be seriously prejudiced in the long term if the land is not restored to agriculture.	The proposals for the restoration of land at Block Fen / Langwood Fen will restore the land to a form which could be used for agricultural purposes. However, the land would be managed for nature conservation purposes. Land owners across the site would need to take into account the final form of restoration when determining the sale of the land / mineral rights to the minerals industry.	No further amendments required
MWBFLFSPD29	Paragraph 2.6	008	We support the principle of preparing a Draft Supplementary Planning Document and the need to set out a long term aim for development in the future. However, we are concerned that as working farmers of a considerable area of land affect by the DPD, the post extraction proposals for much of our land appears to involve restoration as wetland	See response to representation MWBFLFSPD28	No further amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD30	Paragraph 8.1	009	<p>rather than back to agriculture. We fear that the viability of our farm holdings may be seriously prejudiced in the long term if the land is not restored to agriculture.</p> <p>As far as I can see little has been done apart from a very suspect survey (Quarry and Landfill Traffic Study, Feb 2010) which seems to completely ignore one of the main routes at present and I suspect in the future for HCV's from the quarries that being through Earith towards St Ives. As usual Cambridgeshire forgets that Earith actually exists and people have to live here and put up with the vast numbers of HCV's and cars which come through our village every day. I don't know where you 'consultants' stood when they measured the traffic flows through Earith Bridge (location B) but I'm sure they did not look at the number of HCV's turning in and out of Earith High Street. They seem to have measured all the traffic flows North South and West but not the flow East. When I sit in my front room there must be 20 or more quarry lorries passing through the village in both directions every hour and not just 6 am to 6 pm we also get them through the night. It would not be so bad if they stuck to the speed limit but as I can see a flashing 30 MPH sign from my widow most are doing over 30 MPH and don't even bother to brake when the light</p>	<p>See generic response A.</p> <p>With regard to more detailed queries, any easterly HCV flows would be captured by Point 5 of the CCC traffic survey at Haddenham (Quarry and Landfill Traffic Study, Feb 2010, page 9, paragraph 6.10).</p> <p>It should also be noted that a recent Section 106 Agreement with Mick George Ltd removes this companies through traffic from Earith; and that the Colne Fen and Somersham Quarries are now closed which also reduces potential HCV movements along the B1050 north of Earith.</p>	No further amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLFSPD31	Paragraph 2.2	010	flashes. That comment applies to most of the traffic as well but a 40 tonne truck at 40 MPH shakes the house a lot more than a car! Hanson supports the objectives set out in section 2.2	Noted	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD32	Paragraph 3.3	010	Reference to 2.8 million tonnes should be altered to 2.88 million tonnes to reflect the sub regional apportionment and the draft East of England Regional Plan.	The apportionment in the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy is used, rather than that in the draft review which has no formal status. However, in practice the Councils have made provision for 3 mtpa to be provided which allows some flexibility. This is clarified later in paragraph 3.3 of the SPD	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD33	Paragraph 3.15	010	Hanson supports the approach taken by the County Council in preparing the Phasing and working of reserves and strongly supports the intention to allocate reserves that will be made available beyond the end of the plan period in accordance with MPS1 Annex 1 Paragraph 4.1	Noted	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD34	Paragraph 8.6	011	Whilst we recognise the need to extract and transport minerals extracted in this area, we feel that this substantial increase in lorry movements will result in the following:- 1. Increased vibration resulting in further damage to the houses in the High Street on the A1123. Increased noise and air pollution. This part of Earith is a designated conservation area and as	See generic response A.	No additional amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD35	Paragraph 8.1	012	<p>such has several historic and listed buildings.</p> <p>2. This table gives no indication of when and how frequently the lorries will pass through the High Street. We already have to endure frequent movements at night and early in the morning. A substantial increase like the one indicated in this table will only serve to make this worse.</p> <p>3. This increase in traffic movements will also increase the risk of accidents involving both other vehicles and pedestrians. Ours is a narrow High Street not suited to this type of HCV traffic and our village has already witnessed several accidents in recent time.</p> <p>4. A recent survey by the Environment Agency suggested that the serious flood risk in our area will increase from 1 in 100 years to 1 in 20 years. This will result in the A1123 being closed (as already occurs every year) which surely suggests, coupled with the fact that other roads e.g. B1050 Earith to Willingham are subsiding, a better alternative would be to invest in a route around Earith. There is already a major network of roads far more suitable for HCV traffic e.g. A141, A10, A14 and A142.</p>	See generic response A.	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD36	Paragraph 8.2	012	<p>enforceable before any extractions begin, as local rural roads are not built to withstand the volume of traffic proposed.</p> <p>It has been proposed that the main route will be the A142 and A10, and I understand from the meeting in Sutton that one such hauler Mick George states he will not be going through Sutton. How will this be policed? What will be the outcome if haulers are not adhering to their agreements, as they are not now? More traffic through Earith cannot be allowed we have already had a considerable increase in traffic over the years and have HCV's speeding through at all times of the day and night.</p>	See generic response A.	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD37	Paragraph 8.4	012	<p>An increase in heavy vehicles in all our rural areas has to be restricted and policed with intent. There has already been a considerable increase over the last 6 years. Not only are rural roads not built to withstand the weights and vibrations of these HCV's neither are the villages, which were built to withstand horse and cart.</p>	See generic response A	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD38	Paragraph 8.5	012	<p>The existing road infrastructure cannot withstand this increase of traffic. Roads built on wetlands are continually subsiding –Willingham-Haddenham. Environmental – the air pollution on our doorsteps will be unacceptable and the after shocks from lorries thundering</p>	Assessment of the Block Fen / Langwood Fen site has raised no issues associated with road capacity or road safety (Block Fen roundabout / A142). A range of measures are being put in place to address the potential impact of traffic on local roads. See generic response A.	No additional amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			through are none to similar to earthquakes. The HCV drivers do not care which road they take.	Any application which comes forward at Block Fen / Langwood Fen would be subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment, which would include details of traffic and potential impacts (including any air quality issues) and proposed mitigation measures.	
MWBFLSPD39	Paragraph 8.6	012	It is interesting to see that the survey carried out was 3 years old, and the traffic moving through Earith A1123 (Needingworth/Earith pits) were not taken into account, so the figures stated will be considerable higher. I find your document misleading. The time has come for a bypass not only for Willingham but also for Earith and Sutton. We are all aware that the traffic is using these two villages as a rat run. Hansons have not held their word in as much as all vehicles out of the Needingworth depot should turn left not right, and use the A141. The County Council are not the slightest bit interested in public option it only pays lip service. I do not know one member of the public who thought the guided bus way was a good investment, in-fact public options was against this, the money spent could have been used in a bypass. Earith has many listed properties and the High St is mainly a	See generic response A.  With regard to the survey date, in practice given the economic down turn this period represents a more realistic snapshot of traffic movements than currently, as some of the quarries at Block Fen / Langwood Fen are temporarily mothballed or on a reduced production rate.	No additional amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			conservation area, so how can you justify an increase in HCV's. The front door of many of the houses open straight onto the pavement, windows are getting broken from flying stones and buildings are being hit. Does it take the lives of 3 people or even worst 3 children before something is done? Our whole community is dying because of traffic.		
MWBFLSPD40	Paragraph 8.8	012	In the report it states the rejection of rail or any other mode of transport other than road.	The SPD outlines that alternative transport other than road have been examined and it concludes that movement of aggregate / waste by rail and water is not deliverable.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD41	Paragraph 8.7	012	In the year 2036....26 years from now vehicle movement will decline!!!. This is a patronising statement to make to the people whose lives will be affected by this traffic plan, and causes outrage.	This sentence provides further information about the traffic movements anticipated at the site as the development proceeds. It states that as mineral extraction ceases in sub areas A and B traffic will decline significantly. It is not intended to be patronising, but to provide additional information on how traffic will change over time.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD42	Paragraph 8.16	012	It has been proposed that the main route will be the A142 and A10, and I understand from the meeting in Sutton that one such hauler Mick George states he will not be going through Sutton. How will this be policed? What will be the outcome if haulers are not adhering to their agreements, as they are not now? More traffic through Earith cannot be	See generic response A	No additional amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD43	Paragraph 8.17	012	<p>allowed we have already had a considerable increase in traffic over the years and have HCV's speeding through at all times of the day and night. Who will police weight restrictions and ensure other routes are not being used?</p> <p>De classification of the A1123 is imperative and strong traffic guidelines are set and measures are enforceable before any extractions begin, as local rural roads are not built to withstand the volume of traffic proposed</p>	<p>This is a matter which is beyond the scope of the SPD.</p>	<p>No amendments required</p>
MWBFLSPD44	Paragraph 1.19	013	<p>We welcome reference to Cultural and Historic Interest in paragraph 1.19, although this needs to include more than just a discussion of archaeology. The Block Fen / Langwood Fen area lies in close proximity to a number of towns and villages, such as Chatteris that contain numerous listed buildings and are designated conservation areas. There are also isolated listed buildings and scheduled monuments dotted along the roads, waterways and fields that form the edges of the strategic area. There is potential for development within the area to have an impact on the setting of these features in terms of noise, views and traffic movements.</p>	<p>Agreed that this paragraph should be widened to reflect the wider cultural and historic interest of the area. This section provides the background of the area. Policies relating to the impact of proposals on such features, and any proposed mitigation, are in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. Paragraph 1.1 of the SPD makes it clear that the SPD must be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy.</p> <p>(Amendments also take into account the Councils response to representation MWBFLSPD2)</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 1.19 to read:            In terms of cultural and historic interest the area contains isolated listed buildings and scheduled monuments along the roads, waterways and fields of the Block Fen / Langwood Fen area.            One such listed building is Fortrey's Hall, which is located alongside the Old Bedford River. The area also lies in proximity to towns and villages such as Chatteris, which</p>

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD45	Paragraph 2.1	013	<p>The vision and objectives for the SPD need to reflect historic environment issues as discussed in relation to paragraph 1.19.</p> <p>We recommend that reference to the historic environment is added to the end of the first paragraph of the vision for Block Fen / Langwood Fen, using wording along the following lines:                      "The historic environment within and surrounding the area will be preserved and where appropriate enhanced, including archaeological features and the</p>	<p>The Visions and Strategic Objectives are drawn from the parent Minerals and Waste Plan Core Strategy, and cannot be amended through the Masterplan.</p>	<p>contain numerous listed buildings and designated conservation areas. The area is of high archaeological importance and includes a number of Scheduled Monuments. It is known to contain prehistoric remains and there are extensive remains of Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman Settlements in the area, some of which may prove to be of national importance.</p> <p>No additional amendments required</p>

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD46	Paragraph 3.10	013	<p>setting of designated heritage assets.” We also recommend that an additional objective is added, using wording along the following lines:                      “to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the historic environment within and surrounding the area, with full archaeological investigations accompanying any planning application.”</p> <p>We welcome the requirements for archaeological investigation in paragraph 3.10. However, this applies to any development proposal (including restoration and habitat creation) and not just sand and gravel extraction. This requirement should therefore be repeated in subsequent chapters relating to other types of development.</p>	<p>There is no need to repeat this requirement through other chapters of the SPD, as these land uses will follow the sand and gravel extraction. A planning application for sand and gravel extraction is required to address the restoration and afteruse of the site. It is at this stage that archaeological assessment and mitigation will be addressed.</p>	<p>No amendments required</p>
MWBFLSPD47	Paragraph 12.1	013	<p>Reference to archaeological and other historic environment assessment should be included within this appendix, to reflect paragraph 3.10 and other concerns.</p>	<p>Agreed, but this reference would sit better in the subsequent paragraph.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 12.2 to include an additional sentence at the end:                      Pre-application discussion should also cover archaeological and historic environment matters, and if necessary an additional discussion with the County Archaeological Team</p>

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD48	Table 8.1	014	<p>As we live on the High Street in Earith any suggested increase in the volume of lorry traffic through the village will have a major impact on our quality of life, due to increased noise, pollution, vibration &amp; damage to our property. We already experience frequent cracks to plasterwork &amp; ceramic tiles, plus external doors need realigning annually. The infrastructure surrounding &amp; through the village will not support any increase in traffic, the road between Earith &amp; Willingham is already constantly in need of repair due to the weight of traffic which it was never designed to cope with. The road out of Earith frequently floods which will cause even more disruption, although lorries tend to ignore the road closed signs!</p> <p>Lorries travelling through the village in the early hours of the morning cause disruption to sleep due to both the rumbling noise &amp; vibration of the house. If this was to increase &amp; also extend into the evening this would seriously affect the health &amp; well being of residents living on the High Street.</p> <p>Earith's conservation area has been recently extended, what is the point if it is to be destroyed by increasing the traffic flow?</p>	See generic response A	<p>should be arranged.</p> <p>No additional amendments required</p>

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD49	Paragraph 8.15	012	All HCV's should be diverted to the A141, A10 and the A142. Signage should be placed at all possible entries off and on to the surrounding roads and cameras put in place to 'monitor traffic movement'. The placing of such cameras has been carried out in other areas of the UK.	See generic response A	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD50	Paragraph 8.16	012	All HGV's should be diverted as stated, with the addition of better road markings and traffic islands in the middle of roads. Signage at the entrance of each village and traffic enforcement cameras put in place. If / when the Earith road is flooded vehicles use alternative routes they can do it anyway.	See generic response A	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD51	Paragraph 1.26	015	As a local resident I take an interest in planning matters. I believe this paragraph represents a flawed development process as a viable one. I believe the stakeholder workshops involved a small and carefully selected group of organisations. There were no representatives of local Parish Councils. The Haddenham Drainage Board which borders the affected area was not represented. Farmers interests were not represented by the National Farmers Union or any other body. The East Cambs. HCV Group and Northstowe Joint Action Group of parish councils were not involved in the workshop	See generic response B	No additional amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD52	Paragraph 8.17	012	process. We will provide Bed & Breakfast for any member of the Council who will take up the offer brave enough to stay in my home. Being woken up by lorries thundering through at all hours of the night is great fun. I am sure this will help with your review.	See generic response A	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD53	Paragraph 1.29	015	As far as I can determine from the statement made, no elected representatives of any Parish or District has been involved in this process. I therefore think it is flawed.	See generic response B	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD54	Paragraph 8.19	012	All HCV's should be diverted as stated, with the addition of better road markings and traffic islands in the middle of roads. Signage at the entrance of each village and traffic enforcement cameras put in place. If when the Earith road is flooded vehicles use alternative routes they can do it anyway. Hansons, Mike George should be included in this.	See generic response A	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD55	Paragraph 2.1	015	My comments relate to the first paragraph. Firstly I do not believe these proposals can be described as 'sustainable' when they involve moving millions of tons of material by the least environmentally friendly method possible - road. Secondly, digging these areas will in itself result in the issue of carbon dioxide that is currently 'locked' into the deposits	There is a balance to be made when considering the proposals, some aspects of the proposals may seem unsustainable, but regard must also be had to the objectives and the final form of restoration. The final restoration will be sustainable, it will create 'carbon sinks' which over time will absorb carbon dioxide, and also prevent through creation of managed wetland grassland,	No additional amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD56	Paragraph 8.6	016	and their overburden into the atmosphere as well as causing significant fuel burn to effect the excavation process. Thirdly, I am aware of no 'active traffic management' process. The only attempt at traffic management is to attempt to negotiate traffic routing agreements with site operators but these do not cover sub-contractors or customers of the operators and there is no legally enforceable sanction, other than refusal of future planning consents against the operators. I therefore think this paragraph is misleading. The small village of Earith has seriously inadequate road infrastructure for the greatly increased volume of HGV traffic that this plan will generate, which will be intolerable for the safety and peace of its residents. I therefore protest most strongly against the traffic impact of this plan.	the degradation of peat (which might otherwise be lost through erosion). If the land remained in arable production, carbon dioxide in soils would in any event be released through the activity of ploughing.  See also generic response A.	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD57	Paragraph 2.3	015	Bullet Point 9. As far as I can ascertain there has been no assessment of the additional traffic impacts of a Visitor Centre and no assessment of the impacts on wildlife of large numbers of additional visitors to what is currently a completely private area. Bullet Point 10. I do not believe that traffic management issues have been	The SPD advises that a visitor centre should be provided in due course, and that a car park of around 150 spaces should be provided. The final form of the visitor centre will be determined through a planning application, which will consider if there are any implications for the local highway and if improvements are required.	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD58	Paragraph 2.5	015	adequately addressed. My own estimates indicate that the rate of extraction proposed will generate an additional HCV movement every 30-60 seconds from 05.30hrs - 17.30 hrs each working day. The preferred routes using the A142/A10 or A142/A141/A14 are already admitted (by the County Council in other planning responses) overloaded and the alternative routes pass through the middle of several villages without adequate regard to road safety, pedestrian safety or pollution and cross or run alongside vulnerable flood protection structures using roads that do not meet recognised construction standards.	However, given that total movements are likely to be less than those generated by HCVs from the site when mineral and waste movements are occurring, it is not anticipated that this will be the case. In addition, recreational traffic will also be busier at off peak periods when general traffic levels and HCV movements are also lower.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD59	Paragraph 2.6	015	The only 'stakeholders' to have been involved in providing the roundabout are those with a financial interest in the success of this plan.	The Block Fen / Langwood Fen roundabout was funded by the mineral companies in order to provide access to the reserves which are currently being worked.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD60	Paragraph 3.2	015	I think it is less than honest to describe this level of man made destruction as a 'vision'.	Noted. This Vision is drawn from the parent Plan, the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. Planning policy requires that the Plan include a Vision(s) and Strategic Objectives.	No amendments required
			I think these figures demonstrate clearly that government policy to develop this number of new houses on greenfield sites in Cambridgeshire is flawed. There are 1 million empty houses in this	Noted, this is a matter beyond the scope of this SPD.	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD61	Paragraph 3.9	015	country and nationally and locally, in order to minimise energy usage and greenhouse gas emissions, we should be looking to refurbish and re-use these and the materials they already contain from pits that have already been dug rather than digging up further areas of countryside and building new structures on more countryside while burying the old materials. I have seen no evidence to support this statement and am aware of no detailed testing which has been undertaken to determine the engineering stability of these flood protection structures. With sea level rise measured by the Environment Agency of 1.4mm per annum, it is likely that these structures will need modification and strengthening over the next 100 years and beyond if the whole of the fen is not to revert to a permanently flooded condition. The geology of the fens is very complex and I submit that there could be as yet unseen weaknesses which, once disturbed, this 'rule of thumb' will not protect them from.	The stand off distance from the edge of the Ouse Washes, Forty Foot, and A142 is an indicative figure. The paragraph says 'in the order of'. In practice further assessment will need to be undertaken as part of any planning application which will help determine a precise stand off distance. Advice will also be taken from relevant consultees including the Environment Agency.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD62	Paragraph 3.15	015	I believe this statement is deliberately misleading. The key reason for the scale of this submission has little to do with habitat enhancement, it is purely required to satisfy the needs of unsustainable development plans for the	The scale of extraction proposed goes beyond that required to meet the Core Strategy Plan period which extends to 2026, and the period of the Regional Spatial Strategy. This reflects the unique opportunities that can be provided by the	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD63	Table 3.1	015	County which have been forced upon it by central government. There are no units of measure on this table. Are we talking teaspoons, hundredweights or millions of tons?	quarry restoration.  This needs correcting to show the figures in Table 3.1 relate to million of tonnes of sand and gravel.	Amend Table 3.1 to make it clear that the figures given relate to million tonnes of sand and gravel.
MWBFLSPD64	Paragraph 3.16	015	While I can find reference to informing landowners of the strategy, I can find no reference to the rate of removal of the affected farm land from production and the impact of this on growing capacity and food supply. I find this surprising at a time when the Secretary of State for the Environment, Mr Hilary Benn, has called for the agricultural industry to increase its capacity in order to counter-act the effects of recognised probabilities of growing world and national population and reduced world and national food supply.	Chapter 9 of the SPD considers the Sustainable Use of Soils, which are some of the best and most versatile in the Country. With this factor in mind the methodology of restoring the site to nature conservation will also allow the land to revert back to an arable use should this be required in the long term (paragraph 9.14) . In addition consideration has been given to the use of high quality soils which will be displaced from the area to accommodate the water storage bodies. Some of these soils may be used in habitat creation elsewhere on the site, or will be removed to address soils management problems in another area e.g. to augment depleted peat derived soils off site (paragraph 9.16).	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD65	Paragraph 1.26	015	I believe this process is flawed because the 'stakeholder' group has been limited to mostly sympathetic members. It has not included any Parish Councils. It has not included elected members of District Councils. It has not included	See generic response B	No additional amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD66	Paragraph 4.7	015	<p>farming groups such as the NFU. It has not include the East Cambs. HCV Group or the Northstowe Joint Action Group. It has not included the Haddenham Drainage Board.</p> <p>I see no evidence for the estimates of materials to be disposed of. I support the plan to maximise the use of recycled materials, however, I see no evidence that the study has included the possibility of reducing construction waste by refurbishing and therefore recycling more buildings instead of demolishing them and building new ones.</p> <p>I see no evidence that attempts have been made to maximise re-cycling and reuse at the point of demolition in order to minimise the costs and impacts of transport.</p> <p>I see no evidence of the impact on construction waste volumes of the need to use construction waste raise construction site levels in situ in order to provide flood protection as is being considered at Northstowe.</p>	<p>The amount of material to be disposed of at the site is shown in Table 4.1. This quantity of material forms part of the total waste that is planned to be managed through the parent Minerals and Waste Plan. This Plan has been found sound by an independent planning Inspector.</p> <p>The Plan tackles waste management through a variety of measures, including requirements for site waste management plans and audits which should ensure that waste is minimised and maximum recycling takes place prior to disposal.</p> <p>The Block Fen / Langwood Fen will have 3 recycling facilities on site.</p> <p>However, paragraphs 4.3, 4.4, and 4.7 need to be updated to reflect the updated figure in the Core Strategy which states that 12.09 of inert landfill void will be needed over the Plan period.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 4.3 to read:                      In Cambridgeshire and Peterborough it has been forecast that just over 59 million tonnes of construction and demolition waste will need to be managed between 2006 and 2026. The target recycling rates are, at least 65% of this waste will be recycled by 2016, increasing to 70% by 2021.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.4 to read:                      The remaining construction and demolition waste and inert waste that is not recycled for aggregate or other uses, will primarily be used for quarry restoration proposals or disposal</p>

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
					<p>to inert landfill sites. It has been calculated that in order to accommodate this material, provision will need to be made for 12.09 million cubic metres of inert landfill voidspace across the Plan area. A site specific strategic allocation at Block Fen/Langwood Fen is made in the Core Strategy for inert construction waste landfill disposal. This strategic allocation will accommodate 8.4 cubic metres of inert landfill to 2026.</p> <p>Some of the material sent to recycling facilities will turn out not to be inert material (less than 12%), this will require disposal to non-hazardous landfill sites.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.7 to read:</p>

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD67	Paragraph 4.11	015	I see no evidence as to how this limitation will be enforced.	This will be secured at the time planning permission is given by way of a planning condition. This will be consistent with Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy which deals with Ancillary Development.	It is forecast over the period from 2006 to 2026 over 12 million cubic metres of landfill space for inert waste will be needed in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.  No Amendments required
MWBFLSPD68	Paragraph 5.19	015	Given that this methodology is only at the stage where a pilot project to test it is about to be started, para 5.20 below, I do not believe it is sound planning practice to base large parts of the current proposal on this as yet untested methodology without any alternatives. The small test area mentioned below is insufficient in size and has not been in existence for a sufficient period to be regarded as providing anything other than useful pointers. Therefore this whole submission should be regarded as environmentally unsound. The SPD should not be allowed to proceed until the methodology has been tested by completion of and evaluation of the full pilot project.	The trial site begun in 2009, and has been overseen and monitored by the RSPB which has experience of creating similar schemes elsewhere e.g. Coveney. Results are positive showing both a success in terms of the methodology of the creation of the lowland wet grassland, but also in terms of bird species. Whilst it cannot replicate the conditions of a wider area of wet grassland it has been sufficient to confirm that the restoration proposals are deliverable.	No Amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD69	Paragraph 1.26	017	The East Cambs HCV group whom I represent consists of Parish Council representatives from over 10 local parish councils in the area none of whom were involved in this process.	See generic response B	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD70	Paragraph 2.1	017	The statement in 2.1 bullet point 1 about 'active traffic management' is entirely misleading. There is simply an advisory strategy which has failed dismally in the past and will do so again. Operators will always favour their economic interests over any other considerations unless there are sanctions in place to deter infringement.	See generic response A	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD71	Table 8.1	017	The Block Fen/Langwood Fen Traffic study gives different figures to those appearing in table 8.6. The summary table in the traffic study at 6.2 reports 147 mineral HCVs associated with Block Fen/Langwood Fen from the 2007 survey. This is substantially more than the 116 reported in the table 8.6 for minerals and substantially less than the combined total of 185 for minerals and waste based on the same survey. How can accurate predictions be made when the numbers from the same survey are not even consistent between documents?	The figures given in paragraph 8.6 (table 8.1) are consistent with those in the Block Fen / Langwood Fen Traffic Study 2009 (paragraph 10.4).  Some confusion has arisen about the detailed figures due to a typographical error on page 6 of the Block Fen / Langwood Fen Quarry and Landfill Traffic Study. The summary table, line BF/LF Master Plan HCV, should read 185 (not 147). This is unfortunate, although it does not change the final figures which are presented in conclusions and which have been used in the Master Plan.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD72	Paragraph	017	Block Fen also lies very close to the 100	The waterways in this area are almost	No Amendments

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
	8.9		<p>foot river (the New Bedford) which is entirely navigable. It would be interesting to know if the possibility was ever explored of moving aggregate by barge down the New Bedford to the south bank of the Ouse just East of Brownshill Staunch. The advantages of this are; This land is adjacent to the Needingworth quarry; the site is only 3-4 miles from the major Northstowe development; there are no locks to negotiate. Such a strategy overcomes a major difficulty with the W&amp;M plan in which the minerals are mostly north of the river Ouse whereas the main developments are to the south of it and traffic is forced on to already congested roads and, more importantly, bridges.</p>	<p>exclusively used for leisure traffic, particularly in the summer months. Some sections of the waterways are tidal (part of the Great Ouse) and also subject to flooding events with high tides. This can stop river craft movements by reducing bridge headroom and the availability of locks. All this would compromise the reliability of this mode of transport for the delivery of construction materials.</p> <p>Barges commonly used for aggregate are c.250-300 tonnes of aggregate and are c.28m long and 7.3m wide. The local chambers on local waterways range between 3.5 and 4.6 m in width. Without major expenditure on infrastructure improvements to the locks (for which there are no known programmes) transport by barge is not considered a feasible long term transport option.</p>	<p>required</p>
MWBFLSPD73	Paragraph 8.16	017	<p>This section states that HGV traffic would not be precluded from using other roads such as the A1123 or the B1050. It is quite clear that these routes are entirely unsuitable for large scale HGV movements. The B1050 south of Earith Bridge runs along the bank of the Old West river and is in a constant state of disrepair largely due to HGV traffic. The road has no real foundations and is resting on a major flood defence. The A1123 runs through villages with</p>	<p>See generic response A.</p> <p>This section needs to be revised to reflect the Councils Advisory Freight Map which has been adopted by the Council. This Map defines the A1421, B1049, B1050 and part of the A1123 as local routes. The A142, A10, and A141 are all defined as strategic routes.</p>	<p>Update the Traffic Management Section to reflect the Councils adoption of the Advisory Freight Map, including advice on which roads are strategic / local.</p>

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD74	Paragraph 5.25	015	<p>buildings very close to the road. Unless strict routing enforcement is in place the use of these roads will lead to further damage to infrastructure and additional stress to the population living alongside them.</p> <p>I can find no reference in this part of the document to the evaluation and management of the future impacts of climate change upon the site. Given the rising sea levels, 1.4 mm per year, and increased risk of long term flooding of the whole of the fen will the management regime be capable of adjustment to cope with sudden permanent flooding without risk to the environment from seepage and other escapes, if works are only partially completed when flooded?                      I see no evidence that this has been considered.</p>	<p>The proposals for water storage are to deliver a more sustainable way of managing the drainage system, of the Cranbrook / Counter Drain. This is clearly linked to addressing the impact of climate change, and flooding is becoming more severe and more frequent out of season. The capacity proposed includes a 20% increase in flows over 100 years of climate change. The flow of water to / from the storage bodies will be regulated in accordance with a Specification which will be set out by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The creation of enhancement habitat will also help address climate change as it will from a large carbon sink. The water regime / drainage of the area will be managed artificially.</p> <p>With regard to any unexpected flooding of mineral workings whilst extraction is still taking place, as the workings are normally pumped whilst extraction takes place the infrastructure will be in place to evacuate any excess water when</p>	No Amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD75	Paragraph 6.3	015	There is no evidence that the impacts on agriculture and food production due to the withdrawal from use of this area of admittedly high quality land has been properly considered.	appropriate. Chapter 9 of the SPD considers the Sustainable Use of Soils, which are some of the best and most versatile in the Country. With this factor in mind the methodology of restoring the site to nature conservation will also allow the land to revert back to an arable use should this be required in the long term (paragraph 9.14) . In addition consideration has been given to the use of high quality soils which will be displaced from the area to accommodate the water storage bodies. Some of these soils may be used in habitat creation elsewhere on the site, or will be removed to address soils management problems in another area e.g. to augment depleted peat derived soils off site (paragraph 9.16).	No Amendments required
MWBFLSPD76	Paragraph 6.10	015	I believe this statement mis-represents the Environment Agency's position. The Environment Agency is seeking to achieve a flood protection level of 1 in 25 years only because the Treasury Green Book rules restrict them currently from providing a higher level of protection to farmland. However, since publication of the Great Ouse Tidal River Strategy, the Agency has stated in public forums locally that it has recognised the high value and national importance of the	Chapter 9 of the SPD considers the Sustainable Use of Soils, which are some of the best and most versatile in the Country. With this factor in mind the methodology of restoring the site to nature conservation will also allow the land to revert back to an arable use should this be required in the long term (paragraph 9.14). With regard to the capacity of the water bodies proposed the advice of the Environment Agency has been taken into	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			large areas of 'best and most versatile' farmland which exist in the fens and that it is currently seeking evidence to justify to government the raising of these protection levels by modification of Treasury Rules. Destruction of and flooding of this area on the scale proposed might not be compatible with future Environment Agency strategy if they are successful in obtaining the modification of protection levels. This proposal does not consider that possibility. It is therefore flawed.	account. This may be influenced by national legislation to which they have to comply.	
MWBFLSPD77	Paragraph 1.29	018	But not Residents	See generic response B	No additional amendments required
MWBFLSPD78	Paragraph 1.10	018	Why have no consultations taken place in either Mepal or Chatteris	Consultation on the Minerals and Waste Plan, incorporating the emerging SPD has been held in the local area. In 2008 a series of manned and unmanned exhibitions took place across Cambridgeshire, including a manned exhibition at Kind Edward Centre in Chatteris and one at Mepal Village Hall. However, due to poor attendance in 2008, in 2010 (at the Submission stage) manned exhibitions took place in a wide number of venues, which in this area included the Glebe, Sutton and the Arkenstall Village centre in Haddenham. Parish Councils were always consulted, regardless of whether a manned exhibition was staged in their village.	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLSPD79	Paragraph 1.11	018	The fact that the area is "relatively sparsely populated" does not grant the authority the right to ignore the interests of that population and the European and UK legislation designed to protect those interests.	This is not suggested. This paragraph is a factual statement in the Section which is setting out the characteristics of the area.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD80	Paragraph 1.26	018	The exclusion of small landowners/residential property stakeholders has resulted in some flaws in the master plan most obviously in them being denied the right to contribute to the various ecological enhancements that the plan seeks to achieve.	The proposals for the Block Fen / Langwood Fen area have been subject to extensive public consultation, during which time any stakeholder may have commented on the proposals, or put forward additional land which they would have liked to have been considered for inclusion.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD81	Paragraph 1.27	018	No study been carried has been carried out on the impact of wind born pollution, (Noise, sand, dust inert waste) this despite the fact that the designated area is well known for its strong and consistent winds evidenced by the proliferation of wind farms. This factor alone should highlight the need to address the issue but is then compounded by both the scale and duration of extraction and infill.	See also generic response B. These are matters which will be addressed at planning application stage when an Environmental Impact Assessment will accompany the application. This will consider in detail potential impacts of the development, as well as appropriate mitigation measures.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD82	Paragraph 6.14	015	I do not believe the water bodies will be far enough away from the Washes to minimise the impacts upon ground nesting birds from the increased gull population which will be attracted there.	Advice on this matter has taken from the RSPB which is satisfied that the proposals are appropriate. New habitat for the ground nesting birds needs to be as close as possible to the Ouse	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representative No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			Gulls often travel up to 20 miles radius to visit known food sources. This statement is misleading.	Washes. Careful consideration has also been given to the form of landscaping which will surround the water storage bodies. This needs to be open in character and minimal so that it will not attract corvids and foxes which will eat the ground nesting birds (paragraphs 6.26 – 6.28).	
MWBFLSPD83	Paragraph 6.25	015	To proceed with this proposal before completion of the major hydrological survey and determination of the flood management strategy is unacceptable.	Studies which support this SPD address the baseline hydrology, and hydrological impacts and opportunities arising from restoration proposals. Further work on this subject will be undertaken by the Environment Agency, and will also need to be addressed by any planning applications which come forward.	No amendments required
MWBFLSPD84	Paragraph 7.14	015	I can find no evidence of planning for the traffic impacts of 60,000 visitors.	The SPD advises that a visitor centre should be provided in due course, and that a car park of around 150 spaces should be provided. The final form of the visitor centre will be determined through a planning application, which will consider if there are any implications for the local highway and if improvements are required.  However, given that total movements are likely to be less than those generated by HCVs from the site when mineral and waste movements are occurring, it is not anticipated that this will be the case. In addition, recreational traffic will also be	No amendments required

**SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIONS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT 'BLOCK FEN / LANGWOOD FEN MASTER PLAN'**  
**Part Two: All Representations**

Representation No	SPD Ref	Representee No	Response received	Councils Proposed Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
MWBFLFSPD85	Paragraph 1.31	018	<p>I object to the core strategy on the following grounds.</p> <p>1) The plan does not seem to have been the subject of a Strategic Environment Assessment EEC directive 2001/42/EC.</p> <p>2) It is inconsistent with national(PPS1) in that the document The Vision fails to mention the issue of protecting amenities.</p> <p>3) The core strategy whilst taking on board the needs to respond to European Ramsar Convention fails to address the impact of European human rights legislation.</p>	<p>busier at off peak periods when general traffic levels and HCV movements are also lower.</p> <p>Noted. However the soundness of the Core Strategy has already been considered by an independent planning Inspector and has been found sound. Part of this assessment included consistency with national planning policy guidance such as PPS1. The Core Strategy was subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal at all stages of its preparation.</p>	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD86	Paragraph 7.16	015	<p>This statement is disingenuous. The main centres of population are too far away for visitation by all but the keenest cyclists and certainly for young families. Additionally the local roads are now too dangerous for cycling and there are no cycle paths to the site. There are no bus services. I can find no evidence of plans or funding to rectify this situation.</p>	<p>Noted. However, whilst current opportunities may be limited, this SPD covers the time period of the proposals which extends to 2050. There may be opportunities in the future which could help address these limited options, and if they come forward these should be encouraged.</p>	No amendments required
MWBFLFSPD87	Paragraph 8.1	015	<p>I can find no evidence that effective traffic management policies and processes have been either devised or implemented. I can find no evidence of accurate measurement of traffic flows</p>	<p>The Council have undertaken the Block Fen / Langwood Fen traffic study (2009), and further assessment of any traffic movements would also form part of an Environmental Impact Assessment at</p>	No additional amendments required



































































































































































