

Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project  
Anglian Water Services Limited

# Community Working Group Meeting Minutes



Application Document Reference: 6.1.29  
PINS Project Reference: WW010003  
APFP Regulation No. 5(2)q

Revision No. 01  
April 2023



# Meeting Note

**Project:** CWWTPR

**Meeting Title:** First Community Working Group (CWG) - Milton and Waterbeach

**Date:** Thursday 22 April 2021

**Time:** 7:00pm – 8:00pm

**Format:** Video call

**Location:** Zoom

**Attendees:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
(Anglian Water project team); [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] (Milton PC)

## Notes:

1. Welcome and introductions.
2. [REDACTED] (KT) gave overview of Community Working Groups (CWGs) purpose and aims, project progress including the commencement of surveys, and programme timeline update setting out current phase of consultation and development of the proposals including commencement of the technical as well as community working groups and forthcoming phase two consultation.
3. No comments on the Terms of Reference, which were agreed. [REDACTED] (JC) noted it would be helpful to see what the specific CWG outputs will be, as well as to understand who else is involved in the other 'Site Area' CWG session.
4. JC also added that it would be helpful to attend the larger 'Site Area' CWG forum alongside the other parishes, but otherwise happy to continue with more specific Milton and Waterbeach meetings to discuss other issues of interest, where these may be different.
5. It was noted that Waterbeach Parish Council had sent their apologies, but that it would be helpful to understand their potential level of interest, if any, in being involved in future discussions. KT also agreed to ensure that the rest of the 'Site Area' parishes knew about Milton Parish Council's involvement in this forum, for

transparency.

6. AP and ZI set out the input into the design and Environment Impact Assessment (EIA), and consultation reporting processes for the CWGs, as part of the DCO application.
7. JC agreed would be happy to chair future meetings if needed and [REDACTED] (DW) clarified what level of commitment this would require between meetings, although both felt happy for meetings to continue to run by consensus for the time being without a formal chair given the number of attendees without a formal Chair.
8. DW proposed areas of interest specific to Milton and Waterbeach for discussion at future CWG sessions, such as flows between the existing and new plants and tunnel/pipeline routing with Waterbeach and the Waterbeach development, as well as water quality, flooding and storm flows.
9. JC requested to see examples of other new plants elsewhere for comparison, including use of similar technologies to those proposed for the new plant, and expressed interest in the opportunity of a site visit. KT noted that there were differences in storm treatment in particular, which may be of interest, and that otherwise a visit to the existing plant could be arranged following the lifting of covid restrictions.
10. JC expressed interest in the importance of opportunities for environmental and habitat enhancement, noting that this appeared to be an area in particular which could be meaningfully shaped by consultation.
11. KT raised whether there were any suggestions of further individuals or stakeholder groups who may be interested in participating in the Milton and Waterbeach CWG, such as representatives from the County Park. JC noted that some other Milton parish councillors may be interested in future. ZI confirmed that additional parish councillors would be able to attend if interested, subject to the overall number of attendees going forward.
12. It was confirmed that next meeting would be held week commencing 17 May, although Mondays and Tuesdays should continue to be avoided owing to existing scheduling of parish council meetings.
13. KT confirmed that additional individuals or groups could continue to be suggested going forward. DW noted that there may be opportunities to engage with the Sports Lakes Trust about possible linkages between the projects.
14. [REDACTED] (JB) noted ongoing monitoring of progress of other planning applications, including the rowing lakes, as part of the DCO process and to understand opportunities for possible linkages.
15. DW agreed to share information if helpful to clarify the identification of a piece of

land being discussed and which Anglian Water owns, bordering the current site and the A14, which there would be interest from Milton Parish Council to explore opportunities for. KT confirmed, if understood correctly which piece of land was being referred to, that there were no plans for this piece of land but could not speak as to any opportunities for it.

16. KT concluded by thanking attendees.

17. **End.**

### **Actions**

- Anglian Water to invite Milton and Waterbeach parish councils and the Waterbeach Community Forum to attend future 'Site Area' CWGs, and clarify to other parish councils their involvement in the Milton and Waterbeach specific sessions.
- Anglian Water to reach out again to Waterbeach Parish Council to gauge their longer term interest in becoming involved with the CWG process.



# Meeting Note

**Project:** CWWTPR

**Meeting Title:** First Community Working Group (CWG) - Site Area

**Date:** Wednesday 21 April 2021

**Time:** 7:00pm – 8:00pm

**Format:** Video call

**Location:** Zoom

**Attendees:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
(Anglian Water project team); [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] (Stow cum  
Quy PC); [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] (Save Honey Hill Group); [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
(Lode PC); [REDACTED] (Fen  
Ditton PC); [REDACTED] (Bottisham  
PC); [REDACTED]  
(Cambridgeshire County Council); [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] (South Cambs District  
Council); [REDACTED]  
(Teversham PC); [REDACTED]  
(Great Wilbraham PC)

## Notes:

1. Welcome and introductions.
2. [REDACTED] (KB) gave an overview of the Community Working Groups (CWGs) purpose and aims, project update including the commencement of surveys, and set out how the development of the proposals is progressing including the commencement of the technical as well as community working groups and forthcoming phase two consultation.
3. [REDACTED] (DY) sought clarification on the distinction between the technical and community working groups, including their composition how information would be communicated between groups. KB explained that the technical working groups

(TWGs) are comprised of statutory consultees and specialist experts. CWGs also provide members of the community with the opportunity to discuss in more detail the issues which matter most to them. The outputs of both groups are used to help shape the development of the project proposals. [REDACTED] (JB) also added that the nature of the technical discussions at the TWGs is also often highly subject specific, such as consideration of data collection and modelling methodologies for traffic assessments.

4. [REDACTED] (MS) commented on the recent commencement of survey works including the construction of a temporary compound and requested additional, more specific information on the different stages of the survey works in future. KB acknowledged and agreed that the previous survey update provided an overview of the coming months of survey works could be supplemented with more specific notifications of when the different stages of these works were commencing.
5. [REDACTED] (CJ) raised concerns that environmental data referenced in CON1 representations i.e. biodiversity and the presence of protected species, would be considered in detail through the TWGs as it had otherwise not been fully addressed in the Stage 4 reports to date. KB noted that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process was being undertaken by specialist experts, that all phase one consultation responses were being fully considered, and that the project would always welcome receiving local knowledge to feed into the process. [REDACTED] (AP) added that communities can provide input either directly through these CWGs, or via their local council officers as part of the TWGs if they prefer, but that both of these groups will input into the technical survey and assessment process. CJ agreed this may also be a matter helpful to discuss offline.
6. [REDACTED] (FA) questioned which TWG would assess carbon targets. KB set out Anglian Water's ambitious 2030 net zero carbon target and noted that more detailed process information for achieving these will be made available through future rounds of public consultation. AP added that given these net zero carbon targets it would not necessarily be an area where statutory consultee input was needed, however, this will still be included in the Scoping Report, which statutory consultees are consulted on. KB noted that it may also be helpful in the meantime to bring some more detailed information on the design principles for the project to the next CWG meeting, and that these have already been developed through working with the Design Council and a range of the project's stakeholders.
7. MS reiterated CJ's point regarding providing input into the TWGs, and also queried why planning permission was not required for the construction of the temporary survey works compound. JB explained the different consents and permits required as part of the DCO process, including discussions as part of the TWGs, planning discussions with the local councils, and other land access licences. JB confirmed Anglian Water has permitted development rights as a statutory undertaker and that this covers temporary works, such as the survey compound, for up to six months without needing to seek planning permission.

8. [REDACTED] (AB) asked whether the previously suggested option of providing a direct access off the A14 was still being considered. KB confirmed that it was and that Anglian Water are currently exploring three main options (as well as a number of sub-options within these) with one of these being access directly off the A14. All are being considered with the TWGs and will be presented for public consultation at phase two.
9. Discussion and agreement of Terms of Reference (ToR). Noted that one suggestion had already be submitted in advance, as reflected in the finalised agenda and ToR circulated with the joining details for the meeting. AB requested the inclusion of a commitment to providing draft minutes within two weeks of each meeting, which was also agreed.
10. Discussion of suggested approaches to agreeing a Chair for the meetings including agreeing a single Chair from among attendees; finding an alternative independent chair; rotating chairing responsibilities among attendees, with the option of parish councils/groups sending an additional delegate when chairing, to ensure they can still fairly participate. Considerations included: the potential benefits of continuity of a single Chair, potential for Anglian Water reimbursement; need for the Chair to be impartial; potential benefit of knowledge of the planning process. Suggestions for finding an alternative Chair included: a local education or business representative; a representative from one of the southern parishes; someone with knowledge of the planning process. KB summarised that consensus was for an independent Chair to be found and in place ahead of the next meeting. Anglian Water will work to identify a suitable candidate based on these discussions and continues to welcome further suggestions in the meantime.
11. [REDACTED] (CD) returned to the question of TWG input. KB agreed to share an update of the TWG schedule and provide updates following TWG meetings with the CWG meetings. [REDACTED] (SB) requested TWGs be held publicly. AP explained the need for statutory consultees to be able to share their balanced views in an unguarded manner without pressure of public opinion or from other interests being present. Democratic input is provided via local council officers. Discussions are also often of a very dense and technical nature i.e. around methodology and data gathering.
12. DY raised similar concern with regards to the design process itself, and lack of transparency around trade offs being made, for example, with cost, and that impacts would be balanced fairly. AP acknowledged that trade offs will have to be assessed and determined by Anglian Water as part of the design process. Although it's never possible to balance all considerations Anglian Water is working hard to get that balance right, and this will also be consulted on, feedback responded to, and decisions examined, through the DCO process. KB added that ensuring trade offs and impacts are balanced fairly is a key consideration of the design process.
13. AB suggested, regarding the timing and frequency of meetings, that CWGs should be presented with a range of options being considered in between phases of

consultation, with materials submitted to CWGs in advance of meetings wherever that is possible. KB added that as well as the timings of meetings additional or more frequent meetings could also be arranged.

14. MS queried whether the DCO programme had slipped as phase two consultation had originally been publicised for spring 2021 and was now taking place in June, and whether Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) will be published as part of this. KB acknowledged that there had been some slippage due to covid disruption and the extension of the phase one consultation but that the final submission of the DCO was still on track. The draft SoCC has been consulted on with local authorities and will be published in early June, two weeks in advance of the consultation launch.
15. Topics and issues for discussion at the next meeting to include: design principles and carbon targets; draft site masterplan with areas of optionality; access options for consideration including a direct slip road off the A14; biodiversity and presence of protected species; archaeology and local heritage including potential for archaeological finds; update on the TWG schedule and outputs.
16. Date for second CWG meeting proposed for end May 2021. Anglian Water to propose a schedule of dates for meetings going forward, alongside a plan of the topics for discussion. KB also extended the offer to arrange any technical briefings on specific topics if helpful. Future CWG meetings to also be held in-person when safe to do so at venues in the local community, and MS noted the need for disability access for these. Disabled access to be made explicit in the ToR.
17. CJ queried whether odour limits will have already been agreed by the TWGs before 17 May. AP clarified that Anglian Water cannot produce the final odour modelling until the site layout and process unit decisions are in place, in line with the IAQM, and limits will be enforced through the DCO. KB noted that more information on this, including the options being explored to limit odour, will be made available as part of phase two consultation.
18. ██████████ (ME) requested that proposed schedule of future meetings be circulated as a matter of priority, to help avoid clashes with parish council meetings. JB added that to aid discussions agenda items would also need to be submitted and agreed in advance.
19. KB concluded by thanking attendees and noting that for future meetings briefing materials would be circulated and a presentation given before wider discussion. For the next meeting Anglian Water will be able to present visual design elements, but otherwise remain open for any other suggestions of topics which attendees would like to receive information on and discuss. Agreed 1.5 hours would be suitable amount of time for next session.
20. **End.**

## Actions



1. Anglian Water to propose a schedule of dates for meetings going forward, alongside a plan of the topics for discussion.
2. Anglian Water to begin approaching potential independent Chair candidates for future meetings and receive further suggestions from attendees before circulating an update on the progress of this ready to agree a Chair to be in place for the next meeting.



# Meeting Note

**Project:** CWWTPR  
**Meeting Title:** Community Working Group (CWG)  
**Date:** Wednesday 02 June 2021  
**Time:** 7:00pm – 8:30pm  
**Format:** Video call  
**Location:** Zoom  
**Attendees:** P [redacted]  
[redacted] Chair); [redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted] (Anglian Water project team); [redacted]  
[redacted] (Stow cum Quy PC); [redacted]  
(Save Honey Hill Group); [redacted] (Lode PC); [redacted]  
[redacted] (Fen Ditton PC); [redacted] (Bottisham PC); [redacted] (Cambridgeshire County Council); [redacted] (South Cambs District Council); [redacted] (Great Wilbraham PC).

## Notes:

1. [redacted] (KB) welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the CWG's nominated independent Chair: Professor Jeremy Sanders.
2. [redacted] (JS) gave an overview of his background and introduced the meeting agenda. JS informed attendees that the materials they are about to see are confidential, and explained the meeting would be structured into sections allowing the Anglian Water Project Team to present information, followed by time allocated for questions and discussion.
3. JS provided an opportunity to comment on the meeting note of the previous Community Working Group meeting, which had been circulated in advance. No comments were raised.

**Presentation Section One: Introduction to phase two consultation, the project's design principles, inspiration and emerging proposals, access and connectivity, and odour.**

4. KB provided an update on the CWWTPR phase two consultation, how this fits within the project programme, and explaining that the upcoming consultation will begin w/c 21<sup>st</sup> June and will last for 8 weeks.
5. KB explained how the National Infrastructure Commission's Principles for a good design; People, Places, Climate and Value underpin the design and how these will be applied to the CWWTPR project.
6. KB also provided an overview of Anglian Water's Design Objectives which have been shaped by the feedback received during phase one consultation.
7. KB informed attendees of the 'landscape-led' approach to the design of the new site. KB noted that potential visual impact was a key concern following phase one consultation and consideration has been given to reduce that impact whilst advancing wildlife habitats.
8. KB informed attendees that the inspiration for the design is also inspired by the local Fen-edge character, past and present, citing local hill forts, such as Fleam Dyke and Devil's Dyke and circular Iron Age hillforts such as the Wandlebury Ring and Belsar's Hill.
9. KB presented the indicative design for consultation including viewpoint and indicative visuals of the facility, and some of the options that Anglian Water (AW) will be looking to receive feedback on.
10. ██████████ (AP) provided an explanation of the proposed improvements to biodiversity and recreational connectivity at the site.
11. ██████████ (MD) presented of the design and engineering solutions for the new facility and explained multiple methods being deployed to minimise odour at source.

### **Questions**

12. JS asked about the extent of odour reduction compared to the current site.
13. MD explained that, while it is difficult to compare due to the age of the existing facility and the differing processes and technologies, Anglian Water (AW) has set itself ambitious targets for odour mitigation.
14. ██████████ (DY) asked how this information can be shared with the community if the presentation materials are confidential.
15. KB explained that the materials are confidential at this stage and other stakeholders are still to be briefed on the proposals that will be coming forward for an 8 week consultation. KB also explained that attendees may verbally discuss the information outside of the CWG, and that all information would become available during the phase two consultation, at which point further meetings can be arranged.
16. ██████████ (MS) asked to clarify the point made regarding nutrients and of the water returned to the River Cam. MS also asked about the use of biofertilizer to farmers.

17. MD explained that AW will be working with the Environment Agency (EA) to agree a new permit, which will set the nutrient level of the water that is returned to the River Cam. MD also explained how the new treatment process will involve a more efficient process to create a biofertilizer which can be used by farmers.
18. [REDACTED] (AB) asked about access from the A14. JS assured AB that traffic and access will be discussed later in the presentation.
19. AB asked whether the facility would have storm lagoon capacity to deal with heavy rainfall.
20. KB informed attendees that the new plant will be designed to hold a higher capacity of storm flows. MD added that AW are still working closely with the EA, to agree storm flow management for the new facility and that it is being designed to be resilient to climate change impacts.
21. [REDACTED] (CD) asked whether AW are confident that the project will be fully funded. JS added to this question with a comment on value engineering.
22. KB explained how the project is funded through the government's Housing Infrastructure Fund and that the @One Alliance engineering team help the project understand the cost of delivery ahead of construction starting. KB explained that the advantage of having the @One Alliance integrated into the team at an early stage gives AW the confidence of delivering the scheme within the allocated funding.
23. [REDACTED] (ME) asked about the height of the earthwork bank and the screening.
24. MD explained that the design details are still being progressed, but indicative height is 7-11m, including the potential further screening on top.
25. [REDACTED] (CJ) asked if on-site lighting would be within the earthwork bank to reduce light pollution.
26. MD confirmed this would be case.
27. CJ asked if rainfall that falls within the bunded area would be moved offsite or processed through the treatment process.
28. MD explained how a mixed approach will be taken to addressing rain that falls within the bunded area, including sustainable drainage solutions.
29. CJ asked a question regarding the odour modelling that has been taking place for the new facility and how it compares to the existing site.
30. MD explained it is difficult to compare the odour models of the existing treatment plant and that of the new facility. This is due to the composition, area and the technologies/ processes used being different. Other factors such as local topography and surface roughness all play a part in affecting the odour models. Due to the new facility being designed from the ground

up and taking into account our odour performance specifications of delivering a negligible impact on sensitive receptors, we are confident that the new plant's performance will achieve this performance criteria as set out in the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidelines.

31. MS asked that if the project is aiming to be carbon net zero, does this include the decontamination of the current site.
32. KB clarified that the focus of carbon net zero will be on the operation of the new site.
33. MS asked who the developers of the new site are.
34. KB explained the @One Alliance, which comprises engineering and construction companies that deliver AW infrastructure across the region.
35. DY raised that, during the first CWG, AW stated that the four villages are being treated equally fairly. DY asked does the odour positioning of the new site reflect this.
36. KB explained how a key design principle is the fairness of the plant and the circular design contributes to that.
37. DY also asked if the shape and size of the site mean that the plant is at its absolute maximum development capacity.
38. KB explained how AW are building a facility that accommodates future growth beyond 2050. KB added that any future expansion of the facility is designed to be accommodated within the bounded area.

#### **Presentation Section Two: Traffic and access, landscape, climate, and carbon**

39. KB continued the presentation by introducing the traffic and access proposals.
40. [REDACTED] (JB) explained three options for permanent vehicle access to the new site: one off junction 34 (Fen Ditton), one off junction 35 (Quy), and another new junction on the north of the A14. JB explained how all three options are subject to further assessment with Highways England and Cambridgeshire County Council, but all three options have been agreed with those organisations to be presented for consultation.
41. AP explained the landscape proposals for the new site, and that these are driven by the three main aims of screening the facility from sensitive viewpoints, increasing biodiversity and providing new opportunities for recreation. AP explained that biodiversity net gain will be significant but not yet calculated as surveys are still ongoing.
42. MD explained the climate and carbon aspirations of the new site, and that AW are working to the Water UK Net Zero 2030 route-map and reducing operational carbon by exporting biomethane to the local medium pressure gas network and looking to utilise renewable energy to power the plant. MD also talked through climate resilience.

## Questions

43. CD raised concerns that the access option selected will be the cheapest one.
44. AP explained how cost is one of many factors being considered including impact on Green Belt, safety of the roads and junctions, impacts on the local road network and biodiversity. AP clarified that the consultation feedback provided by stakeholders and the local community continues to be important to the project.
45. CD asked if AW are in discussion with the Greater Cambridge Partnership regarding the Eastern Access project.
46. KB confirmed that AW are engaged with GCP.
47. ██████████ (JW) asked what would be visible above the earthwork bank at what height.
48. AP conformed that the anaerobic digestors are the tallest element of the facility (up to a maximum of 26m) and would be visible above the earthwork bank. The extent of that would depend on the additional screening being explored in the consultation.
49. CJ asked if attendees could share the traffic and access options with colleagues not at the CWG meeting.
50. KB reiterated that attendees can verbally discuss options however the visual elements are to remain confidential for briefing to all stakeholders.
51. CJ also asked if there was the possibility of rounding the top of the bund, to appear more organic and natural.
52. KB explained how the options presented tonight will be taken to consultation and that AW are seeking feedback on the proposals, including the earthwork bank.
53. CJ also asked about transport access option 1 being different to construction access.
54. JB clarified that preliminary construction works will need to take place on the site before the new access is built, meaning the existing road network will be used, and it being anticipated that Horningsea Road would be used for preliminary works.
55. MS asked to further explain how Horningsea Rd will be used for traffic and access option 1.
56. JB explained how the intention would be to create new road where the top slip road joins Horningsea Rd, meaning you would allow vehicles to access the site straight off Horningsea Rd.

## **Presentation Section Three: Surveys, Technical Working Groups, and phase consultation methods**

57. KB continued with the presentation by providing a description of the surveys that have taken place or are ongoing.
58. MD explained that the geophysical and topographical surveys have now been completed.
59. AP provided a breakdown of the ecology findings from surveys and provided specific information on terrestrial invertebrates. AP explained that AW will be continuing to agree the format of surveys with Natural England later in the summer. AP stated that the reports of the surveys will be reported at consultation phase three in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR).
60. KB provided an update on the Technical Working Groups that have taken place, including traffic and access, water quality, biodiversity and ecology and landscape and heritage.
61. ██████████ (TM) provided a breakdown of the 8-week consultation period. Approximately 9,700 addresses within the core consultation zone will receive consultation leaflet, feedback form, and freepost envelope. Information will also be made available online and at Community Access Points. Free-to-use communications channels will be open for feedback, questions or to request materials in alternative formats, and webinars will be held to provide Q&A opportunities. The consultation will be further publicised through the media, social media, local stakeholders, and those who have registered to be kept updated. TM also stated that the project team are happy to attend additional meetings if requested.
62. JS raised the issue about residents who are digitally deprived.
63. KB explained that AW are monitoring developments about best practices regarding COVID-19 and that AW are in contact with hard-to-reach groups.
64. KB reiterated that consultation will take place **23 June – 18 August**.
65. It was agreed that AW will answer unanswered questions in the meeting note.
66. KB informed attendees that the next CWG will take place in between phase two and phase three consultation.
67. AW to also get in touch with Parish Councils to host consultation documents.
68. **END.**

### **Actions**

1. Provide breakdown of construction and engineering companies forming the @One alliance that will be involved in the development of the new plant.

@One Alliance partners are: MWH, ██████████.

2. Project team to attend local meetings if requested.
3. Answer follow up questions in meeting note.

Please see follow up questions below.

4. AW to get in touch with Parish Councils to organise the facilitation of hosting consultation documents.

---

### Follow up Questions

1. AB asks if you anticipated generating 1765 tonnes Co2 and removing 2461t Co2, do you really mean you have reduced your emission by more than you originally anticipated emitting?

*AW response:* We have managed to reduce our carbon emissions by improving the local gas networks carbon emissions by injecting biomethane into their grid. Therefore, reducing the amount of fossil fuels needed to fulfil their obligations in supplying gas to homes and businesses. This benefit to the gas grid offsets the carbon emissions created by the new facility by the numbers that we presented.

2. AB asks, the route directly eastward from the A14 off slip onto the B1047 is not accurate there is a drop to land on the east side.

*AW response:* We have taken the drop in elevation from the top of the off-slip to the land immediately to its east into account in developing option 1B and the solution would involve some earth movement to create a useable access.

3. AB also asks, if you do consider a direct route on/off the A14 would you have to rotate the orientation of the bund? I.e., would you have to alter to location of the main access point into the bund?

*AW response:* Yes, the point of main access into the bunded area would vary between the three access options.

4. Clive Purbrook (CP) asked, is the relocation of the plant from its current site irreversible? In the latest edition of the Lodestar village magazine there is an item from the Save Honey Hill action group about their wish for the relocation decision to be reversed. I do not get any impression from the liaison group meetings however that this might be on the cards.

*AW response:* The creation of a new, state of the art facility will allow the older treatment plant on Cowley Road to be decommissioned. The need for this is driven from Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils' vision for a new low-carbon city district in North East Cambridge, creating 8,000 new homes and 20,000 jobs over the next 20 years. Closure of the current plant will unlock the regeneration potential of the area which has great walking, cycling and public transport links, including the new Cambridge North station, making it a highly sustainable location for new homes.



You can visit GCPs website: [REDACTED] where there is more information of the wider Area Action Plan consultation.

5. CP also asked, early on in the meeting this evening reference was made to the plan for the section of the disused railway heading NE from the site to be opened up for use by walkers/cyclists etc. and linked up with the existing paths and tracks around Quy, Anglesey Abbey and Lode. Would it also be possible for the section of the disused railway going SW into Cambridge to be used by cyclists etc. so that a new route from the villages into Cambridge was created which could possibly join up with the Chisholm Trail?

*AW response:* We have discussed the public access and connectivity options with a number of stakeholders. We hope that through enabling part of the disused railway to be opened up to public access and connecting that with existing paths, access into Cambridge can be achieved utilising existing rights of way.

6. ME asked, with particular regard to options 1 and 2 for the site access, please could I request that Cambridgeshire Greenways (if they're not already included as part of GCP) and Sustrans are involved in the consultation with regard to traffic crossing cyclepaths?

*AW response:* We are already in dialogue with these stakeholders on the proposals.

7. ME asked, I'd like to understand why, for option 3, access via new junctions from both carriageways has not been considered utilising the existing Honey Hill bridge (as would be required for option 2) to cross back over the A14?

*AW response:* The option of providing access from both carriageways was discussed with Highways England (HE) and Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) as local highways authority. We consider that delivering such a solution would be extremely complex and expensive as well as visually intrusive. The existing Honey Hill bridge would be unlikely to be of a sufficient standard to support direct access to the strategic road network and, in any event, is located relatively close to J35, making a direct access junction in this location unlikely to be acceptable to HE and CCC.

8. ME asked, vis-a-vis the proposed woodland, what species of trees are being considered and how mature would the newly planted trees be? Would you please consider taking input from the local Parish Council Tree Wardens, the National Trust and the Quy Fen Trust on what would be appropriate choices given the local ecology?

*AW response:* Currently we are considering a mix of native species including Wild Cherry, Rowan, Hornbeam, Oak and Wild apple but we intend to consult extensively on this both through the Biodiversity Technical Working Group, which includes the National Trust and Wildlife Trust, and more widely. We would very much welcome the input of the local tree wardens. As we discussed during the meeting, it is our intention to commence some planting at an early stage after consent has been granted to allow screening to mature as soon as possible.





# Meeting Note

**Project:** CWWTPR

**Meeting Title:** Community Working Group (CWG)

**Date:** Monday 13 December 2021

**Time:** 7:00pm – 8:30pm

**Format:** Video call

**Location:** Zoom

**Attendees:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] (Chair); [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] (Anglian Water project team); [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Save Honey Hill Group); [REDACTED] (Fen Ditton PC); [REDACTED] (Cambridgeshire County Council); [REDACTED] (South Cambs District Council); [REDACTED] (Teversham PC); [REDACTED] (Stow-cum-Quy PC).

## Notes:

1. [REDACTED] (JS) welcomed everyone to the meeting and instructed the attendees on the proposed format of this Community Working Group (CWG).
2. [REDACTED] (AP) outlined the process of producing the bubble chart and the 22 criteria that were used to make the decision over traffic and access.
3. [REDACTED] (AB) asked for a further explanation of the bubble chart.
4. AP used the first criteria to explain the size of each bubble representing the weighting of each criteria and their position on the chart relating to how that criteria is applied to each access option.
5. [REDACTED] (MS) asked if Anglian Water have talked to Highways England about the issues with Horningsea Road and consulted the highways authority on all the options presented at phase two consultation.

6. AP clarified that it is a Department for Transport policy that there needs to be no alternative if a new access junction is to be created and added that National Highways (previously Highways England) are aware over the concerns on the network.
7. [REDACTED] (KB) added that there is a focused traffic and transport working group and they were consulted on all the options.
8. [REDACTED] (AR) also raised that Cambridgeshire County Council were also in attendance at the traffic and transport working group and have a good local knowledge of the roads. Both authorities (National Highways and Cambridgeshire County Council) were firmly of the opinion that option 1 was the preferred option in regard to policy.
9. AP continued with presentation with criteria the of the strategic road network and safety of the strategic network and explained that the largest bubbles represented the criteria that were considered more important. AP also added that historical data suggests that there is not a safety impact on the strategic network as a result of increased levels of HGV traffic.
10. [REDACTED] (DY) asked when considering the safety aspects of Option 1, did you consider that when Anglian Water are using the slip road for extensive construction traffic, did you consider back ups of traffic.
11. AR stated that assessments looked at both the junctions for option 1 and modelled at the peak movements of the construction traffic which showed the queues do not come close to backing up to the A14.
12. AB stated that the traffic already does back up on to the A14 and DY added that this would increase with Waterbeach New Town.
13. AR responded in saying the traffic modelling that has been done, when we add in growth and construction traffic, shows those junctions are within the acceptable threshold set.
14. [REDACTED] (KS) also mentioned the construction management plan that is being put in place.
15. AP added that the full traffic modelling data will be available prior to application submission next year and that the project can only at this moment use the modelling and expert opinion that we currently have.
16. [REDACTED] (CD) asked if there is more information that is not related to construction traffic.
17. AP stated that this assessment and the one undertaken at site selection considered construction and operational traffic, the latter being around 90, which is a low number of movements to justify building a new junction.

18. ██████████ (FA) stated that the road already has traffic backup problems and the local MP, Parish Councils, and local Councillors all in favour of a option 3. FA called into question the traffic modelling that had taken place.
19. AP responded in saying that Anglian Water utilise best professional judgement alongside traffic experts from Cambridgeshire County Council and National Highways in stating that option 1 is the viable option. Anglian Water appreciate the public concern over this junction and the evidence base that has been put together will be presented at DCO submission.
20. AP continued the presentation talking about impacts on capacity of local road network. AP clarified that a new access road would not have been built for construction.
21. ██████████ stated that Anglian Water should seek to find a solution that does not greatly impact the local community considering the national importance of the project.
22. AP stated that the challenge of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects is the challenge of mitigating impacts on the local community, and you mitigate what you can in the costings of the project.
23. KB clarified further that there is not enough evidence to go against policy.
24. MS stated that according to the phase two consultation summary report, you do not specify whether option 1a and 1b will be chosen.
25. AP responded in saying that Anglian Water are not currently in a position to decide between the two at this time as there are ongoing assessments, but in February there will be more details available for phase three consultation.
26. KB added that this will be on the agenda in the CWG set to take place in January.
27. AP continued with the presentation, discussion the criteria of safety of the local road network.
28. CJ raised that from the previous CWG it seemed clear that the preference was for option 1b.
29. AP clarified that Anglian Water have yet to confirm that formally.
30. AB raised that somewhere the indication was given that if you were to do option 3 it would create unusual movements into a junction but that rat-running would not be expected to take place.
31. AR stated that there was concern over long term movements into a new junction.
32. AB added that there is no reason to rat run but wanted to clarify that that justification was spurious.
33. AP clarified that it is not an issue that Anglian Water have considered for the decision.

34. AP presented detail on the criteria of local amenity and operational management.
35. AB asked if Anglian Water have currently got traffic counters out at present on Cowley road and in Waterbeach.
36. AR responded that surveys have been carried out in the whole vicinity of the proposed site. The extent of the surveys was agreed with the local Highways authority and does not believe that we are doing any at the moment as December is not classified as a neutral month.
37. AP presented the criteria of construction cost.
38. AB raised that option 1b it is relatively high compared to the surrounding landscape, meaning a steep slip road up to the junction and wondered about this particular impact of noise and visibility.
39. AR clarified the height difference of 5 metres.
40. DY raised that this area is the highest point in the area meaning that it will be difficult to address landscape mitigation of the facility itself from this point.
41. AP clarified that there will be considerable screening and the view will not be immediate.
42. DY raised that any trees used for mitigation will have to be at least 5 metres tall.
43. [REDACTED] (JB) clarified that each option would have visual impacts and added that terms of disturbance to the wider area of greenbelt option 1 was preferable and that Anglian Water were interested in the concentration effect of any activity.
44. AP presented the criteria of the programme, public rights of way, air quality, land requirements, land severance and existing accesses.
45. AB raised her concerns about the resident at the Gatehouse and hope that the project would wish to improve her access.
46. [REDACTED] (KT) clarified that Anglian Water are in discussions with the resident and are working to make sure the impact is minimal.
47. AP presented the criteria of visual impact and greenbelt openness, biodiversity and heritage assets.
48. CJ raised that it was his understanding that part of the area had been used for borrow pits to construct the A14 and was restored afterwards.
49. AP/KB stated that the project are to look into the survey works that had taken place along the A14.
50. CD wanted to know in what ways have Anglian Water investigated potential heritage assets.

51. AP stated that geophysical surveys and trial digging have already taken place to help inform Environmental Impact Assessment.
52. AP presented the criteria of capital carbon and operational carbon.
53. JS asked what the timescale in moving HGVs from diesel to natural gas is.
54. KB committed to find a more specific date for this out and AP reminded the group of Anglian Waters commitment to net-zero by 2030 so will be before then.
55. AP presented criteria of s42 stakeholder responses.
56. CD noted that SCDC preferred option 3 as did Anna Bradnam as County Councillor.
57. AP presented the criteria of s.47 stakeholder responses and a final summary of the bubble chart and presented the favoured criteria between each option.
58. AP summarised that the criteria that favoured option 1 included operational management, construction cost, programme, air quality, land requirements, visual impact, capital carbon, operational carbon and s.42 consultation responses. The criteria that favoured option 3 included capacity of local road network, safety of local road network, local amenity, heritage assets, s.47 consultation responses and Political / reputational risk. AP added that four criteria were equally balanced between option 1 and option 3 including PROWs, severance, existing accesses and biodiversity – all of these were considered to be of only minor or moderate importance.
59. AP clarified that the examiners of the DCO submission will ask what alternatives were considered.
60. CJ questioned the weighting of each criteria on the bubble chart.
61. AP clarified that there were four sizes used for the bubbles and that the chart was put together as part of the professional assessment that was undertaken.
62. Francis question whether the option 3 can be defined as a new junction and how this is related to the current layby on the A14.
63. AR clarified that if you required a development off the strategic road network it would fall under the classification of a junction and that Anglian Water are not able to go with the suggestion that we can use the layby.
64. CD requested that the group revisit the criteria that were favoured for each access option.
65. AP showed the criteria that were preferable for each access option and clarified that it is not one single issue but multiple in combination that contribute to the decision.

66. MS asked if, when Anglian Water talks about Option 3 and refers to the Department for Transport policy supported by National Highways and Cambridgeshire County Council, are you the only ones that think Option 1 is a viable alternative?
67. AP clarified that the decision is supported by NH and CCC, and the community is welcome to put forward an alternative when the DCO submission takes place.
68. FA stated that in Teversham, the community have had another consultation, they are building two types of roads, one temporary and one permanent and that she could not see a difference between those two roads and the one being proposed by Anglian Water. Adding that this is to do with cost and not the other criteria.
69. AR clarified that the decision has been made as A14 is at highest hierarchy of strategic road network by being important to the whole UK economy and that this is not the case for the roads such as Airport Way as FA suggested.
70. DY raised that regarding the safety for option 3, the layby currently seems unsafe and it looks possible that this could be changed if building a new access option.
71. AP stated that Anglian Water do not believe that this is the case.
72. DY added that this is an NSIP and a unique project and this access decision should consider this.
73. AP presented information on storm flows and that Anglian Water will present more info at phase three consultation. Stated that the facility will plan for growth in line with the Greater Cambridge Local Plan and further onto 2050. Onwards there will be space within the rotunda facility to expand to be resilient up to 2080s in terms of climate change.
74. JB added that as part of the design process the project are trying to put tighter parameters on those years based in the factors considered and are trying to work out the long-end capacity and that this work is still in hand.
75. KT added that the figures do include the known growth from Waterbeach.
76. CJ raised that the Scoping Report said that capacity is set at 250,000 or 300,000 and wanted to know when will the project decide the capacity.
77. AP stated that this will be done at the point of submission.
78. CJ raised concern over Waterbeach as at the moment the village has a sewage flooding problem and does not want the effluent flooding at the new facility.

This was later followed up with a series of emails between CJ and AW project team regarding potential sewage flooding risk at the new facility.



79. KT stated that Anglian Water are doing significant strong modelling with the Environment Agency to work out storm capacity, including the Waterbeach numbers. We are estimated to be resilient to 1/100 year events.
80. KT clarified that the purpose of the CSO design is to protect the network. We are working at solving the problems in the network to stop that problem.
81. AP presented information on odour mitigation that is being looked at for the facility.
82. AP stated that Anglian Water have modelled using the assumptions to meet those in the IAQM guidance.
83. Based on a question previously submitted by DY regarding the distance between the villages and the centre of the facility. AP clarified that Anglian Water have never committed to sharing the odour out between villages. But can show you the distance between villages.
84. AP added that further odour mitigation and technology details will be available post-submission.
85. AB raised that it is odd that issues over odour comes after consent.
86. AP clarified that Anglian Water will provide a level of deliverability, but technology comes later. Some of this comes through design and some of this is done with technologies later down the line. Odour levels will be judged by the examiners.
87. KB/JB added that the project team are confident that the technology will meet the criteria on odour now and that technology should improve in the future. And that it is the environmental technology officer for South Cambridgeshire District Council who is responsible for setting parameters.
88. DY questioned the opportunity to position the centre of facility within the wider site area.
89. AP clarified that Anglian Water have never accepted the proposal that impact should be shared between the villages and the project have concentrated on taking odour away from sensitive receptors and are confident that Anglian Water have chosen a site that meets that. Adding that the project team have always sought that villages are outside the sensitive receptors and have achieved that.
90. MS to follow up PINS Scoping query.
91. END.

#### **Actions**

1. Anglian Water to find out a more specific date for vehicle decarbonisation.
2. Anglian Water to look into the survey works that had taken place along the A14.
3. Margaret Starkie to follow up with PINS Scoping query if needed.
4. Anglian Water to provide dates to when traffic studies were undertaken.

5. Anglian Water to clarify weightings used in the bubble chart.

#### **Follow Up**

1. Regarding operational traffic (17), this has been confirmed as 119 daily movements into and 119 daily movements out of the facility, 73 of which will be HGVs.
2. Regarding the dates of traffic flow surveys (36), AR later confirmed that surveys took place between 29 November – 08 December and added that approval to extend the data collection into December was agreed with the Local Highways Authority.



# Meeting Note

**Project:** CWWTPR

**Meeting Title:** Community Working Group (CWG)

**Date:** Thursday 13 January 2022

**Time:** 3:30 – 5:00pm

**Format:** Video call

**Location:** Zoom

**Attendees:** [redacted]  
[redacted] (Chair); [redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted] (Anglian Water project team); [redacted]  
[redacted] (Save Honey Hill Group); [redacted]  
(Fen Ditton PC); [redacted]  
(Teversham PC); [redacted]  
[redacted] (Stow-cum-Quy PC); [redacted]  
[redacted] (Horningsea Parish Council);

## Meeting Note

1. [redacted] (JS) started the meeting with apologies from Councillors [redacted] and [redacted] and [redacted]. JS also noted the correction required for point 66 from the previous CWG minutes raised by [redacted] (MS).
2. [redacted] (CJ) raised another correction from the previous CWG. [redacted] (KB) confirmed that these corrections will be made and the amended minutes will be resent.
3. [redacted] (AR) presented slides on traffic access and associated mitigations. Confirming that HGVs will not travel through villages of Horningsea and Fen Ditton, they will be prohibited from using Horningsea Road north of Low Fen Drove Way and that only limited construction HGV traffic necessary to build the transfer pipeline will use Horningsea Rd south of Junction 34, turning off prior to the village.
4. AR added that a Construction Traffic Management Plan, Operational Traffic Management Plan, Green Travel Plan and Highway improvements will be developed with stakeholders including Cambridgeshire County Council and National Highways.

5. AR presented slides based on option 1b, access off existing signalised junction of slip off A14, becoming a four arm signalised junction, in order to build the road and associated improvements. Enabling works are estimated to take four months, construction traffic will use Horningsea Road below Low Fen Drove Way to build a new access road. AR presented the vehicle movements during that enabling works period.
6. AR confirmed that after the enabling period, the new permanent site access will be open and will then be used by HGVs.
7. AR presented information on the transfer pipeline, and that construction traffic that will be required for it, showing a route south of the junction, turning into the site before the village.
8. AR presented a slide on highways mitigation proposals, with traffic heading into the facility, going straight over the slip road and left on the way out. Local Highways Authority and Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) are looking at improvements to the footway on the westside of Horningsea Road. Between Low Fen Drove Way and the junction, Anglian Water want to provide a pedestrianised island. This will allow for safe movement for pedestrians and cyclists to cross.
9. AR advised that there will also be a footway/cycleway on the east side, that makes it safe for people to cross and link in with proposed site network.
10. AR confirmed that from Low Fen Drove Way to A14, Anglian Water want to improve the existing footway/cycleway, increasing it to 3 metres wide and provide a 1 metre buffer strip to the carriageway.
11. AR added that the new four arm junction will include a left turn only out of the site with islands to facilitate this.
12. AR confirmed that the footway/cycleway widening will also happen on the southern section of the road.
13. AR presented proposals for the overbridge, this section will also increase width to 3 metres with a 1 metre buffer strip. To facilitate this Anglian Water are looking to shift the carriageway to the east and make use of the existing tarmacked verge, meaning a smaller offset on the carriageway and eastern parapet.
14. AR added that a proposal is to make changes to the alignment of Horningsea Rd and widen footway/cycleway. There is engagement with GCP team on Horningsea Greenway to ensure plans align with.
15. AR provided information on the existing speed limits that vary on the road, in the villages it is 30 mph limit, a section of 40 mph south of Horningsea, it then goes to the national 60 mph. Anglian Water want to reduce this to 40 mph. AR stated that the recent traffic survey just south of Low Fen Drove Way showed that 85<sup>th</sup> percentile of vehicles drive no faster than 42 – 45 mph. Therefore, a reduction to a 40 mph speed limit would not be too impactful for those already using the road, this reduction should also see safety improvements to those using the footway/cycleway.

16. [REDACTED] (KT) added that the Greater Cambridge Partnership's (GCP) early designs will be presented in March, therefore the GCP are further behind in their designs but are further ahead in delivery.
17. [REDACTED] (MS) stated that it appears that traffic will be coming out of the site, turning left then travelling over the bridge then right. MS asked that as construction traffic is very heavy, are you doing anything to the bridge?
18. AR confirming that Anglian Water do not expect any issues with the weight of HGV traffic in relation to the bridge.
19. MS asked if option 1b will go into phase three consultation.
20. AR confirmed that option 1b is the preferred option.
21. Karen Barclay (KB) added that the third phase of consultation will go ahead with these current proposals for the formal statutory consultation period.
22. CJ stated that he welcomed the amount of detail and thinking that has gone into the proposals, particularly the idea that AW will set back the pathway, this is very welcome. CJ suggested that a 'no left turn' sign should be erected on Horningsea Rd just north of the junction to make sure that there is a legal obligation for people to abide by the rules, meaning much less interference at the junction for traffic turning right to head to Cambridge. CJ added that it would be helpful if for northbound traffic, there is a 'no right turn' sign into the junction from the south.
23. AR confirmed that these current traffic flows are what is proposed.
24. CJ reiterated that a sign would help it be enforceable.
25. CJ asked that as the proposals show a right turn access off Horningsea Road within the Parish of Fen Ditton to get pipeline access underway, were AW thinking of using filly lane byway or a separate access?
26. **AR confirmed that Anglian Water are looking at using a separate access, stating that he would prefer for it to be a haul road but will double check.**
27. CJ added that a haul road would mean less interference with Fen Ditton.
28. [REDACTED] (DY) asked, if AW are going to prohibit left and right turns for HGVs, would this also be applied to non-HGV vehicles?
29. CJ added that they would have to follow same path as the HGVs, this would stop people turning from High Ditch Rd or short cutting through villages.
30. AR confirmed that this would be the case.

31. ██████████ asked, does this mean that 1b is the only option for consultation. I'm not sure about the focus on widening on the cycle lane, difficult to get to the school if you will have to spend time constructing any widening on the footway/cycleway. Also, the road is too small for HGVs. FA also asked why wasn't the widening done in the first place?
32. KB clarified that at con 2 Anglian Water consulted on the three options and have made our decision. KB added that of the two variants that are proposed, Anglian Water have got the message that 1b is preferred, working better for community impact perspective. Anglian Water are interested to hear people's thoughts on if we should still consult on option 1a.
33. AR added that Anglian Water concentrated on improvements to the cycleway/footway based on Con 2 feedback received over HGV movements for the facility, recognising that it is a key route to school from Horningsea to Fen Ditton Primary School. In terms of closing the footway/cycleway, we expect to maintain a footway/cycle route whilst improvement works are taking place. AR added that we cannot comment on the previous design, but are following guidance of 'LTN120' which is a comprehensive design guide which has raised the bar over the facilities for pedestrians. Our proposals are now compliant with LTN120.
34. AR added that in terms of widening the carriageway for HGVs, it is already 7.3 metres wide, more than sufficient for two way movements of HGVs. Horningsea Rd does narrow significantly north of Low Fen Drove Way, but this is outside the area we are looking at in terms of improvements to cycleway/footway.
35. ██████████ added that in relation to the Greenways initiative, we must be mindful of Horningsea Greenway in our proposals. It is about trying to secure a modal shift towards working and cycling. Horningsea has mind towards strategic links from Waterbeach New Town. GCP are currently looking at increased standard of cycling and walking facilities.
36. MS stated that there is no connection for a Greenway from Waterbeach New Town to Horningsea. We wanted that but there is currently no way of cycling between the two towns. Coming back to what FA said over existing cyclway, when it was put in, one of the conditions was that the bus would be withdrawn. I am glad on a personal level you are going to widen it.
37. JB clarified that he did not imply that there was a Waterbeach greenway, but there is an expectation that the cycling route will take more traffic on.
38. CJ stated that there is a fine row of trees north of the junction. Going back to Con 2, on the access map there was a second access shown to get to the Waterbeach pipeline access, has this now been dropped?
39. AR added that in terms of the pipeline, that would you use the same access (south of A14). North of the A14 the Waterbeach pipeline would need an access off Horningsea Road but this is dependent on the programme. If the programme is ahead of the main enabling works then its own separate access would have to be built in the vicinity of Low Fen Drove Way.
40. AR added that there is a preference for option 1b over 1a, due to having a lesser impact on Horningsea Road due to its shorter length than 1a. 1a would also widen the road due to the ghost island junction. Having a site access under signal control reduces the conflicts with

different turning movements. 1b also respects the existing weight limits. These are the main considerations for preferring 1b over 1a.

41. DY asked regarding the arrangements north of the bridge, is Low Fen Drove going to be used for the Waterbeach pipeline access?
42. AR stated that it will travel from Waterbeach to the site then across to existing site, there will be a site access to the south of the southern signalized junction prior to entering Fen Ditton.
43. DY asked is the access you showed just before Low Fen Drove a temporary access?
44. AR clarified that after the four-month period of enabling works, all site traffic will then use main access.
45. DY asked will Low Fen Drove change appearance?
46. AR confirmed that whatever changes are needed to be made to Low Fen Drove, this will be returned to its existing state following its use as a temporary access.
47. MS asked if this will have any impact on the bus shelter and bus stop on Low Fen Drove, which is owned by Horningsea Parish Council.
48. AR stated that we have looked at the timetables that is used in the area, two in morning and evening Monday to Friday. AR wanted to know as this shelter is not on the official list of stops, is this bus stop used?
49. MS clarified that she has asked, in the two years in which MS was looking at it, it had been used only once. But added that it has to be recognised that there might be people at Biggin Abbey who want to use it in the future.
50. AR added that our proposals do not affect the structure itself but will need to look in more detail at the topographical survey.
51. For information, DY added that the bus shelter was built in 1926 for those who lived in and around Biggin Abbey.
52. KB sought further clarification over preference for 1a or 1b.
53. DY stated that option 3 is his real preference but does prefer 1b over 1a.
54. CJ agreed from the point of view of Fen Ditton Parish Council.
55. ██████████ (RS) stated that we received the Scoping Opinion back from the Planning Inspectorate at the end of November, Natural England's response was received late but it has been considered. We are going to be taking on the points made where relevant for the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). Local wildlife sites that were omitted have been reintroduced and the original viewpoints have also been refined.

56. MS stated that the inspectors did pick up on various points. One being the transition from the existing site to the new facility. Other DCOs have regulations that protect the environment.
57. MS added that she will quote the actual schedule in an email.
58. MS asked will AW apply the flood resilience change rating tool.
59. KT clarified that we are currently working with the Environment Agency over what methodology they want us to use.
60. MS added that in the Environment Act 2021 there is 10% increase in biodiversity, the City Council has just adopted that all new developments will adopt this, and South Cambridgeshire District Council will produce a similar one. MS added that the guidance they are giving is in excess of 10%, I wondered if the comments that have come back has meant AW commit to more than 10% net biodiversity gain.
61. KB clarified that we are aiming for in excess of 10% and are confident that this will be achieved. We are still defining the landscape plan to have more detailed information.
62. RC added that more information regarding this will be available at phase 3 consultation but this is a planning issue not a Scoping Issue.
63. MS stated that she is keen that this is going to be net gain considering the loss of greenbelt.
64. KS confirming that it will be a net gain.
65. JB added that biodiversity net gain essentially looks at biodiversity with a score of the existing site and make an assessment to what is required to achieve net gain.
66. CJ raised that previously in a discussion over net gain based on DEFRA methodology, are you seeking to provide a replacement to the existing biodiversity at the Milton facility.
67. JS added that the community are wary that there is not a gap in biodiversity measurements between the two works.
68. [REDACTED] (MD) clarified that our baseline assessments does include the existing site, when we finish and decommission that gets handed over to the new developers. We will include for any units within the current area and add that to the overall net-gain biodiversity. Then they will make their own assessments when building on the existing sites.
69. CJ stated that this is very reassuring.
70. CJ raised that RC referred to a potential list of viewpoints and that he would like to see that as soon as possible, there has been a lot of work done to identify places where we believe there is public visibility.



- 71. RC stated that there will be a map with dots on and we can action that to show the attendees.**
72. CJ stated that we have asked that when the odour mitigation is being considered, you will put forward your interpretations of negligible. What happens when the other 5% of the time is not taken into account, and north-east wind would mean a strong odour in Musgrave Way. I would like you to account for those more extreme cases.
- 73. KB stated that we will take this away to look at.**
74. MD added that when modelling for odour, the worst day in every four years is used.
75. KS presented information on phase three consultation. Aim is for that to take place in mid-February, and will be an 8-week consultation on new landscape designs and new site design, mitigations and PEIR. Free to use information lines. Looking to a mix of digital and face-to-face, we will continue to do the digital as has shown strong response. KS added that we do want to do face-to-face. Likely to be March time we will look how comfortable the community are in light of Covid.
76. CJ stated that he can speak to Parish Council on this, welcome digital engagement due to those outside of the area. Previously FDPC are keen on doing face-to-face but will put this to PC at beginning of Feb for organising a date in March.
77. MS raised the new figure for consultation of 10,600+ properties.
78. KS clarified that we have now slightly extended the core consultation zone to include southern houses on Newmarket Rd and Meadowlands Rd.
79. KB added that we still welcome feedback from outside the core consultation zone.
80. MS asked, will phase three consultation include the PEIR or draft Environmental Statement (ES)?
81. KB stated that it will include PEIR but not draft ES, we are also looking at ways to make this available for a non-technical audience.
82. DY asked if Anglian Water can check if Marleigh is in the core consultation zone.
83. DY asked if during phase three will there be an opportunity to see a demonstration of odour and the assessments alongside mitigations. We have not seen anything about how the designs on how odour mitigation will take place so we can be reassured.
84. MD clarified that in the consultation 2 leaflet we did identify areas of design but we will be taking that detail in the next phase of consultation. We will certainly be showing how odour mitigation will take place.

85. DY asked, are you still going to position the odorous elements in the centre when the facility grows?
86. MD said, yes this certainly will be taken into account.
87. KB raised that we can arrange a later meeting on odour mitigation.
88. Ray Jakes asked that the towers are going to be 6-metres less, why is this?
89. MD clarified that the two towers will be slightly wider, from between 19 – 20-metres and a maximum of 20-metres high.
90. MS stated that some of our members have asked about current work taking place, will there be new tunnelling and pipeline work to change the area.
91. KT clarified that in relation to the Fen Ditton pipeline replacement scheme, this is just being replaced to prevent future potential bursts but there will be no new pumping station but improvements. This would be taking place independent of the relocation project.
92. CJ added that this is a much better solution that this is going under the river.
93. Regarding point 82, ██████████ (ZI) showed a map of consultation zone and explained the extension on Newmarket Rd.
94. JB stated that we can get information through Hill to inform new house owners in Marleigh of the relocation project.
95. CJ added that there is a community enabler on Marleigh who may be worth getting in touch with.
96. DY stated that we would like to see in consultation three some reassurance to how the planting will be organized, especially on the bund which would struggle to retain water. Could we have a demonstration on the technology that will prevent tree failure on the earthwork bank?
97. KB responded in saying that is already in train.
98. MS raised that she attended the meeting of scrutiny of City Council transport and planning committee for NECAAP. They gave updates on benefits of the relocation site, can we see them?
99. ██████████ (DS) to insert these responses to councillors in the meeting minutes.
1. MS asked that that if the consultation will be mid February, what impact does this have on the rest of the timeline?
  2. KB stated that we are broadly on track with the programme, we hope to commence in mid-February. Submission of DCO itself will take place in the autumn.

3. JS asked when will the next CWG be.
  4. KS stated that the next CWG to take place following con 3 and when we have feedback analysis ready, around June.
  5. KB added that we will be back in contact to see what works for the community.
  6. CJ, RJ and FA all agreed that a meeting around this time would be appreciated.
  7. JS thanked for attendance and helpful dialogue.
  8. END.
- 

### **Actions**

1. Amend previous CWG minutes with amends from MS and CJ.
  2. AR to double check where the pipeline access location will be.
  3. RC to share public visibility viewpoint map.
  4. Look into severe odour cases potentially impacting Musgrave Way.
  5. Explore contact with HILL or AW internally about providing project materials to incoming residents.
  6. Share answers given to councillors about AAP with CWG (See below).
  7. Arrange next meeting following phase three consultation and prior to DCO submission.
- 

### Questions and Answers about AAP

1. AW have a declared commitment to get to net zero carbon by 2030 – and I assume the new plant is significantly better in terms of its operational performance/carbon footprint than the current facility?

*Correct – becoming operationally carbon net zero by 2030 is one of Anglian Water’s key strategic objectives as a business, which aligns under this commitment with the water industry as a whole. The new facility will be operationally net zero and it will significantly reduce both process emissions and capital carbon against a 2010 baseline through the use of innovative construction and wastewater treatment technologies along with renewable energy. Biogas would be either used to operate the plant, with excess electricity exported to the grid, or the biogas itself would be exported to assist with the decarbonisation of the gas grid.*

2. The existing treatment facilities at Waterbeach are not adequate for the new town and additional capacity therefore needs to be created in this area to address that – and potentially additional forecast growth – either at the existing site or new plant?

*Correct, all Waterbeach flows will be transferred to the new facility and in the event that does not progress, they will be transferred and treated at the existing Milton facility.*

3. The existing site has a significant issue with storm water flows and the combined sewer systems which the new plant will seek to address – particularly important as rainfall intensity and water quality issues are growing in significance/frequency?

*Not correct to say the existing facility has a significant issue with storm water flows. The existing facility has experienced 'flow compliance' issues under storm conditions balancing flows for immediate treatment and stormwater storage using existing infrastructure. These historic limitations are known and understood by the EA and would be resolved by the design at the new facility. Additionally, the Combined Sewer Overflow (there is one on the incoming tunnel sewer to Milton) has in the past operated in storm conditions – again as it is permitted to do. The new facility is being designed to deliver far greater resilience in storm conditions. The details of the design are being discussed and agreed with the EA. We anticipate this will mean the CSO would be unlikely to operate in all but the most extreme storm conditions, so the likelihood of spills to the River Cam would be significantly reduced. Waste water will also be treated to a higher quality compared to the existing facility therefore improving the quality of the effluent discharged to the river Cam compared to today.*



# Meeting Note

**Project:** CWWTPR

**Meeting Title:** Community Working Group (CWG)

**Date:** Tuesday 28<sup>th</sup> June 2022

**Time:** 3:30 – 5:00pm

**Format:** Zoom video call

**Attendees:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] (Anglian Water project team); [REDACTED] (Chair); [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

## Notes:

1. Introduction and apologies from [REDACTED] (JS).
2. Further information and housekeeping from [REDACTED] (KB), including Anglian Water (AW) to share the note following the meeting.
3. KB presented the Agenda.
4. KB thanked attendees for their engagement and feedback for phase three consultation. AW have been carefully considering the feedback received from stakeholders.
5. [REDACTED] (KS) highlighted the key themes of consultation and general conclusions of the feedback, which included landscape and visual, recreation, gateway building, discovery centre, carbon, odour, traffic and construction.
6. [REDACTED] (MS) wanted to know how many comments there had been on transfer tunnel and Waterbeach pipeline and wanted further info on plant design.
7. KB stated that AW have information on the later slides and specifically regarding transfer tunnel.
8. [REDACTED] (AB) wanted to check format of the meeting, asking if AW will be accepting questions after each section.
9. KB confirmed that this is what is planned.
10. [REDACTED] (CM) stated that she did not directly receive a CWG invite and asked if this directly went to the Parish Council.

11. ██████████ confirmed that it went directly to the Parish Councils.
12. ██████████ (DY) asked how AW assess the impact of visual impact of the facility
13. ██████████ (DS) stated that this is assessed through the professional guidance of an independent regulator.
14. ██████████ (AP) clarified that AW want to go through how they have responded to the feedback and confirmed that AW have not changed the bund height of 5 metres, due to cut and fill balance. But have reduced building heights so that the gap between the roof, ground level and bund is significantly better. The digestors and stack height remain highest points of the project but other buildings have come down significantly.
15. AP presented specific heights of changes in selected building heights.
16. AP stated that AW have also being working hard on the colour palette, which will form part of the review in the examination stage and will be finally approved by the LA following consent.
17. AP presented further updates to the photomontages, much lower profile of buildings on show and what they will now look like following maturing. To share following the meeting.
18. AP referred to the negative feedback regarding High Ditch Rd visualisation. AW investigated options of further offsite planting. It was discovered that any planting would impact agricultural operations over any mitigation it would have from that section.
19. DY stated that the most disturbing montage is from the A14 at road level.
20. KB said we will be updating all photomontages for examination.
21. DY questioned that some of the buildings presented at phase three consultation have not been mentioned.
22. DS confirmed that some buildings have been removed and incorporated into other parts of the facility.
23. KB confirmed that the digestor towers remain at 20m at its worst case scenario. Ground level should lower this by half to 1 metre.
24. ██████████ (CJ) welcomed the fact the some of reductions can be made within the site but asked about the reduction in heights of the smaller buildings. (e.g., 8-9 metres).
25. AP confirmed that a 9 metre tall building should be around 3 metres above the bund so would not have a particularly significant impact on the landscape.
26. CJ stated that there were approx. 10 or 15 of these structures above the bund height, and was wondering why the bund wasn't above these heights.

27. AP confirmed that local authority feedback was concerned with the landscape impact of the bund itself, stating that we received strong officer views about the alien nature and environment.
28. MS asked regarding Horningsea Road, this will not be a fleeting glance for most people and also used by cyclists and pedestrians. It would appear from the angle you have taken, did you take any photo/montages from extreme southern end of the road?
29. AP clarified that AW got heavily criticised for showing a hedge across here last time round, we can explore hedging along the viewpoint. Photomontages include 18 viewpoints will be in the Environmental Statement will include Horningsea Road.
30. [REDACTED] (CD) said she would like to see a clearer view of the 5 metre bund. You have shown trees at 15 years, will you be planting young trees and is that because of issues around growth.
31. DS stated that young trees establish more effectively and have a greater success rate.
32. JS added that it does matter how young in consideration of the failed trees next to the A14.
33. AP added there will be a mix of tree ages but will come back to it later.
34. [REDACTED] (CH) stated that the houses living along the edge of the visualisation will still see the facility and that it will show more in the winter.
35. AP added that AW can only do montages from publicly accessible land, but there will be engagement with landowners over visual mitigation.
36. [REDACTED] (FA) asked that the sky in the visualisation is grey, what about with a blue sky
37. AP clarified that based on the landscape institute guidance, the buildings will likely stand out more and that it is very difficult to fit a palette to variations in the British weather.
38. CM asked why couldn't you lower the ground level more than a metre/half a metre.
39. DS clarified that there were many reasons for this, including some groundwater considerations and further hydraulic system issues with deeper facility, cost and carbon.
40. CM asked if there a contamination issue?
41. AP added that the whole site is primarily gravity driven, also cost of excavation had to be considered.
42. CJ disagreed with the hydraulics argument and that it is simpler from his point of view.
43. AP added that it is a balance of multiple considerations.

44. CM added that there didn't seem to be planting on Horningsea Road.
45. AP clarified that there is planting along Horningsea Road but didn't want to show people just a thick hedge.
46. AB wanted to point out that I think you misunderstood what Cllr Hofman said, if you had a quiet word with the farmers to leave the hedges to grow taller that will have a quicker effect than any planting.
47. AP clarified that he understood that but we do not have a relationship with them and are not able to request them to do that.
48. KB added that it is one to take away in our engagement with landowners.
49. AB added that young saplings survive better given the right soil conditions whereas on new land with subsoil layers they would not thrive. Would this be the case on this project?
50. AP agreed and stated that information will form part of the LERMP, AW have also increased the management plan in there to ensure that the new trees are managed properly.
51. DY added that he made a general point in my response to the consultation, both if the tallest and most odorous buildings are at the centre of the facility.
52. AP clarified that the latest layout has not changed significantly as the most odorous remain in the middle and the tallest elements in the least significantly impactful location.
53. DY added that in the con 3 doc you showed an odour map not shown before.
54. AP confirmed that regarding odour, AW wanted to make sure straight away that the odour contour was correctly placed, then did the stand off between the three villages to ensure parity.
55. AP presented info regarding more rectilinear lanting following comments from LA officers, aligning this planting with existing roads and ditches to allow views across the grassland areas of the site area. Showed updated masterplan, including information on native planting trees. The planting is as dense as possible whilst fitting in with existing character of the landscape.
56. AB asked regarding the existing trees along western side of LFDW that provide a good screen. Will the trees be protected?
57. AP clarified that the access is a short section on LFDW, in the construction plan there is information to show that there will not be impacts to trees and hedgerows.



58. AP presented gateway building information and that the feedback received during phase three consultation was mixed. But the bridge structure, car parking and massing felt inappropriate according to feedback.
59. AP presented evolution of the gateway building, car parking moved away, removal of the bridge structure. Access to the bund will be from one side of the visitor centre. Frontage will be lower and massing less impactful. Still work to do with stakeholders through examination and thereafter. Will also be solar panels on the roof and a less obtrusive visitor car park.
60. AP confirmed that a lot of the buildings have solar panels and green roofs.
61. DY asked if the bund is used to visual mitigation, why is this building not within the bund?
62. AP clarified that this building is a key part of the design, it is significantly less conspicuous and there are operational purposes for having a building within the bund.
63. KB added we also received other positive feedback regarding educational purposes that will be accessible within this building.
64. AP added that this will be an interesting part of examination, AW will have to justify why it is not within the bund.
65. AP regarding FA comment provided in the chat, antisocial behavior is managed well on our estate. We will be able to restrict people as it is private land. CCTV car park, bund will be managed as we manage the rest of our estate.
66. ██████████ presented information on the updated odour assessment following the changes to the design. Stating that the bund impacts the flow of air within the facility but does not contribute towards odour mitigation. Presented 5 year meteorological data and wind rose data to determine worst case. Working on developing preliminary odour management plan. Also sets out what is predicted for the existing works. A sniff test has been undertaken across the area by an independent organisation and trying to respond to comments about odour units.
67. AB added that in her experience of wind rose data, it shows direction from which it comes, showing that odour will be more prevalent to the north east of the facility.
68. DS clarified that wind rose is showing prevailing wind but the modelling is selecting out an individual worst case.
69. KB added that it shows it is very contained and negligible level not impacting local homes.
70. DS presented information on updates to shaft 4, relocated further east and will be temporary, following reinstatement there will not be a vent there.
71. DS presented information on construction management. There will also be change to scheme order limits, including minor modifications regarding Waterbeach construction.

72. AB stated that Burgess Road not easily accessible.
73. DS said that there will be maintenance of the access to fill pot holes and deal with ruts.
74. AP added that AW have raised this following feedback, they have assessed that and with a few amends they are happy. Pipeline constructions tend to take place in more difficult places.
75. MS stated regarding Hartridges Ln, it is narrow and you cannot get a low loader down there, it would require parking on the verge opposite. You also talk about it being a single public highway, are you sure about that? It is also not named Clayhithe Farm.
76. JS stated that questions can be sent in the chat and responded to after as the meeting is nearing its end and there is more material to get through.
77. ██████████ (EM) presented information on what happens after the application gets submitted. Preparing for Autumn / Winter DCO submission.
78. EM notified attendees that there will be a targeted consultation following small changes to the scheme order limits. Will be consulting landowners and prescribed consultees.
79. EM added that we will be producing a Consultation Summary Report for phase three consultation.
80. EM added that there will be an offer for further CWG prior to DCO submission.
81. EM added that there will also be a site visit opportunity regarding odour.
82. EM presented information on the targeted consultation.
83. EM presented information on what happens next. Once submitted, the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) have 28 days to decide whether quality of application and consultation can go towards examination. Once accepted, formal notifications (Section 56s) will explain how to register as an interested party. Your comments will then be published on the PINS website, the issues presented will form part of the examination.
84. MS asked, regarding targeted consultation, have other negotiations taken place with landowners.
85. EM responded in saying that AW have been in dialogue with landowners, as there has been minor changes we need to reconsult. KB added that all landowners of main site have been in regular dialogue.
86. MS asked when AW submit to PINS, will docs be available on the website.
87. AP stated that this will not be the case.





## Get in touch

You can contact us by:



Emailing at [info@cwwtpr.com](mailto:info@cwwtpr.com)



Calling our Freephone information line on **0808 196 1661**



Writing to us at **Freepost: CWWTPR**



Visiting our website at 

You can view all our DCO application documents and updates on the application on The Planning Inspectorate website:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/cambridge-waste-water-treatment-plant-relocation/>