Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project
Anglian Water Services Limited

Applicant Regard to Section 42 Consultation Responses

Application Document Reference: 6.1.3
PINS Project Reference: WW010003
APFP Regulation No. 5(2)q

Revision No. 01
April 2023

Document Control

Document title	Applicant Regard to Section 42 Consultation Responses
Version No.	01
Date Approved	20.02.23
Date 1st Issued	30.01.23

Version History

Version	Date	Author	Description of change
01	30.01.23	-	DCO Submission

Contents

Table

1 Applicant Regard to Section 42 Consultation Responses

Table 1-1 Air Quality / Odour

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cam Valley Forum	Odour	Proposed WWTP	Anglian Water cannot provide meaningful increase on the new site of good open space. It will be badly affected by Odour as is Milton Country Park.	n	The design of the proposed WWTP has focused around the commitment to achieve negligible odour levels, this has included technological and operational measures. The new green space has been designed to ensure that recreational pathways are not impacted upon by odour with odour concentrations predicted to be less than 5 ou_E/m^3 (IAQM guidance (odour-guidance-2014.pdf (iaqm.co.uk) in that space.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18 : Odour
Cambridgeshire County Council	Air quality	Air Quality Management Plan	A key element of the Anglia Water Net Zero Strategy to 2030 is “Decarbonising our vehicle fleet”. we would suggest the applicant supports this strategy by including, as an integral part of the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), a statement to operate a minimum of EURO VI for the own fleet and incorporate a condition limiting access to the site to Minimum EURO VI for 8 contractors and subcontractors. This could also include on-site equipment to a minimum standard of EURO VI or Alternative Fuels, such as LNG. this would also complement and support the accompanying Climate Resilience and Carbon Papers	n	The air quality impacts from construction and operational traffic have been modelled and assessed using the standard UK Euro fleet mix as incorporated into the Defra's Local Air Quality Management Emission Factor Toolkit. The effect on air quality has been concluded to be not significant and no secondary mitigation or enhancement measures, such as the adoption of EURO VI vehicles, are required.	Application Document Reference 5.2.7 ES, Chapter 7: Air Quality
Cambridgeshire County Council	Air quality	CHP	It is understood that the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) facility will meet stringent emission requirements to minimise the effect on air quality. However, we await the results of the computer modelling to determine the concentrations of air pollutants (specifically, NO2, NOx and PM10) and provide more accurate illustration of actual emissions	n	The Applicant notes the comments, dispersion modelling has been completed using the ADMS developed by Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants (CERC) and is integrated into the EIA for air quality. As the energy plant will operate on gaseous fuels only (biogas and natural gas), the assessment of energy plant considers emissions of NOx and SO2 only. The energy plant will be regulated by, and meet the relevant emissions limits set out within, the Medium Combustion Plant Directive (2015/2193) as transposed into UK law. Emissions of particulate matter are considered from road traffic only.	Application Document Ref 5.4.7.1 Air Quality Assessment Methods
Marshall Group	Odour		As identified through MGP’s previous consultation responses, the potential odour implications of the proposed new waste water treatment plant and how these may affect any future development at Cambridge East have been a key concern of MGP. Accordingly, Air Quality Consultants (AQC) has been instructed by MGP to review the latest consultation information and advice on any potential implications for Cambridge East. it is AQC’s view that odours are being sufficiently considered throughout the design process of the CWWTPR and that the risk of	n	The Applicant notes the comments made in respect of the Odour Management Plans and mitigation presented to date. The Applicant will continue to engage with MGP and its consultants once they have had an opportunity to review the finalised Air Quality and Odour Chapters of the ES and the measures included in the preliminary Odour Management Plan. It should also be noted that the operation of the Proposed Development will require an environmental permit, which is issued and regulated by the Environment Agency. The environmental permit for the Proposed Development will	Application Document Ref 5.2.7 Chapter 7: Air Quality, Chapter 7 Appendices 5.4.7.1. and 5.4.7.2 and Application Document Ref 5.2.18 Chapter 18: Odour, Chapter 18 Appendices 5.4.18.1 to 5.4.18.4

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			adverse odour impacts at Marleigh and Cambridge East remains very low. Whilst there are some areas of information relating to the previous modelling which have still not been provided, it is assumed that the final model undertaken to support the planning and permitting application processes will include all the required information in the public domain. MGP requests that detailed information on the exact locations of the odour vents is provided by Anglian Water, so that AQC can accurately assess the potential risk of adverse impacts from these vents at the parcels of development land. The OMP for the works should include measures to mitigate such events to ensure that odour release is minimised as far as practicable. MGP request that consultation with Anglian Water continues to be held, following the issue of the final design for the WWTP, to ascertain what level of mitigation and management measures will be employed at the works to mitigate elevated odour emissions resulting from abnormal operations.		require the operator to have a written environmental management system (EMS), which includes a set of plans and procedures describing measures to avoid, reduce and eliminate potential environmental impacts associated with the activities covered by the permit. This includes an Odour Management Plan (OMP), which details how site operations are to be managed to minimise odour impacts. The OMP for the Proposed Development will be a 'living document' with regular updates, which outlines operational odour management, monitoring, and reporting measures. It will also include controls to be implemented in the event of an incident such as a spillage, and outline how to record odour events and respond to complaints. The exact locations of the odour vents are not yet fixed, however the DCO has Limits of Deviation and the identified locations have been based on a Realistic Worst Case Scenario.	
Natural England	Air Quality	Operational emissions	Natural England is generally satisfied with the preliminary findings of the air quality assessment subject to detailed modelling and assessment confirming the initial findings through the ES and detailed mitigation measures being agreed and secured through DCO requirements. The detailed air quality assessment will need to inform the updated HRA and the ES with regard to impacts on Devil's Dyke SAC.	n	An assessment of potential air quality impacts from construction and operational road vehicles movements on Devil's Dyke SAC is included in the HRA report. As the Devil's Dyke SAC is approximately 11km east of the CWWTPR it is not considered within the on-site combustion energy plant air quality modelling assessment in accordance with best practice guidance from the Environment Agency.	Application Document Reference 5.2.7 ES, Chapter 7: Air Quality Application Document Ref 5.4.8.16, HRA Report
Natural England	Air Quality	Study area	The ES should provide a rationale for scoping out potential effects on designated sites within the zone of influence of the Proposed Development, such as air quality impacts to Wilbraham Fen and Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSIs.	n	Air quality impacts from construction traffic, operational traffic, and operation of the energy plant on Wilbraham Fen and Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSIs have been assessed.	Application Document Reference 5.2.7 ES, Chapter 7: Air Quality, Air Quality Dispersion Model Results, Application Document Ref 5.4.7.2
Quy Fen Trust	Odour	Proposed WWTP	No draft odour management plans have been provided in the documents for view and comment and the odour graphic has very little supporting information or data. The footpaths surrounding and leading Quy Fen will be impacted even if Fen is located further away.	n	The Applicant confirms that a preliminary Odour Management Plan is included within the application. It should also be noted that the operation of the Proposed Development will require an environmental permit, which is issued and regulated by the Environment Agency. The environmental permit for the Proposed Development will require the operator to have a written environmental management system (EMS), which includes a set of plans and procedures describing measures to avoid, reduce and eliminate potential environmental impacts	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour Application Document Ref 5.4.18.4 Preliminary Odour Management Plan

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					associated with the activities covered by the permit. This includes an OMP, which details how site operations are to be managed to minimise odour impacts. The OMP for the Proposed Development will be a 'living document' with regular updates, which outlines operational odour management, monitoring, and reporting measures. It will also include controls to be implemented in the event of an incident such as a spillage, and outline how to record odour events and respond to complaints.	
Quy Fen Trust	Odour	Proposed WWTP	Footpaths and bridleways should be reclassified as high sensitivity receptor areas to align with High sensitivity rating in the PEI landscape character and visual amenity assessment. As SSSI it is unacceptable that Quy Fen and surround villages could be endangered the prevailing winds and proximity to the relocated plant.	n	The Applicant notes the comment and advises that the odour assessments follow the IAQM guidance (IAQM guidance (odour-guidance-2014.pdf (iaqm.co.uk)	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Odour		The District Council considers more details are required particularly with regard to the use of negative pressure and air locks on sludge buildings, covers on tanks, etc. The documents refer to higher concentrations of odour being experienced from the site whilst the site becomes operational which may continue for a number of months before settling down. The District Council considers that Anglian Water should model this odour and base this on their experience of similar new sites. This will ensure transparency and a sound evidence base upon which to assess, manage and consider complaints, should they arise from either local residents or people visiting the area. It is noted that some odour may be released from vent shafts with one proposed vent shaft in particular to be located approximately 10m away from a residential property on Low Fen Drove Way. Further information should be provided about this aspect so that the impact on the property can be fully understood e.g., how often the vent shaft is likely to release odour and the methodology for assessing the potential impact.	y	The Preliminary Odour Management Plan outlines measures that will be put in place for odour. This includes a complaints resolution mechanism. Following design modifications post Phase Three Consultation, there is now only one vent shaft planned. This is located at the interception shaft in the existing Cambridge WWTP boundary. The vent will be 10 metres above existing ground level and will have a filter upon it. We do not consider it necessary to model odour during operational set up as there be controls in place to mitigate impact. All the items connected to the odour control systems (TPS, inlet, all STC tanks that are not connected to the biogas collection and utilisation system) will operate under negative pressure from the tank/equipment to the odour control unit, and on to the extraction fan that pulls the treated air out from the Odour Control Unit (OCU) to the top of the OCU stack at high level, where the treated (reduced odour) air is released. The tanks/equipment is closed/sealed to allow this capture of the odorous air. Different tanks and equipment would employ suitable methods of covering e.g. steel tanks would come with their own bespoke steel roofs, that the tank manufacturers design to ensure that it can handle the OCU system negative pressures, potential snow, and all other load situations, as appropriate. Furthermore, standby plant is provided in case duty plant failure, whilst also allowing timely maintenance.	Application Document Ref 5.4.18.4 Preliminary Odour Management Plan

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					Air locks on buildings are typically associated with sludge cake reception facilities. The first phase of the Sludge Treatment Centre does not include any sludge cake imports and thus no air-locked buildings. The second phase will include a sludge cake import facility, which would include an airlock building or other suitable method of containing raw cake delivery odours, that is considered BAT at the time. These are combined with odour control systems, to provide an integrated odour management system. It is uncertain where the expectation of *"…higher concentrations of odour being experienced from the site whilst the site becomes operational…"* originates? Experience of similar new sites were that they were upgraded and commissioned under the same operational odour emission permits. To provide more details, the OCUs that will be ensuring that *higher concentrations of odour* are not released, are seeded in a timely manner prior to planned generation of anticipated odours for example from the inlet works area or sludge areas. This is required as biological OCUs require some odorous air to establish and maintain treatment capacity (called seeding). Following initial seeding, odorous air to the OCUs is increased in line with their treatment capacity. During commissioning, the teams have additional odorous air available on site to maintain capacity, should either a planned stoppage or unforeseen event occur. Further risk assessments are also carried out associated with various tasks and streams that will be commissioned. Occasionally this would result in 'scrubbers', usually Granular Activated Carbon based units, being added to the OCU treatment system for short periods of time to mitigate short term risks of *higher concentrations of odour being experienced*.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Odour		The Council would expect that, should the DCO be granted for this development proposal, odour monitoring should be undertaken to verify any modelling undertaken within twelve months of the site becoming fully operational. This would need to be reflected in a requirement of the DCO and which the District Council would expect to comment upon at the DCO examination stage.	n	The monitoring of odour is covered in the Preliminary Odour Management Plan, submitted with the DCO Application. The operation of the Proposed Development will require an environmental permit, which is issued and regulated by the Environment Agency. The environmental permit for the Proposed Development will require the operator to have a written environmental management system (EMS), which includes a set of plans and procedures describing measures to avoid, reduce and eliminate potential environmental impacts associated with the activities covered by the permit. This	Application Document Ref 5.4.18.4 Preliminary Odour Management Plan

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					includes an OMP, which details how site operations are to be managed to minimise odour impacts. The OMP for the Proposed Development will be a 'living document' with regular updates, which outlines operational odour management, monitoring, and reporting measures. It will also include controls to be implemented in the event of an incident such as a spillage, and outline how to record odour events and respond to complaints. Under the environmental permit, the operator will continually monitor treatment performance, prevent, and respond to any on-site issues at the earliest opportunity.	
Cambridge City Council	Odour		The main potential source of odour impact for Cambridge will be the waste water transfer tunnel between the CWWTP and ReWWTP ('the WW transfer tunnel'). From an operational level the City Council, along with other neighboring Districts to the WW transfer tunnel site, will need to be able to assess and understand in greater detail potential odour impacts associated with the proposed ReWWTP. Alongside the WW transfer tunnel structure, the proposals provide for three ventilation shafts in addition to primary inlet points and pumping infrastructure. The three ventilation shafts are proposed with one adjacent to the B1047 Horningsea Road and the Poplar Hall Farm access road; one close to Red House Close, Fen Ditton; and the third located within the CWWTP. It is stated that in the case of potential odour from the ventilation shafts associated with the transfer tunnel, the design, the location, and height of vents will be modified to mitigate against odour impacts where possible and that a suitable maintenance regime will be put in place to minimise the potential for odour. There is currently no odour modelling and prediction of odour level contours available for these vent shaft locations – although the principles outlined, which include filters and above ground level discharges, are noted. Local site-specific significance of odour impact assessment has also not been provided for the transfer tunnels' infrastructure between the existing and proposed site. This information will be required as ideally in advance of any DCO application to allow the City Council to form a view on the local impacts of the scheme from odour.	y	Following design modifications post Phase Three Consultation, there is now only one vent shaft planned. This is located at the interception shaft in the existing Cambridge WWTP boundary. The vent will be 10 metres above existing ground level and will have a filter upon it.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.2 Project Description
Fen Ditton Primary School	Odour		The school have concerns that odour will have a negative impact on children	n	The Environment Statement provides an assessment on Odour, which shows a negligible impact. The Application also	Application Document Ref: 5.2.18 Odour Chapter,

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					includes a Preliminary Odour Management Plan that sets out management of Odour on site.	Application Document Ref: 5.4.18.4
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Odour		Given that the model leaves an average of around 6 days per year with conditions worse than the model inputs and excludes emergency/out of design conditions, FDPC considers AW should reverse model odour spread to predict and report how much the wind speeds or source terms would have to increase for 0.75 and 1.5ou detection limits to be breached at the 600m zone and at residences including Musgrave Way, High Ditch Rd, Marleigh, Horningsea and Biggin Abbey some of which are within AW's mapped 1km zone. In addition, although the wind rose for Cambridge Airfield and Mildenhall (2020) looks plausible the ES should include a comparison of the modelled wind speeds and those in a longer-term data span in case the former has missed the strong south easterlies or the north easterlies and north westerlies that sometimes occur.	n	Five years of hourly meteorological data have been included in the odour assessment. This represents up to 43,848 hours of meteorological data, covering all conditions encountered over a five-year period. The assessment approach follows professional guidance and best practice.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour, Application Document Ref 5.4.18.1 Odour Assessment Method and Effect Summary
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Odour		Ensure that the improved natural airflow through the bund required to alleviate high temperatures will not lead to odour problems for residents or degrade the effectiveness of landscaping.	n	There will be no impact of odour on residents or the landscaping as a result of the gaps within the earth bank.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour
Horningsea Parish Council	Odour		However, the odour modelling presented is understood to be based on a preliminary assessment and doesn't account for odour that could occur with above average weather conditions or outside of 'normal operations', such as spillages, accidents, or ancillary operations e.g., transporting sludge. The documents do not provide any analysis of the frequency of these types of incidents and how they could impact odour levels	n	Odour modelling presented within the ES incorporates five years of hourly meteorological data as per IAQM's 'Guidance on the assessment of odour for planning' to account for variability in weather conditions. (IAQM guidance (odour-guidance-2014.pdf (iaqm.co.uk). Odour impacts outside of normal operations and during ancillary operations have been considered qualitatively using a risk -based approach following the IAQM Source-Pathway-Receptor model.	Application Document Ref 5.4.18.1 Odour Assessment Method & Effect Summary, Application Document Ref 5.4.18.2 Odour Impact Assessment
Horningsea Parish Council	Odour		It is also unclear if the modelling is based on a continuous bund, or the latest reduced height bund with ventilation gaps. There doesn't appear to be any variation in the odour profile in the vicinity of the ventilation gaps, which could suggest that the odour profile is not current. Furthermore, there appears to be no assessment of conditions classified by the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) as the 'most offensive odours', such as occurrences of septicity, which have a significant bearing on the odour classification and impact on the environs. HPC believe that these are important omissions.	n	Odour modelling is based on the final layout and earth bank design. The earth bank is not expected to influence odour dispersion, although it has some effect on surface roughness. Odour modelling incorporates emissions from the least, moderate, and most offensive odour sources within the proposed WWTP under normal operating conditions.	Application Document Ref 5.4.18.2 Odour Impact Assessment

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Horningsea Parish Council	Odour		We also request more detailed information on the data behind the odour models presented to us. The PEI Odour Paper states that prevailing wind is from the Southwest, but no detailed data is provided, and the radial key is missing from the wind rose provided, so we have no certainty of the number of days it blows from the south west. There must be significant number of days it blows from the north and would therefore have an impact on sensitive receptors such as Fen Ditton Primary School.	n	Odour modelling presented within the ES incorporates five years of hourly sequential meteorological data. Wind direction and speed are presented as wind roses, along with a description of how to interpret the wind roses.	Application Document Ref 5.4.18.1 Odour Assessment Method and Effect Summary
Horningsea Parish Council	Odour		We also request more information on the odour impact of the tunnels, pumping venting and from the vent shafts. Odour nuisance is already experienced in the existing Fen Ditton transfer area. Ventilation shafts (Field Lane) and manhole outside pumping station create problematic odour for residences, gardens and inside homes. There is also a possibility of cumulative effects – residents in Abbots Way, Horningsea, have repeatedly complained about the Amey Cespa plant and could be impacted by odour from both directions.	y	The Applicant notes the comments regarding odour impacts of vents and advises that following Phase Three Consultation the design has been amended to remove all the intermediate vents along the tunnel corridor. The only vent remaining will be located at the start of the corridor on the existing Cambridge WWTP.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour
Horningsea Parish Council	Odour		Odour document shows a contours map with a 1km 'odour buffer zone' which encompasses the majority of homes in the village of Fen Ditton, a number of homes in Horningsea Village, Fen Ditton Conservation Area, Baits Bite Lock Conservation Area, and Horningsea Conservation Area. However, we cannot find any reference to the 1km buffer in the main text. HPC would like an explanation of the 1k buffer zone because it contains sensitive receptors. NB: The cemetery and allotments in Horningsea are missing from the odour diagrams and are approximately 600m and 800m away from the plant, therefore within 1k. We consider these to also be sensitive receptors.	n	The 1km buffer is only intended to give context of scale and nothing more. The modelled odour contours are presented to give a prediction of odour concentration during operation of the proposed WWTP. The odour modelling shows that within the 98th percentile of odour distribution none of the described receptors, within the 1km buffer zone, have anything more than a negligible impact and are unlikely to have any impact at all.	Application Document Ref 5.4.18.2 Odour Impact Assessment
Horningsea Parish Council	Odour		HPC would like to understand when the draft Odour Management Plan will be available for review. We also need confidence that the Odour Management Plan will be enforced, an understanding of how it will be enforced and how will this be guaranteed through the DCO process?	n	A Preliminary Odour Management Plan (OMP) is provided as part of the DCO Application. Where it relates to OMP within the permit this will be enforced by the Environment Agency. The Preliminary OMP will form part of the DCO and will therefore form part of the final order.	Application Document Ref 5.4.18.4 Preliminary Odour Management Plan
Horningsea Parish Council	Odour		We have requested information about odour mitigation at comparable plants and suggested a visit so we can experience the odour. We would like to be given details of the technology used in a similar site. We need more information about the technology and siting of the odorous parts of the plant in order to have any confidence about the odour mitigation. The idea of the enclosing bund	n	A visit was held on 20th July 2022, and a representative of Horningsea PC attended. Information on odour is provided in the Odour Chapter of the Environmental Statement. The purpose of the earth bank design was not to mitigate odour and it has no discernible impact (positive or negative on odour).	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			was claimed to be critical in the design in terms of odour mitigation and visual softening of the plant, however we see in this iteration of the design that the bund has been reduced in height and there has been the introduction of 'ventilation' which means there are gaps in the bund. We request information on why this is required and what will be the impact on odour from these new vents and the reduction in height of the bund?			
Save Honey Hill	Odour		Including a contour in the odour model Map of an Odour Unit of 1 would improve confidence in the Odour effect of the Proposed Development reported. Industry standard where odour experience would be detected as negligible across all levels of receptors i.e., low, medium, and high sensitivity. 'Negligible' is a level where people are unlikely to detect odour and if they do so, they are unlikely to find it offensive. However, 50% of a population have been found to detect odour beyond the contours shown at an odour unit of 1, the more offensive the odour, the higher levels of detection (CWWTPR Stage 4 Final Site Selection Preliminary Odour Study). Notwithstanding the industry standard of <1.5 odour units is considered negligible, including a contour in the odour model Map of an Odour Unit of 1 would improve confidence in the Odour effect of the Proposed Development reported.	n	The Applicant advises that the odour modelling shows that within the 98th percentile of odour distribution, none of the described receptors have anything more than negligible impact and are unlikely to have any impact at all. The comments of improving confidence of the community in our odour modelling is noted, an odour site visit for members of the community was held in July 2022, in order for the community to experience different levels of odour and to explain how the project will mitigate impacts. The Odour Chapter of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the effects of odour and is supported by predictive modelling reported in an Appendix document to the ES.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour, Application Document Refs: 5.4.18. 1-4 Odour Appendices
Save Honey Hill	Odour		It is recommended for the benefit of consistency that Anglian Water apply the same standard of <1.5 odour units to all odour receptors and high sensitivity ratings to recreational footpaths and cycle paths within the vicinity of the Proposed Development.	n	Footpaths and cycle paths are modelled at less than 5 ou_E/m^3, which presents a medium magnitude of impact. However, in line with IAQM guidance, the footpaths have been classified as low sensitivity receptors. Therefore, the proposed development has a negligible effect on the footpaths and cycle paths. The Odour Chapter of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the effects of odour and is supported by predictive modelling reported in an Appendix document to the ES.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour, Application Document Refs: 5.4.18. 1-4 Odour Appendices
Save Honey Hill	Odour		The odour modelling presented does not account for odour that could occur with above average and future weather conditions or outside of 'normal operations', such as spillages, accidents, or ancillary operations e.g., transporting sludge. The likelihood of such incidents expected frequency and impact on odour levels is not reported; given the extent of HGV transport and the quantity of sludge import from across the wider region	n	The Applicant acknowledges that odour is a key concern. The Environmental Statement provides modelling and an assessment of odour, this includes spot odour measurements and consideration of abnormal operations.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour, Application Document Refs: 5.4.18. 1-4 Odour Appendices

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			frequency and impact from such incidents are important considerations for this Public Consultation.			
Save Honey Hill	Odour		1.Notwithstanding the industry standard is met by the odour model illustrated, including examples of odour contours showing alternative wind directions and a representative range of strength/speeds would improve public confidence in the assertions Anglian Water have made about the odour effects on sensitive receptors. 2 Anglian Water should include the point that a negligible effect on all known receptors from older Impacts, as defined by the Institute of a quality management brackets IAQM brackets is not defined as applying and also come stances but rather as under 98% of normal operations, excluding emergency out of design conditions and future weather patterns. 3 Anglian Water should identify and describe the additional odour mitigation measures that could or would be included should the number of residences nearby be affected. This would increase public confidence in Anglian Water's assertion they are committed to minimising odour as far as possible.	n	1.The wind rose assessment has considered winds from all directions. 2. The odour modelling has been carried out in line with IAQM standards. (IAQM guidance (odour-guidance-2014.pdf (iaqm.co.uk). 3. Odour mitigation is set out in the Preliminary Odour Management Plan.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour, Application Document Refs: 5.4.18.4 Preliminary Odour Management Plan
Save Honey Hill	Odour		An explanation should be provided of the 1km buffer zone, its purpose and relevance. 2 This 1km buffer zone drawn should be used to facilitate interpretation of odour effects from a range of specific wind directions, strength/speed on residence within 1km of the Proposed Development.	n	The 1km buffer is only intended to give context of scale and nothing more. The modelled odour contours are presented to give a prediction of odour concentration during operation of the proposed WWTP. The odour modelling shows that within the 98th percentile of odour distribution none of the described receptors, within the 1km buffer zone, have anything more than a negligible impact and are unlikely to have any impact at all. The Odour Chapter of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of the effects of odour, including wind direction, and is supported by predictive modelling reported in an Appendix document to the ES.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour, Application Document Refs: 5.4.18. 1-4 Odour Appendices
Save Honey Hill	Odour		Ensure that the improved natural airflow through the bund to alleviate high temperatures will not lead to odour problems for residents or degrade the effectiveness of landscaping.	n	The odour modelling demonstrates that at the one hour 98th percentile averaging period, the predicted odour impacts are negligible at all modelled sensitive receptors. The effect is therefore described as not significant in accordance with IAQM guidance adopted for the assessment. (IAQM guidance (odour-guidance-2014.pdf (iaqm.co.uk).	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour
Ian Gilder	Odour		I have previously suggested that, given these challenges, the Project should subject the final odour assessment to peer review by one or more acknowledged experts in this field. The preliminary assessment has not modelled odours from the transfer tunnel vent shafts or other sources on	n	The Applicant notes the comments about peer review; however, the Applicant is confident that the odour assessment has been done in line with IAQM guidance, the assessment has been through the Applicant's consultants and the Applicant's own comprehensive internal quality review process.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			the pipeline routes and it will be essential that these are addressed in the submitted design and assessed in the final ES		Furthermore, the Odour Impact Assessment will also be considered as part of the DCO examination process. Following design modifications post Phase Three Consultation, there is now only one vent shaft, this is located at the interception shaft at the existing Cambridge WWTP, it is not modelled as in normal operation it is designed to allow air in and not emit odour. These are a number of these vents positioned throughout Cambridge they do not create any nuisance odour.	
Stow Cum Quy PC	Odour		We note that the map in the consultation brochure was based on 5 years' averaged weather. We still have concerns about the days that are not average and that the prevailing wind is towards Quy.	n	The Odour Chapter of the Environmental Statement provides further information on odour modelling, all wind directions have been included in the wind rose and odour assessment. The odour modelling has been carried out in line with IAQMs guidance (IAQM guidance (odour-guidance-2014.pdf (iaqm.co.uk).	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour

Table 1-2 Agriculture land and soils

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cambridgeshire County Council	Agricultural Land and Soil	Soil Surveys	We welcome the work to date to assess the impact of construction and operation on agricultural land and soils. Supporting documents include the Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Management Plan to ensure sustainable soil handling. From the survey it is noted 80% is grade 3a and 2, that falls under Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land (BMVL). This broadly aligns with Natural England's Regional Agricultural Land Classification Map for the Eastern Region. It is noted the soil survey did not include the pipeline routes where topsoil stripping will take place. For completeness we would encourage this to be done.	n	The Applicant presented soil survey locations at scoping; the baseline has been completed in accordance with the scoping opinion. The Outline Soil Management Plan (SMP) includes measures for the safeguarding of soils temporarily affected during construction and therefore considers topsoil stripping. The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part A requires that prior to construction, specific measures to protect soils will be set out in a detailed Soil Management Plan (SMP), based upon the Outline SMP and if required supplemented, by additional survey data.	Application Document Ref 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan.
Cambridgeshire County Council	Agriculture & Soil Management Plan		Soil compaction by construction traffic should also be considered near to existing trees and hedgerows and measures should be taken to prevent damage to the roots.	n	Measures are contained within in the Outline SMP and the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).	Application Document Ref 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1
Natural England	Agricultural Land and soil resources	ALC survey	Soil management plan welcomed. Land within the CO boundary subject to temporary disturbance has not been subject to an ALC survey despite Para 6.6.5 (CWWTPR Scoping Report) stating that 'The ES will be informed by the following: An ALC survey carried out within the EIA Scoping boundary of the Proposed Development'. Page 17 does refer to 'this impact will be verified through our remaining survey programme and reported within the ES.' The information from these additional surveys should be included in the ES. Natural England understands that, of the agricultural land which will be affected by the proposals during construction, 100 ha will be permanently and irreversibly lost, of which 80 ha is BMV. We advise that the Applicant should provide simple area breakdowns for each of the individual components (including the land associated with construction of the Waterbeach pipeline, final effluent transfer and the areas required for launch and recovering shafts for transfer pipeline installation). For example, total agricultural area impacted temporarily and permanently (split by scheme component and by ALC grade),	n	The Applicant notes the comments and confirms that the DCO is supported by Agricultural Land Classification surveys which align with the Scoping Opinion. The measures within the Outline SMP would apply to all works within the Scheme Order Limits and not all just the land required for the proposed WWTP. The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part A requires that prior to construction, specific measures to protect soils will be set out in a detailed Soil Management Plan (SMP), based upon the Outline SMP and if required supplemented, by additional survey data. The Environmental Statement includes the temporary and permanent agricultural land take area, identifying the area of each ALC grade for each element of the development, along with loss of ALC grades in assessment of agricultural land in operational impacts.	Application Document Reference 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			and total BMV agricultural area permanently and temporarily required for the development.			
Natural England	Agricultural Land and soil resources	ALC survey	Detailed SMP and appropriate SMP implementation is essential	n	An Outline SMP has been prepared in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Construction Sites (DEFRA 2009) and is submitted with the DCO application. It sets out in detail the measures that are required to be in place to ensure that soil is appropriately managed during construction and suitable for its final use. The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part A requires that prior to construction, specific measures to protect soils will be set out in a detailed Soil Management Plan (SMP), based upon the Outline SMP and if required supplemented, by additional survey data.	Application Document Reference 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan
Natural England	Agricultural Land and soil resources	ALC Survey	We advise that the Applicant should provide simple area breakdowns for each of the individual components (including the land associated with construction of the Waterbeach pipeline, final effluent transfer and the areas required for launch and recovering shafts for transfer pipeline installation). For example, total agricultural area impacted temporarily and permanently (split by scheme component and by ALC grade), and total BMV agricultural area permanently and temporarily required for the development.	n	The Applicant agrees with the comment and has included this area breakdown within the Environmental Statement.	Application Document Reference 5.4.6.1 Baseline Agricultural Land Classification
Natural England	Agricultural Land and soil resources	ALC Survey	ALC grade as determined from a soil survey should be used to inform the restoration criteria of land undergoing temporary disturbance, with BMV land to be returned to the same quality as far as reasonably practicable to minimise BMV losses and limit permanent impacts. Furthermore, the site-specific information should be utilised to contribute to pipeline route refinement to help minimise BMV loss. The ES should include the temporary and permanent agricultural land take area, identifying the area of each ALC grade for each element of the development.	n	An Outline SMP has been prepared in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Construction Sites (DEFRA 2009) and is submitted with the DCO application. It sets out in detail the measures that are required to be in place to ensure that soil is appropriately managed during construction and suitable for its final use. The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part A requires that prior to construction, specific measures to protect soils will be set out in a detailed Soil Management Plan (SMP), based upon the Outline SMP and if required supplemented, by additional survey data. The pipeline has been designed and refined to minimise the use of land, and the ES assesses the impact of each element of the development on BMV land.	Application Document Reference 5.4.6.2 Agricultural Impact Assessment, Reference 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan
Natural England	Agricultural Land and soil resources		It should be noted that soils contribute to the ALC Grade; with the same soil type capable of supporting differing ALC Grade of land depending on the location and climate. This loss of ALC grades should therefore be considered in the assessment of agricultural land.	n	The Applicant agrees with this comment and the loss of ALC grades is considered in the Environmental Statement (ES) and Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA).	Application Document Reference: 5.4.6.2 Agricultural Impact Assessment and 5.2.6 Chapter 6 -

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
						Agricultural Land and Soil Resources
Natural England	Agricultural Land and soil resources	Inherent and Secondary Mitigation	On soil resources, including minimising the footprint, Siting, and planning of activities, Natural England welcomes the secondary mitigation measures to minimise the potential impact on soil resources, including Siting and planning of activities, Creating the landscape bund from subsoil to preserve high quality topsoil, the measures relevant to the protection of soil resources will be tailored according to the characteristics of on-site soil resources. In addition, all soils should only be handled in a dry and friable condition (noted this is included in the SMP), and it is expected that soil handling would be confined to the drier summer period to minimise risk of soil damage (April through September). This would minimise the need to recondition soils, which requires additional space and time. This is particularly important for land to be restored to agricultural use.	n	An Outline SMP has been prepared in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Construction Sites (DEFRA 2009) and is submitted with the DCO application. It sets out in detail the measures that are required to be in place to ensure that soil is appropriately managed during construction and suitable for its final use.	Application Document Reference 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan
Natural England	Agricultural Land and soil resources	Soil re-use	A detailed SMP and the appropriate implementation of the SMP will be essential to ensure the soils are sustainably managed and re-used.	n	The Applicant agrees with the comment and the Outline SMP clearly defines roles and responsibilities. Overall roles and responsibilities for the project will be specified in the final CEMP. The main roles and responsibilities specific to the outline SMP are set out.	Application Document Reference 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan
Natural England	Agricultural Land and soil resources	Earth bank	Whilst we welcome that a soils specialist will be present during key soil management stages, a soil survey should be undertaken in areas under temporary development so as to inform restoration. It should be clarified whether it is the upper or lower subsoils (or both), which will be utilised for the bund.	n	The Applicant will maintain a stockpile record card in respect of keeping records during the course of the excavations however no further classification surveys are proposed. An Outline SMP has been prepared in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Construction Sites (DEFRA 2009) and is submitted with the DCO application. It sets out in detail the measures that are required to be in place to ensure that soil is appropriately managed during construction and suitable for its final use. The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part A requires that prior to construction, specific measures to protect soils will be set out in a detailed Soil Management Plan (SMP), based upon the Outline SMP and if required supplemented, by additional survey data.	Application Document Reference 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Earthbank	The soil balance should include the quantities of the soil resources required for the bund (and other re-uses on site); as well as an indication as to whether there will be a surplus/deficit.	n	The Applicant can confirm that the estimated volumes are provided in the ES. Although there may be a small deficit of material based on current estimates, it is the philosophy of the	Application Document Reference 5.4.6.3 Outline

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					project to achieve a neutral cut fill balance to avoid the need to import soil material from offsite.	Soil Management Plan
Natural England	Agricultural Land and soil resources	Stockpiles	The SMP states in 5.4.6 that the soils should be stockpiled according to their nutrient status. However, 5.5.3 states soils will be stockpiled according to type and texture. The SMP should clearly set out how the soils will be handled, and how they will be split up (where necessary). 5.5.6 - topsoil stockpiles should be no higher than 3 m as per the Defra Construction Code. The Subsoil can be stored no higher than 5 m.	n	An Outline SMP has been prepared in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Construction Sites (DEFRA 2009) and is submitted with the DCO application. It sets out in detail the measures that are required to be in place to ensure that soil is appropriately managed during construction and suitable for its final use. The outline SMP does not refer to stockpiling according to soil nutrient status. It states that soils should be stockpiled according to type and texture. Appropriate stockpile heights are detailed in section 5.3.21 in the outline SMP and depend on soil moisture.	Application Document Reference 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan
Save Honey Hill	Agriculture		AW confirms that the site comprises arable land, including winter wheat, oilseed rape and beans. There will be a permanent loss of agricultural land; at a time when food security is a priority, this loss cannot be justified.	n	The ES includes a chapter on Agricultural land and soils.	Application Document Ref 5.2.6 ES, Chapter 6: Agricultural Land & Soils

Table 1-3 Biodiversity / Ecology

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cambridgeshire County Council	Biodiversity	BNG/Nature Networks	We welcome the commencement for the scheme to provide a minimum of 10% BNG (including 30-year management period), with the scheme set to deliver over 20% BNG for area-based habitats and linear features (hedgerows). We support Anglian Water's aspiration for the "new landscape and ecology habitat creation design as part of the proposed WWTP can be integrated into the Cambridge Nature Network opportunity areas for nature recovery".	n	The Applicant notes the comment	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Ecology	Bats	It is noted that the bat survey work provided within the PEI: Bat Survey Data report doesn't cover the entire scheme. It is important that a comprehensive assessment of the entire route has been undertaken to determine the impact on bats. Also details of the proposed lighting scheme for both the construction and operational phase should be submitted as part of the DCO application. It should be designed to minimise impact to bats – wherever possible, lighting should be avoided. The lighting scheme should follow ILP / BCT's Bats and artificial lighting guidance note (2018). The Council would welcome further stakeholder engagement on this topic, prior to DCO submission.	n	The Applicant has completed further bat surveys in 2022 that align with the principles agreed through the TWG for Biodiversity in relation to survey area and survey methods. The results of the surveys are included in Baseline Report Bats. Details of the lighting are provided in the Lighting Strategy included within the application. An Environmental Lighting Impact Assessment (ELIA) has been completed and is included in the application. It is a requirement of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part A that temporary lighting in construction is aligned with ILP / BCT 2018 guidance. The design of permanent lighting has sought to minimise lighting as much as possible, such as by removing lighting from the access road to the proposed WWTP and reducing lighting columns or mounting heights so that they are not elevated above the earth bank.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.7 Bat Survey, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.3 Lighting Assessment Report and Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description
Cambridgeshire County Council	Ecology	Water Vole	The route of the pipelines should be designed to minimise impact to water voles by avoiding damage to their burrows. Water Vole mitigation habitat should be installed and established prior to proposed displacement.	n	The CoCP Part A requires the application of best practice measures in relation to the protection of protected species. The COCP Part A Section 7.2 (Nature Conservation and Ecology) (Application Document reference 5.4.2.1) specifies that where required, protected species licenses will be obtained before the commencement of works. Where possible works to ditches identified as water vole habitat should be completed within the period between 15th February to 15th April (or as otherwise agreed with Natural England) and under a Natural England conservation licence with an agreed method statement.	Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1 CoCP A
Cambridgeshire County Council	Ecology	Badgers	Badger information is not publicly accessible - we asked that we receive a copy of the badger data	n	The report can be confidentially provided once the baseline report is complete.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Ecology		PEI Biodiversity report states that the GCN eDNA "results returned back negative indications for the presence of GCN", however this does not accurately reflect the PEI: eDNA GCN report which says the eDNA	y	Surveys were completed by June 2022 in order to re-survey the waterbodies with inconclusive results.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.11 Great Crested Newt Survey

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			was not conclusive at waterbodies PD008 and WB114. These two waterbodies should be re-surveyed. In addition, the PEI: eDNA GCN report identifies a number of ditches were not surveyed due to safety reasons, but it may be possible to survey these ditches if planned at an appropriate time (e.g., earlier in the season or if livestock were removed). Therefore, update surveys for these ditches should be undertaken			
Cambridgeshire County Council	Ecology	Lizards	The high number of common lizards recorded along the Waterbeach pipeline is surprising (but reflective of findings at Waterbeach barracks). All efforts much be undertaken to protect this population and avoid any habitat loss or severance and therefore, welcome proposals for directional drilling under this area. However, HDD is not confirmed for this area within the Working Areas During Construction - Water beach Pipeline Route (page 12, PEI: Introduction)	y	It is a requirement of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part A that the Principal Contractor(s) prepare a Reptile Mitigation Strategy prior to construction. This will include the mitigation measures to be put in place to prevent impacts to reptile populations. This will also include a requirement to consider relevant adjacent development proposals that may also require reptile mitigation such that mitigation measures that may include translocation are completely in a strategically beneficial way and that mitigation proposals are not conflicting.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP A
Cambridgeshire County Council	Ecology	Management of species	Opportunities in design and management should be taken to improve terrestrial invertebrates, arable plants, fish passage and spawning grounds, macroinvertebrates and macrophytes. CEMP must ensure it includes bio-security measures to avoid spread of invasive species	n	The LERMP has been developed as an integrated multi-purpose core element of the Proposed Development that includes a well-developed set of proposals to deliver biodiversity benefit through the inclusion of a variety of habitat types and niche elements including features to benefit invertebrates. The design of the short section of river bank protection works has sought to minimise the level of disturbance and includes a design to encourage marginal vegetation to re-stablish. It is a requirement of the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part A that the Principal Contractor(s) implement requirements in relation to Biosecurity.	Application Document Reference 5.2.8 Chapter 8: Biodiversity, Application Document Reference 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A, Application Document Reference 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part B
Cambridgeshire County Council	Biodiversity	Link to wider strategies	The Council welcomes the commitment to delivering 20% BNG as part of the landscape and biodiversity management plan. This should be linked to delivery of strategic plans / policies, including Cambridge Natural Network and local green infrastructure strategies. We recommend further discussions with the local authorities, DEFRA family, Wildlife Trust, and other stakeholders to ensure the scheme maximises the biodiversity (and other green infrastructure) benefits for the local area.	n	We have engaged with a range of officers from local authorities (Ecology, Landscape, Greenways) as well as stakeholders such as National Trust, Wildlife Trust and RSPB. We have also engaged with other developers in the area in order to maximise opportunities. We will continue engagement during construction and operation of the site.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Biodiversity	BNG in river	The Council is concerned that 10% BNG for rivers etc. hasn't been achieved under the current landscape / biodiversity scheme (as set out in the PEI: Biodiversity). This should be achieved through detailed design,	n	The design of the proposed outfall and associated section of river bank protection words incorporates design features to allow reeds / sedge to re-establish at the river margin along the affected section of the east bank. It will not be relied upon	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 Project Description

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			including high quality treatment of effluent at the outfall of River Cam through habitat creation (e.g., sedge/reedbeds), which will not only improve BNG scores but also improve water quality in this County Wildlife Site. In the Council's response to consultation 2, the Council recommended that waterbodies were included within the design, but currently there is only minimal standing water proposed and therefore further opportunities should be explored. If further 'river' BNG credits are required, we suggest this is delivered 'off-site', such as contributions to Chalk Stream project, which lie up-stream of the river Cam. The Council recommend further consultation with stakeholders on this matter.		for waste water treatment but will contribute to habitat mitigation. A drainage strategy has been prepared for the area surrounding the proposed WWTP which includes attenuation features for the storage and retention of water in case of heavy rainfall under a future climate scenario. The extent and position of ponds / other temporary and or permanent water bodies within the landscape masterplan is also restricted by the airport safeguarding zone. BNG river credits will be delivered via a requirement in the DCO for the River Units Net Gain Strategy set out in the BNG report to be implemented. The River Units Strategy sets out a commitment to create a series of wet ditches near the outfall location and to seek partnership or purchase for the remaining high distinctiveness river units which cannot be delivered on site.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13 BNG Report Application Document Ref 5.4.20.12 Outline Drainage Strategy
Cambridgeshire County Council	Biodiversity	Inclusion of pipelines	We are concerned that the Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan doesn't incorporate re-instatement of pipelines etc. where they are ecologically sensitive or ecological mitigation is required. For example, mitigation for water vole, or re-instatement of reptile habitat. This should be incorporated into the management plan.	n	Mitigation measures for areas outside of the land required for the proposed WWTP and landscaping proposals are identified within the Biodiversity Chapter of the Environmental Statement. This includes reference to sections of the CoCP Part A and Part B which includes measures in relation to identified ecologically sensitive areas and requirements to complete pre construction surveys to verify the presence/ absence of ecological features of interest. Part B of the CoCP contains specific requirements in relation to habitat reinstatement. Furthermore, for protected species there will be separate licences required in the case of bats, badger, and water vole. Drafts of these licences will be prepared and discussed with Natural England as part of the SOCG process. These drafts will include specific details in relation to mitigation.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES Biodiversity Chapter, 5.4.2.1 COCP A , 5.4.2.2 COCP B
Cllr Claire Daunton	Biodiversity	Biodiversity Net Gain	The change from 10% to 20% biodiversity gain appears to be achieved by using much more land than the site actually requires taking in what is currently surrounding rich arable land.	n	A 20% Biodiversity Net Gain will be achieved on the site of the proposed WWTP using the same amount of land that had been identified at the start of project, the project footprint has not increased. Otherwise, the BNG in the landscaping proposals is only one aspect of the purpose of the landscape plans within the project. The land is required in order to deliver landscape screening as well as recreational, ecological, and functional aspects (i.e., access and drainage) of the proposed development.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13 BNG Report
CPRE	Biodiversity	Species	(Page 2 point 4) CPRE has obtained records and maps from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Environmental Records Centre. These documents show important areas pertaining to County wildlife sites, areas of Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and recorded sightings of wildlife across sites. It is unclear if	n	These records were used as part of the initial desktop review. These have been supplemented with a range of ecological surveys in alignment with those set out at the time of the Scoping Report. The baseline survey information will be included within the application documents, and Biodiversity	Application Document Ref. 5.2.8 Biodiversity Chapter

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Anglian Water are aware of these records. CPRE would like to suggest that perhaps the records could be obtained to further inform their studies and that these be included within the biodiversity reports. Damage to or interference with these sites would not represent compliance with stated biodiversity net gain objectives		chapter of the ES summarises the baseline identified for the purpose of assessment.	
CPRE	Biodiversity	Nature networks	(Page 2 point 5) The Honey Hill site falls within the National Trust's iconic Wicken Fen Vision. Wicken Fen is a designated SSSI. It is a National Nature Reserve and a Nature Conservation Review site. It is also a designated RAMSAR wetland site of international importance and part of the Fenland Special Area of Conservation under the Habitats Directive.	n	The Applicant notes the comments regarding the choice of site 3 in respect of the impact on the National Trusts Wicken Fen Vision, and natural conservation impacts and potential for adverse landscape effects. The relocation project is designed to complement local initiatives such as the Wicken Fen Vision and the Cambridge Nature Network. The HRA Report considers impacts to Wicken Fen and the potential benefits of the LERMP are acknowledged in relation to wider benefits such as the nature network.	Application Document Ref 5.2.5 EIA Methodology, Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES, Chapter 8: Biodiversity, Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape and Visual Amenity
East Cambridge District Council	Biodiversity		The consultation leaflet suggests that it will generate renewable energy but fails to state how this will happen and level of energy production. The land that is shown for wetland, grazing marsh, native hedgerow infilling and meadow grassland, how is this to be managed for the long term? The 20% increase in biodiversity is welcomed.	n	Renewable energy will be generated through gas to grid or combined heat and power, the preferred option is gas to grid. Chapter 2 (Project Description) of the ES includes details relating to options for both G2G and CHP. The Carbon chapter of the ES provides an assessment of impacts of the Proposed Development on carbon. The approach to the management of the landscape masterplan is set out in the LERMP.	Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
East Cambridge District Council	Biodiversity	Nature networks	There is a county scheme with regard to creating a wildlife corridor from Cambridge to Wicken Fen and any opportunity to enhance this should be encouraged.	n	The aim of the project is to complement local initiative such as the Cambridge Nature Network and Wicken Fen Vision. The Applicant has engaged with a range of officers from local authorities (Ecology, Landscape, Greenways) as well as stakeholders such as National Trust, Wildlife Trust, and RSPB. They have also engaged with other developers in the area in order to maximise opportunities. They will continue engagement during construction and operation of the Proposed Development.	
Federation of Cam Residents	Biodiversity	Nature networks	There are a number of SSSIs close to the site which could be affected by its construction and operation.	n	Impacts and associated effects to designated sites are assessed and reported in the Biodiversity chapter of the ES.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES, Chapter 8: Biodiversity
National Trust	Biodiversity and Ecology	Habitats Regulations Assessment	The Ecological PEI makes limited mention of Wicken Fen. It states that potential significant effects on ecological features associated with internationally designated sites will be examined in detail in the ES and the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA). The PEI Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report by Mott Macdonald 2022 identifies potential likely significant effects (LSE) on Wicken Fen Ramsar and	n	A HRA Report including information to inform appropriate assessment has been drafted and will be discussed with Natural England as the statutory Nature Conservation Body. The HRA Report provides information to allow the SoS to make an assessment of significant effects on European or internationally important sites for conservation. The HRA Report is included as a supporting document within the DCO	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES, Chapter 8: Biodiversity, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.16 HRA Assessment

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Fenland SAC (alone and in combination) in relation to air emissions, hydrology/water quality and will be considered within an Appropriate Assessment step of the HRA. This will consider impacts from the project alone and in combination with other plans or projects. We welcome the precautionary approach taken within the screening and note that risk is considered low but cannot be ruled out based on the available information.		application and is referred to within the ES Chapter for Biodiversity.	
National Trust	Biodiversity and Ecology	BNG	The Trust welcomes proposals for enhanced biodiversity through habitat creation. We welcome proposals for 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) through habitat creation, increased from the previous 10% target	n	The Applicant acknowledges that the Trust welcomes the BNG proposals.	
National Trust	Biodiversity and Ecology	Bat Surveys and lighting	Bat surveys have identified Barbastelle bats in the area which may use the Anglesey Abbey CWS for foraging. The Ecological PEI does not mention Anglesey Abbey's bats populations. The Ecological PEI notes surveys of the development site for bats completed in 2021 identified two pipistrelle (Pipistrellus spp.) day roosts and bat activity transect surveys recorded an assemblage of bats comprising common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Barbastelle, brown long-eared, noctule, serotine, Daubenton's and Myotis sp. Bats can travel good distances to forage, etc., and bats from Anglesey Abbey will almost certainly reach the proposed development site, using hedgerows to commute. Understanding how these populations move in the landscape will inform potential impact. Accordingly, the Trust considers that this CWS should be scoped into the EIA assessment.	n	The connectivity between Anglesey Abbey CWS and the Wicken Fen Vision Area from the site are to be considered in relation to the bat flight and usage information obtained during the 2022 season. These areas themselves have not been surveyed, however it is recognised that the proposed works areas are within flight range for the bat species found at these sites. The Biodiversity chapter of the ES includes an assessment of bats.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.7 Bat Surveys
National Trust	Biodiversity and Ecology	Odour	This is a matter which we will consider fully at the time that an application for Development Consent Order is submitted.	n	The Applicant notes the comment and will await sight of further observations from the Trust following their review of the Environmental Statement Odour chapters.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour
Natural England	Biodiversity and Ecology	BNG	We welcome the proposal to establish new habitats for wildlife, including delivery of a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain and creation of an improved landscape and connectivity.	n	The Applicant confirm that there will be a minimum of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain delivered on the site of the proposed WWTP	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13 BNG Report
Natural England	Biodiversity	Designated sites	As indicated in our comments on the HRA above, the Ouse Washes SPA, SAC, Ramsar site and SSSI should be included here. Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC should also be included. The HRA conclusions for these and other Habitat Sites should be presented in the ES Biodiversity chapter.	y	The Applicant notes this comment, and the Environmental Statement has been updated with further information relating to these sites.	Application Document Reference 5.2.8 Chapter 8: Biodiversity
Natural England	Biodiversity	Non statutory sites/bats	Natural England advises that potential impacts on the ecology of Anglesey Abbey CWS and the Wicken Fen	n	The Applicant notes the response and can confirm that an analysis of bat use of the area has been confirmed following	Application Document Reference 5.4.8.7 Bats

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Vision Area should also be assessed through the ES. These sites support a range of priority habitats and notable and protected species, including bats. The proposed development has the potential to impact on these features particularly through recreational pressure, and potentially hydrology, air quality and lighting.		further surveys, with additional appropriate mitigation and enhancement proposed. This is set out within the Environmental Statement Biodiversity chapter. The connectivity between Anglesey Abbey CWS and the Wicken Fen Vision Area from the Proposed Development are to be considered in relation to the bat flight and usage information obtained during the 2021 and 2022 season. These areas themselves have not been surveyed as are not part of the study area agreed through the Technical Working Group, however it is recognised that the land required for the proposed WWTP is within flight range for the bat species found at these sites. The Biodiversity Chapter of the ES assesses impacts to bats using the area and potential impacts to connected locations.	
Natural England	Ecology	Anglesey Abbey CWS	Natural England advises that potential impacts on the ecology of Anglesey Abbey CWS and the Wicken Fen Vision Area should also be assessed through the ES. These sites support a range of priority habitats and notable and protected species including bats. The proposed development has the potential to impact on these features particularly through recreational pressure, and potentially hydrology, air quality and lighting.	n	The Applicant notes the response and can confirm that the connectivity between Anglesey Abbey CWS and the Wicken Fen Vision Area from the Proposed Development were considered in relation to the bat flight and usage information obtained during the 2021 and 2022 season. These areas themselves have not been surveyed as are not part of the study area agreed through the Technical Working Group, however it is recognised that the land required for the proposed WWTP is within flight range for the bat species found at these sites. The Biodiversity Chapter of the ES assesses impacts to bats using the area and potential impacts to connected locations.	Application Document Reference 5.4.8.7 Bats
Natural England	Biodiversity	Protected Species	Our advice is that survey effort, assessment and mitigation relating to protected species should generally accord with Natural England's standing advice. A clear rationale for any departures from this advice, and any likely consequences, should be provided in the ES. In order to resolve any outstanding issues early in the process AWSL is encouraged to seek advice on protected species survey, assessment, and draft mitigation proposals through Natural England's Discretionary Advice Service (DAS). Through DAS we can provide early advice on all 3 licensing tests (in relation to European protected species), before a Development Consent Order is granted. This service also extends to other protected species (such as badger and water vole), protected by domestic wildlife legislation. This early assessment seeks to provide confidence, where required, that Natural England, as the statutory licensing	n	The Applicant acknowledges the comments from Natural England in relation to protected species. The Applicant has now finalised all the surveys and the details and assessments from these surveys is included in the Appendices to the Biodiversity chapter of the Environmental Statement. The Applicant has utilised the DAS service to obtain advice regarding the required Licences for the protected species and the mitigation measures necessary. Draft licences for bats, water vole and badger will be submitted to Natural England for their review and comment prior to the submission of the DCO application.	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			authority, has considered the appropriate issues relating to protected species. Natural England will conduct are view, based on a full draft licence application, in advance of the formal submission of the NSIP application to the Inspectorate. Following the review of the draft licence application, Natural England will either: provide a Letter of No Impediment (LONI), explaining that based on the information reviewed to date, that it sees no impediment to a licence being granted in the future should the DCO be issued; or set out any licensing issues for the applicant to address.			
Natural England	Biodiversity	Priority Habitats and Species	We note that the Proposed Development site is generally of low ecological value, although Low Fen Drove Way Grasslands and Hedges CWS, supporting calcareous grassland and scrub and species-rich hedgerows borders the south of the site. Floodplain grazing marsh, a priority habitat, is located east and west of the River Cam within the area of land required temporarily for the Waterbeach pipeline. Breeding bird surveys have recorded several Schedule 1 species including kingfisher, Cetti's warbler and hobby. We welcome that further targeted breeding bird surveys will be undertaken in 2022. Natural England notes that ecological surveys have recorded low numbers of reptiles and common lizard. Fish, invertebrate and plant surveys have recorded some notable species.	n	The Applicant notes the comments and can confirm that the details of the updated surveys have been included within the ES.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.4 Breeding Birds, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.5 Reptiles, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.6 Terrestrial Invertebrates
Natural England	Biodiversity and Ecology	Mitigation	In addition to our comments above, we welcome that AWSL have sought to address potential impacts to biodiversity through design, development of plans, use of a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and through carefully considered mitigation measures including habitat creation set out within the outline Landscape Ecological and Recreational Management Plan (LERMP) and a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). Natural England supports the habitat creation and enhancement measures set out in the LERMP. However, please note our advice above regarding the need for a more strategic landscape scale approach to address the effects of recreational pressure on the natural environment including Stow-cum-Quy SSSI and	n	The Applicant acknowledges and agrees with the comments regarding the mitigation proposals set out within the CoCP, the LERMP and CEMP. The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England in the delivery of these mitigation measures through the DCO.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part B LERMP and CEMP.

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			locally designated sites and to deliver greater benefits for the local community, wildlife and climate change.			
Natural England	Biodiversity	Landscape	We welcome that biodiversity is central to the landscape and Ecology design of the area around the Proposed WWTP with extensive habitat creation to deliver multifunctional benefits including landscape visual screening and recreational opportunities. Whilst the outline Landscape Masterplan within the outline LERMP provides the vision for the project we welcome that this will inform detailed design which will be secured through the DCO. The primary /embedded mitigation includes woodland, grassland, and hedgerow habitat creation which it is envisaged will integrate into the Cambridge Nature Network and complement and connect with core areas of Wilbraham Fen and Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSIs and the southern drier areas of the Wicken Fen Vision and will enhance and extend Low Fen Drove Way Grasslands and Hedges CWS. Natural England supports these proposals and the additional benefits they will provide for foraging habitat for bats and to benefit key Local BAP species such as turtle dove, and also reptiles and invertebrates. Please note that turtle dove appears to particularly benefit from the incorporation of wet depressions, or other wetland features, within a mosaic of bare ground, weed and scrub habitats.	y	The Applicant notes the comments from Natural England and has included these within the LERMP. Specifically, the landscape proposals have been adapted to include different features and wetland scrapes have been added which will benefit turtle doves.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Natural England	Biodiversity and Ecology	Biodiversity Net Gain	We note that the BNG calculation indicates that the outline Landscape Masterplan will deliver at least 20% net gain for both habitat and linear features (hedgerows); however, the calculation shows that 10% BNG for rivers is unlikely to be achieved through the current proposed landscape and ecology scheme. Natural England recommends that options to address this, through embedding finish within the final effluent outfall, should be fully explored. Embedding natural solutions through reed/sedge bed creation and soft engineering to enhance the riverbank could deliver significant gains for nature, people and climate change. Helpful information is available through the Constructed Wetland Association and some useful examples include the River Ingol wetland creation. Other examples are presented in Constructed Farm Wetlands. We believe some form of reedbed system may also have been	y	The Applicant is mindful of the comments and in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Conservators of the Cam has adapted the design of the outfall and river. In addition, The river units BNG commitment is set out within the ES in the BNG Report's Outline River Units Net Gain Strategy. The Applicant acknowledges that the area within the LERMP doesn't offer as good opportunities for wetland creation as the area near the river. This section of the BNG Report sets out the ditches to be created in the field near the outfall and a commitment to purchase/partner for the delivery of high distinctiveness river units which cannot be delivered anywhere in the DCO boundary.	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			installed at Grafham sewage treatment works. The incorporation of additional wetland features into the design of the scheme could also help to achieve the 10% BNG target and benefit turtle doves and other species. If these measures cannot be delivered AWSL should discuss off-site options with relevant stakeholders.			
Natural England	Biodiversity	Lighting	Construction and operational lighting should be avoided as far possible to minimise impacts on sensitive ecological receptors, particularly bats. We welcome that a Temporary Lighting Strategy will be developed as part of the CEMP and this will have regard to the Institute of Lighting Engineers (2021, 2018) Guidance Note 1 for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light and Guidance Note 8 Bats and Artificial Lighting in order to seek to minimise any adverse impact on sensitive receptors.	n	The Applicant has undertaken a lighting assessment-and a separate report of this forms an Appendix to the Landscape and Visual Amenity chapter of the ES. The approach to lighting is included within the Chapter 2 (Project Description) of the ES as well as a Lighting Strategy being submitted as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.15.3 Lighting Assessment Report and Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description
Natural England	Biodiversity and Ecology		Natural England's advice is that impacts to priority habitats, including floodplain grazing marsh, should be avoided as far as possible. Detailed measures to mitigate any adverse impacts, where avoidance is demonstrated to be impracticable, should be agreed with relevant parties. Detailed implementation, management and monitoring measures should be clearly set out in the LERMP. Measures should be implemented to maximise enhancement of priority habitats.	n	The Applicant notes the comments and monitoring measures, and management proposals are set out within the LERMP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Natural England	Biodiversity	Agricultural Land and Soil Resources	Natural England welcomes the preparation of a soil management plan (SMP) to inform sustainable soil handling and re-use in the landscaping proposals within the DCO boundary for soils impacted temporarily and land which will undergo permanent land take. However, for areas of temporary development, a soil survey should be undertaken to inform soil handling and the restoration criteria.	n	The Applicant acknowledges all the comments in relation to the Agricultural Land and Soil resources. An outline Soil Management Plan (SMP) is included within the Application. A draft of this was provided as part of the PEIR at Consultation 3. The CoCP requires the appointed contractor(s) to prepare a detailed SMP in line with the outline SMP. The outline SMP has been prepared in in accordance with the guidance in the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites. (2009). The CoCP (Defra 2009) provides general measures that are required to be in place to ensure that soil is appropriately managed during construction and suitable for its final use. The outline SMP provides the basis for the final SMP which will be prepared by the contractor prior to the start of construction. The final SMP will details these measures as applicable to the particular soil types of the site and should be adhered to during and after the construction phase.	Application Document Ref 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					Although well-executed soil management will minimise damage to soil resources a period of aftercare and soil monitoring to ensure that reinstated soils are functional to the required level. For this reason, the outline SMP advises that reinstated soils are subject to a period of aftercare, as per Defra 2009 guidance. During this period, the Contractor is required to closely monitor both soil and plant health closely to swiftly identify and rectify deficiencies.	
Natural England	HRA	HRA	Additional comments made in HRA word document. Natural England is satisfied that the approach taken to the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report (Mott MacDonald, February 2022) is in general accordance with the requirements of regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).	n	The Applicant acknowledges that Natural England are satisfied with the approach taken for the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report and that it meets the requirements of regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.15 Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.16 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report
Natural England	HRA	HRA	The HRA should be updated to consider the effects of the Proposed Development on the Ouse Washes SAC, SPA, Ramsar site through any changes in flows and sediment load in the River Great Ouse system associated with the final effluent discharges. We note from PEIR Water Resources that preliminary fluvial models indicate that increased final treated effluent discharges due to population growth will have a negligible impact on the flows and water levels of the River Cam. This should be confirmed through the updated fluvial models, factoring in the effects of cessation of the final effluent discharge from the Waterbeach WRC.	y	The HRA Report has been progressed to take account this response and has been updated by the Applicant accordingly. A first review of the HRA has been undertaken with Natural England to review the findings. This review process will continue with Natural England in the finalisation of the HRA Report.	Application Document Reference 5.4.8.15 Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report and Application Document Reference 5.4.8.16 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report
Natural England	HRA	HRA	Natural England concurs with the view that there is a need for further assessment to consider: Air quality effects for Devil's Dyke SAC associated with emissions to air from vehicles, construction plant and on-site combustion; Hydrological effects through changes in water quantity or quality for Wicken Fen Ramsar site/ Fenland SAC, and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, The Wash SPA and The Wash Ramsar site. The HRA screening should be updated to include an assessment of likely significant effect for the Ouse Washes SAC, SPA and Ramsar site. The HRA screening stage should then be concluded, and further assessment progressed through the Appropriate Assessment.	y	The Applicant notes these comments and can confirm that the HRA Report has included a consideration of emissions to air and hydrological effects to conclude the HRA screening stage. A first review of the HRA has been undertaken with Natural England to review the findings. This review process will continue with Natural England in the finalisation of the HRA Report.	Application Document Reference 5.4.8.16 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Quy Fen Trust	Biodiversity		No BNG assessment has been provided and conflicts with some documents stating 20% BNG and some 10%.	n	The Applicant is committed to the delivery of a minimum of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) on the site of the proposed WWTP	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Report
RSPB	Biodiversity	BNG	Encouraged Anglian Water to raise its ambitions for the project to 20% BNG. This would then contribute to the doubling nature aims of local governments in Cambridgeshire. We therefore welcome the statement that the project will deliver "at least 20% for both habitat and linear features (hedgerows)" from recent BNG assessments. However, we would still be keen to be informed when the final percentage is calculated for the projects Development Consent Order (DCO) application		The Applicant is committed to the delivery of a minimum of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) on the site of the proposed WWTP	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES, Chapter 8: Biodiversity and Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report
RSPB	Biodiversity	Habitats and Species	We welcome the specific inclusion of turtle dove provision in the Landscape, Ecological and Recreation Management Plan	y	The Applicant has considered the recommendation and included this species inclusion accordingly.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
RSPB	Biodiversity	Habitats and Species/LERMP	In addition to the features stated in paragraph 3.4.9 of the Landscape Masterplan, the following advice is recommended by Operation Turtle Dove, as per our original comments: "Areas of bare soil will be created along field margins in the east of the site around the proposed areas of calcareous loam meadow grassland (as shown in the Landscape Masterplan (page 12) and Habitat Areas plan (page 31) and presented in section 3.1 above), with the management of these areas involving annual cultivation in spring. This type of management will also benefit invertebrates." Turtle dove feed plots should have a very open structure which will require management to maintain low sparse structure with 30-60% bare ground. Plot management should be included in these plans to ensure these areas provide for turtle doves. • "Sow flowering seed mixes developed to provide food for turtle doves throughout the breeding season." You can sow either the bespoke turtle dove mix or a mixture of at least 4 legume species and 2 other species known to be important in a turtle doves' diet. The bespoke mix: Early English common vetch (25%), birds foot trefoil (20%), early white clover (20%), black medick (20%), early red clover (10%), fumitory (5%). o Alternative options: common knapweed, cowslip, cut-leaved cranes-bill, ribwort plantain, scarlet pimpernel, scentless mayweed,	y	The Applicant notes these comments and they have been considered within the overall Landscape master Plan to ensure the appropriate selection of species.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			shepherd's purse, or yarrow. o These should be located in a sunny, sheltered and south-facing site. We are also pleased to see the inclusion of small seasonal ponds, created through scrapes or swales. This will provide accessible water for turtle doves alongside the other benefits for wildlife such as invertebrates.			
Ramblers, Cambridge Group	Biodiversity	Habitats and Species	We note the response from the National Trust, and would support their concerns regarding the following: The need to understand bat impact and to scope the Anglesey Abbey CWS into the EIA	n	The connectivity between Anglesey Abbey CWS and the Wicken Fen Vision Area from the site have been considered in relation to the bat flight and usage information obtained during the 2022 season. These areas themselves have not been surveyed, however it is recognised that the proposed works areas are within flight range for the bat species found at these sites.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.7 Bats
Ramblers, Cambridge Group	Biodiversity	Habitats and Species	The need to fully investigate and mitigate potential hydrological impacts on connected sites.	n	The need to investigate and mitigate any potential hydrological impacts from the development site is acknowledged. Pumping tests were performed in 2021 to determine hydrogeological properties of the West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation. Contaminant risk in the chalk is addressed in the revised Contaminant Transport model (ConSIM) which uses updated hydraulic properties provided by pumping test data.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 Chapter 20: Water Resources, Application Document Ref 5.4.20.3 WFD Assessment and Application Document Ref 5.4.20.4Dewatering Pump test technical note
Ramblers, Cambridge Group	Biodiversity	Habitats and Species	The need to evaluate and mitigate any recreational impacts from n the proposed cycle way on Stow-Cum-Quy Fen SSSI		Recreational surveys have been undertaken to determine the recreational use in this area and have been included within the ES. Surveys were undertaken on weekdays, weekends, and holidays to understand any differences on usage patterns.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Teversham Parish Council	Biodiversity	Habitats and Species	We have concerns about wildlife. There are currently several herds of deer in this area muntjac, roe and fallow deer which use Honey Hill and the surrounding area. Since Bellway have begun their work on Airport Way, we have noticed deer move from the site into our village green spaces and gardens.	n	The presence of deer within the area of land required for the Proposed Development is acknowledged in the Biodiversity Chapter of the ES. In construction there will be a requirement to apply the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) which will include a range of measures to secure areas under construction including avoiding harm to wildlife by preventing access to areas under construction. For example, preventing access to excavations and fencing or putting in place barriers to prevent wildlife interfacing with construction areas and equipment. Once the site is operational there will be an overall positive impact on habitats, the newly planted areas will provide foraging and shelter habitats for a wide range of species.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES, Chapter 8: Biodiversity, Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP
The Combined Authority	Biodiversity	BNG,	The Combined Authority is able to comment on, and support, the commitment that the scheme will provide a	n	The Applicant acknowledges the comments and support for the commitment to deliver a minimum of 20% Biodiversity Net	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			20% biodiversity uplift. This aligns with our ambition as endorsed through the OxCam Arc Environment Principles and the Climate Action Plan.		gain at the site of the proposed WWTP. The Applicant has completed a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) calculation encompassing both area-based and linear habitats (hedgerows and rivers) for the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Relocation Project (CWWTRP). This forms part of the final DCO application.	Biodiversity Net Gain BNG Report
The Environment Agency	Biodiversity	BNG, recreational and connection opportunities	We strongly encourage Anglian Water to be ambitious for the environment and explore opportunities for the scheme to deliver further environmental net gains and enhancements wherever possible. For example, contributing to nature-based solutions, nature recovery and green infrastructure.	n	The Applicant is committed to the delivery of a minimum of 20% BNG at the site of the proposed WWTP.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 Chapter 8: Biodiversity and Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report
The Environment Agency	Biodiversity	Riverbank	It would be good to see the proposed measures associated with minimising impacts to the riverbank prior to the DCO application where possible. The proposed new ditch habitats and marginal vegetation may be sufficient to mitigate for any losses of riverbank, however, it is for the applicant to demonstrate how any losses have been mitigated or compensated for and to look to achieve net gains wherever possible.	n	In the progression of our design and construction proposals the area of grazing marsh to the west of the River Cam will be avoided. In the case of the River Cam the outfall drawings are included within the DCO. The Environmental Statement refers to and includes mitigation in relation to reducing impacts. It is recognised that the mitigation for specific impacts i.e., direct loss of river bank should seek to provide a net gain for this loss. This is dealt with in a the BNG Report setting out how the proposals seek to provide net gain.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13 BNG Report
The Environment Agency	Biodiversity	Water vole displacement	Water vole displacements must be undertaken under the relevant licence from Natural England, as noted on page13 within the Water Vole paragraph. They should be undertaken by suitably qualified ecologists. Regarding water vole mitigation, proposed new ditch habitats should be sufficient quality and quantity to mitigate the loss of existing habitats and link up with existing water vole habitat. Newly created habitats will require at least one full growing season to establish and provide suitable water vole habitat. Future maintenance may be required to maintain suitable water vole habitat. We recommend that existing riparian vegetation be translocated from areas where it will be lost on site.	n	Natural England has and will be continued to be consulted in relation to water vole. This will include the preparation of a 'Ghost Licence' which will specify all requirements in relation to mitigation of potential impacts to water vole. Specific mitigation measures such as habitat creation are also identified within the ES	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.3 Water Voles
The Environment Agency	Biodiversity	invasive species	Water vole displacements must be undertaken under the relevant licence from Natural England, as noted on page 13 within the Water Vole paragraph. They should be undertaken by suitably qualified ecologists.	n	The assessment of environmental impacts for Water Resources reported in the ES includes an assessment of the potential impacts related to INNS. This assessment takes account of the requirement with the COCP for appointed contractor(s) to	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES Chapter Biodiversity, Application Document

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Regarding water vole mitigation, proposed new ditch habitats should be sufficient quality and quantity to mitigate the loss of existing habitats and link up with existing water vole habitat. Newly created habitats will require at least one full growing season to establish and provide suitable water vole habitat. Future maintenance may be required to maintain suitable water vole habitat. We recommend that existing riparian vegetation be translocated from areas where it will be lost on site.		appropriately manage their activities to avoid the spread of INNS. The preference for mitigation is to provide measures within the order limits and as close to the impacted area as is possible. However, it is recognised that in some cases there may be a need to explore measures offsite.	Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A
The Environment Agency	Biodiversity	Connectivity and further opportunities	There is local interest in improving Wilbraham Fens SSSI, located southeast of the proposed development site. There may be opportunities to support these improvements. We also recommend consideration of strategic nature recovery opportunities and green infrastructure associated within the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan.	n	The Applicant notes the comments and continues to work with other stakeholders to realise further opportunities.	
Waterbeach and District Bridleway	Biodiversity	Nature networks	The rural nature and diverse wildlife of the byway 85/14 between Low Fen Drove and Horningsea Road should be protected.	n	The Applicant seeks to ensure that the Landscape masterplan mitigates the potential impacts of the proposed development on existing recreational facilities. The Applicant has also included PROW within the Construction and Traffic Management Plan,	Application Document Ref: 5.2.19 Traffic and Transport, Application Document Ref: 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Waterbeach Parish Council	Biodiversity and Ecology	Survey data	It is noted that Waterbeach - Clayhithe PEI ecology mentions that site visits and desk studies were conducted to identify species in the area. It does not give detailed evidence. It is therefore not possible to give an informed response. The consultation documents state there may be loss of hedgerows and trees along the pipeline route. It is therefore not possible to give an informed response. It is noted that ecological studies are ongoing for example water voles in the Bannold Drove, Bannold Road ditches.	n	Natural England has and will be continued to be consulted in relation to water vole. This will include the preparation of a 'Ghost Licence' which will specify all requirements in relation to mitigation of potential impacts to water vole. Specific mitigation measures such as habitat creation are also identified within the ES.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.3 Water Voles
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Biodiversity and Ecology		The creation of bee banks, hibernacula, deadwood and brash piles and seasonal ponds is also supported by the District Council. However, it is not clear if the seasonal ponds will be part of the SuDS system as well as the anticipated water levels for these ponds. The District Council considers further clarity is needed on this point. In addition, detailed information on the design of the ponds (and whether they will be lined or have deep channels to capture water for longer periods of time) should be provided as there is a risk, they could remain dry for much of the year and thus fail to serve as ponds.	n	Seasonal ponds are separate to SUDs. The Applicant spent significant time spent investigating the potential for water habitat on site, however due to the geology and hydrogeology of the site water habitats are difficult to create and maintain. The design includes the creation of seasonal ponds that will help to attract biodiversity to the area.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Biodiversity and Ecology	Water vole and Otter	The District Council would welcome further details on water vole or otter survey work undertaken as well as an assessment of potential impacts to protected species. The District Council also notes that the Bannolds Drain forms part of the drainage system for the new Waterbeach Town (East) development.	y	The water vole and otter survey methodology were agreed in the Biodiversity Technical Working Group. The survey buffers were adjusted as the order limits have evolved – mostly notably in the case of the Waterbeach pipeline where the survey buffers have been reset numerous times to ensure that the commitments on areas covered are met. Otter surveys were undertaken 100m either side of the proposed treated effluent discharge outfall structure on the River Cam and along all other watercourses, ditches, and ponds within the EIA Scoping boundary plus 50m. Water vole surveys were combined with the otter surveys and undertaken 100m either side of the proposed treated effluent discharge outfall structure on the River Cam and along all other watercourses, ditches, and ponds within the EIA Scoping boundary plus 50m.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES, Chapter 8: Biodiversity, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.3 Water Voles, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.9 Otter
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Biodiversity		The PEIR volume 'Invertebrate Survey 2021' notes the sighting of the "IUCN 'Near Threatened' species, Variable Damselfly Coenagrionid pulchellum". The volume includes in Appendix 2 Hyptomenera previously recorded by others but not seen in the 2021 field surveys. As FDPC advised in our letter of 11/9/2020, some Hyptomenera have been classed as Endangered, Vulnerable or Rare.	n	The Applicant notes the comments with regards to Variable Damselfly (Coenagrion Pulchellum) and can confirm that invertebrates are considered in relation to habitat loss and new provision. This species will have new habitats created suitable for its use through the ditch creation (an added benefit) as well as retained habitats (ditches) currently available. With regards to Hyptomenera, collected data will be reviewed against current conservation status.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES, Chapter 8: Biodiversity
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Biodiversity		Fen Ditton Parish Council has concerns that AW have taken a lack of consideration of nesting of skylarks	n	The Applicant notes the comments with regards to skylarks, which were addressed at the time the issue was raised with members of the community. The Applicant advises that their experts were aware of the skylarks, qualified ecologists surveyed the area in advance to ensure that nesting birds were not present in the vicinity of those works prior to commencement. Those ecological checks were logged in accordance with environmental and ecological protocols, which are strictly always adhered to by the surveying team. The Applicant is therefore confident that disturbance to breeding birds by the survey teams has not occurred.	
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Biodiversity		Where public use is granted, would animal proof fences be needed to prevent dogs roaming? If so, how would wild animals still be able to cross the alignment?	n	Animal proof fencing is to be provided internally around the inside of the earth bank and at the top of the earth bank.	Application Document Ref 4.9 Design Plans - Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant
Horningsea Parish Council	Biodiversity	BNG	HPC seeks additional clarity on the issue of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The PEIR documents appear to contain conflicting statements regarding the AW Biodiversity Net Gain commitments. These vary from a 'minimum of 10%' to a 'minimum of 20% BNG' as noted in para 2.1.6	n	The project's design will deliver a minimum of 20% biodiversity net gain (BNG) on the proposed site, with the potential to connect to the Cambridge Nature Network, enhancing ecological connectivity. The BNG Report is provided in the DCO Application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13 BNG Report

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			of the LERMP. No draft BNG assessment appears to be provided within the pack and is requested by HPC.			
Horningsea Parish Council	Biodiversity		HPC notes that village residents regularly observe badgers, deer, foxes, hedgehogs, water voles and otters in the area. These sensitive mammals will be disturbed by the construction activity. We want to register our objection to disruption to their habitat, no amount of mitigation will avoid this.	n	The Applicant notes the comments. Biodiversity impacts and mitigations have been fully assessed and are detailed in the Environmental Statement.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES, Chapter 8: Biodiversity
Horningsea Parish Council	Biodiversity		Report from residence of disturbance of nesting skylarks during drilling at Honey Hill in May 2021. Skylarks are red listed birds and next every year at Honey Hill	n	The Applicant adheres strictly to the requirements of environmental surveys to ensure protection of wild birds. During surveys vehicles accessed the site along the public highway (Low Fen Drove Way) with off-road access routes and the drilling locations being surveyed in advance by a qualified ecologist to ensure that nesting birds were not present in the immediate vicinity of those works prior to their commencement. Those ecology checks were logged in accordance with our environmental and ecological protocols which are strictly adhered to by the surveying teams at all times. The Applicant is confident that disturbance to breeding birds by the survey teams has not occurred.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Biodiversity		We are also concerned about the veteran and other important trees in the CWS and request the CWS to be fenced off to protect root zones and canopies from damage by passing equipment. We request a feedback process for the community to report problems and an independent specialist to be appointed to oversee this.	n	During construction measures will be taken to protect trees. The Community Liaison Plans sets out how the Applicant will engage during construction.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 Code of Construction Practice, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan
Cambridgeshire and P'Boro Combined Authority	Biodiversity	BNG	The Combined Authority is able to comment on, and support, the commitment that the scheme will provide a 20% biodiversity uplift. This aligns with our ambition as endorsed through the OxCam Arc Environment Principles and the Climate Action Plan		The Applicant notes the comment.	
Save Honey Hill	Biodiversity		Particular damage is likely from the combined use of the former railway NE of Low Fen Drove as a Bridleway (Work No 32) and the link path (within the scope of Work No 2?) running east of the AW proposed works to Low Fen Drove. The latter element will cause extra severance of the CWS and should be omitted. At least one alternative layout, proposed elsewhere, exists with a more northerly access from Low Fen Drove towards Allicky Fm, (Station Rd Quy) using the branch of the concrete strip road which runs east from Snout Corner, beyond the steel barrier, to Black Ditch. Here there would be a footbridge and after that, following	n	The Applicant has considered the proposed replacement of the bridleway to Station Road by one via Black Ditch and Allicky Farm, taking into account the main environmental effects relevant to both routes. The Applicant believes that the Allicky Farm option would lead to increased environmental impact and greater interference with land rights compared with the current proposals. The proposed use of the former railway line north-east from Low Fen Drove Way would use the existing surface for its entire length rather than requiring the construction of a new path over farmland. While the option proposed by FDPC would deliver a small recreational improvement by being a more direct route, this benefit would	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			the edge of two fields, the path would link to the lovely drove road which meets Station Rd at the triangular plantation. Such a layout would retain two, not three, entrances to the paths AW propose immediately outside the bund and thus still maintain a circular walk whilst avoiding all use of the former railway line. In addition, this alternative would provide better linkage towards the Wicken Fen Vision's spine access paths although a longer route to Anglesey Abbey		not outweigh the additional cost and environmental impact when compared with the Station Road route. The Applicant therefore intends to retain the Station Road route for the DCO application.	
Save Honey Hill	Biodiversity		Where public use is granted, Anglian Water should consult landowners and consider if animal proof fences are needed to prevent dogs roaming. However, this would need provision for wild animals crossing the alignment.	n	Animal proof fencing is to be provided internally around the inside of the earth bank and at the top of the earth bank.	
Save Honey Hill	Biodiversity		Equal weights should be given to Appendices 1 and 2 of invertebrate species	n	For the assessment for invertebrates reported in the ES chapter on Biodiversity, there is not a distinction, it assesses likely significant effects on invertebrates as the receptor.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES, Chapter 8: Biodiversity
Save Honey Hill	Biodiversity		The future Habitats Assessment should examine the impact of invasive species being introduced from the Bannold Ditch catchment to the River Cam above Bottisham Lock when untreated storm water effluent is pumped upstream for discharge at the existing and proposed future outfalls next to the A14. This mechanism for an effect does not appear to be included in the PEIR.	n	The HRA process is to consider likely significant effects to European sites (SACs, SPA and in the UK Ramsar sites). This considers credible pathways for an effect to occur i.e., a change upstream of a designated site which could be affected by the change. As part of the Proposed Development there is no direct link (currently or proposed) from Bannold Drain to the proposed WWTP. The Waterbeach pipeline will transfer waste water currently treated at the Waterbeach Water Recycling Centre (WRC) for treatment in the proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP). This would pass through the treatment works and treated effluent returned to the River Cam. There would be very infrequent storm events. These would occur under the limits of the operational environmental permit. In instances where storm events occur dilute waste water mixed with rain water would be screened before being discharged to the river. In terms of transfer from different drainage catchments it is not considered likely that either catchment presents a different risk profile in terms of the presence of INNS. Notwithstanding, the various pathways and likely significant effects which may result will be part of the consultation process that the Applicant will have with Natural England in their role as the Statutory Nature Conservation Body in relation to completion of assessments for the purpose of HRA.	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Save Honey Hill	Biodiversity		The BNG calculations should not claim excessive scores from 'improvements' to the CWS. The whole question of whether the CWS should be left under the ownership and management of the current owners should be reconsidered. This may be preferable to a high land take to assist AW's aspiration to achieve 20% BNG.	n	The method of calculation for BNG units that has been applied is as defined by the Metric 3.0. This is agreed with Natural England and does not disproportionately consider the CWS.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES, Chapter 8: Biodiversity
Save Honey Hill	Biodiversity		The BNG calculations should take account of the loss of food production due to land take and recognise that production will be displaced elsewhere.	n	The loss of food production due to land take would not be part of the Metric 3.0 (developed by Natural England) used for the calculation of BNG.	
Save Honey Hill	Biodiversity		AW should provide a copy of the draft Habitats Regulations Assessment.	n	The HRA Report is provided as part of the DCO application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.15 HRA Assessment Screening Report, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.16 HRA Report

Table 1-4 Consultation

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
CPPF	Consultation		We continue to welcome dialogue on this project and are appreciative that your designs are responding to comments being made by stakeholders	n	The Applicant notes the comment.	
National Trust	Site selection	Ecological impacts	The Trust previously responded to the Phase Two consultation in August 2021 raising concerns regarding Site 3 in respect of the impacts on the National Trust's Wicken Fen Vision, traffic, odour, ecological and nature conservation impacts and potential for adverse landscape effects. Prior to this the Trust responded to the Phase One consultation in September 2020 in which it commented on the proposed site options. As you are aware, the Trust was disappointed that Site 3 was chosen as the preferred option by Anglian Water as it is land which is located within the Wicken Fen Vision Area and it removes scope for future restoration for nature, people and climate. We are also disappointed that a development of this scale is proposed within the Cambridge Green Belt.	n	The Applicant notes the comment, however throughout development of the project the aim has been to create proposals that complement local initiatives such as Wicken Fen Vision and the Cambridge Nature Network. The Applicant has engaged with relevant stakeholders throughout the consultation process on this and will continue that engagement. The Applicant believes that the project achieves this alignment and the commitment of 20% Biodiversity Net Gain to be created will provide a benefit for nature and for people.	
Teversham Parish Council	Consultation material and assessments		There are a number of flaws in the consultation process: the questions are not numbered in the online survey, so it is difficult to see if you have answered everything. The system requires you to confirm comments by email- it isn't clear if you are submitting to the consultation or just giving permission for your comments to be made public, some of the wording of questions is leading and some key questions are missing (the focus of the statutory consultation on just design and mitigation issues means there is limited opportunity to highlight alternative proposals) and there has not been enough public face-to-face interaction. One-off f2f meetings and a single on-line meeting are not enough, there should have been a public exhibition over a few days in an accessible place. Many of our residents do not have access to the internet and may have limited digital skills in any case. We were disappointed that Teversham Parish, despite being in the consultation area, was not included as a location for a meeting during the consultation period.	n	Phase Three Consultation focused upon design and mitigation to reflect the stage the project was at and the aspects of the project that required stakeholders' feedback. upon. All comments received during the consultation were read and recorded. Between consultation phases all of the communication lines were open. The consultation programme provides numerous ways for stakeholders to respond digitally, by post and face to face. 5 consultation events were held throughout the core consultation zone, they were set at different times of the week and different times of the day to ensure that there were plenty of opportunities for stakeholders to visit across the consultation zone rather than in just once location. This is done to ensure that people who have limited access to the internet are not excluded.	Application Document Ref 6.1 Consultation Report
The Coal Authority	Consultation area		Having reviewed the project site boundary, the site is located outside the coalfield. Accordingly, the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on this project.	n	The Applicant notes the comment.	
The Combined Authority	Consultation material and assessments		The phase three consultation is specifically on certain aspects of the scheme, such as the landscape proposals, appearance of the Gateway Building, improved recreation	n	The Applicant notes the comments in relation to the material presented during consultation and can confirm that it has engaged with the relevant highway authorities on issues of Traffic and	Application Document Ref 6.1

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			connectivity, and detailed design of the vehicle access. These raise specific issues of local detail that, as a strategic authority, we are not placed to comment upon. Of course, it is expected that where appropriate these will be addressed by the relevant constituent councils of the Combined Authority under their varied responsibilities as Highway and Planning Authorities.		Transport, Natural England and the Environment Agency on Biodiversity and Ecology and water quality and the relevant offices of Cambridge County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.	Consultation Report
The Environment Agency	Consultation material and assessments	PEIR	Overall, we are generally content at this stage that the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) has identified the likely significant environmental effects. The primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures that have been proposed to alleviate the effects seem appropriate, however, we will need to see more detailed designs (and further assessments where applicable) to ensure the environment is protected.	n	We understand a full review will be required of the now final Environmental Statement and we look forward to working with you on this. We hope that responses to each of the Environmental Statements Chapters and the accompanying management plans and works plans will continue to inform the current draft Statement of Common Ground that we are working on with you.	
The Environment Agency	Engagement		We would like to take this opportunity to thank your colleagues who have been engaging with us in early discussions.	n	The Applicant notes that the Environment Agency is satisfied with the consultation and engagement process to date.	
Waterbeach and District Bridleway	Consultation material and assessments		We object to this planning proposal, not in principle, but because we are concerned that the issues we outline above, have not been addressed in related design plans for mitigating against impact on equestrian rights of way and safety.	n	The Applicant has sought to mitigate the potential impacts of the proposed development on existing recreational routes and pathways. The Applicant has worked with the British Horse Society in order to consider equestrians' feedback. The Applicant has contacted the WDBA to inform them of the work that has been carried out on the project in the consideration of equestrians.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Cambridge City Council	Consultation	Engagement	The City Council therefore would welcome further dialogue and, in any event, looks forward to continued engagement with Anglian Water to examine further the key issues highlighted in this response, noting the opportunity to deliver an exemplar ReWWTP facility, in terms of innovative design, sustainability approach and use of technology both prior to and during the DCO stage	n	There has been ongoing engagement, including the series of workshops held in June 2022 with GCSPS Officers following Phase Three Consultation. This engagement will continue to support Local Impacts Report and to agree a Statement of Common Ground.	
Horningsea Parish Council	site selection		HPC request a review of other site options, including retaining the current site at Cowley Road and sourcing of housing from elsewhere. The site at Cowley Road can still be developed with a more modest residential development and greater open space for those residents. HPC request a thorough review of the cumulative effects of siting the WWTP in this area. We believe that at this site we actually have a multiplication of significant effects resulting from Northeast Cambridge, Waterbeach New Town, Marleigh, new development in Fulbourn and Cambridge Airport. The PEI: Introductory Paper p1 'Effects determined to be slight or neutral are not deemed to be significant, and as such are	n	The Applicant has provided the Site Selection Report as part of the DCO Application.	Application Document Ref 7.3 Site Selection Report (NTS)

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			not reported in detail and will not require specific mitigation. The exception to this is where the combination of multiple non-significant effects has the potential to lead to a significant cumulative effect.'			
Save Honey Hill	Site selection		Comments recorded in consultation response (see pages 3,4,5,6,7,8) querying site selection, use of green belt, project need and Local Plan	n	Details on site selection can be found in the Site Selection Report. The Planning Statement details project need and links to planning policy including a green belt assessment.	Application Document Ref 7.3 Site Selection, Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement
Sue Baldwin – Secretary	Contact details		The stakeholder confirmed receipt of the s44 notice and wanted to give a new address as there is no postbox at the church address.	n	The Applicant confirmed to the stakeholder that the change of address had been recorded.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Project Implementation	Consultation	Consultation has been inadequate during all phases of consultation, online, face to face and responding to questions.		Since the inception of the project, the Applicant has provided a detailed programme of consultation, that has involved three phases all have which have been much longer than the statutory minimum of 28 days. Phase Three Consultation focused upon design and mitigation to reflect the stage the project was at and the aspects of the project that the Applicant wanted to obtain stakeholders feedback upon. However, any comments (including those not relevant to Phase 3) made on the consultation feedback forms, consultation response emails or hard copy letters were all read, recorded, and responded to. Between consultation phases all communication lines were open, and comments were acknowledged and responded to. There was always the opportunity to comment on any aspect of the project. With regards to the consultation programme at Phase Three numerous ways for stakeholders to respond were provided: digitally, by post and face to face. 5 consultation events were held throughout the core consultation zone, they were set at different times of the week and different times of the day to ensure that there were plenty of opportunities to visit across the area rather than in just one location. This was done to ensure that it did not exclude people who have limited access to the internet. There was a good response at those meetings as well as through our other engagement methods. Following Phase Three Consultation there has been a further Community Working Group to provide feedback and an Odour site visit at the existing plant. Further details in the Consultation Report.	Application Document Ref 6.1 Consultation Report

Table 1-5 Carbon / Climate Change

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cam Valley Forum	Climate resilience		Climate change is a real issue for all developments like yours, both drought and much greater rainfall events need to be built into a works' capacity.	n	Climate resilience, considering drought and greater rainfall, has been included in the Climate Resilience Chapter of the Environmental Statement, submitted as part of the Application.	Application Document Ref 5.2.9 ES, Chapter 9: Climate Resilience
Cambridgeshire County Council	Carbon	Sustainable Travel Plan	In order to meet the Council's target of net zero carbon emissions by 2045 it is vital that all opportunities to put in place NMU infrastructure to encourage modal shift are taken. As noted above, the Council would encourage the Applicant to consider extending the NMU provision as far as the school in Horningsea, which could have a significant local impact on modal shift, particularly as it would concern the younger generations who may then set up healthy behavioural choices for life.	n	The project is proposing to improve a section of the existing NMU route from Horningsea village to Fen Ditton Primary School between Low Fen Drove Way and the southern 'on slip' signalised junction. The measures include: increasing the width of the existing shared use footway / cycleway to 3.0m, provide separation between the NMU route and the adjacent carriageway by providing a new 1.0m wide verge between the carriageway and NMU route, replacing the existing parapet on the A14 overbridge (with a high barrier) to provide a cycleway compliant facility, improvements to the existing signalised pedestrian crossing points on the 'on-slip' and 'off-slip' roads, a reduction in the maximum speed limit on Horningsea Road from 60mph to 40mph between the villages of Horningsea and Fen Ditton (subject to agreement from the Local Highway Authority and the Police). Provision of a central pedestrian island on Horningsea Road to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross from the existing footway / cycleway on the west side of Horningsea Road to the footway / cycleway network on the CWWTW site, a footway / cycleway link on the east side of Horningsea Road to provide access from Low Fen Drove Way to the new crossing facility on Horningsea Road. These measures seek to deliver significant improvements to a key section of the Horningsea Greenway. The Horningsea Greenway Project is proposing further improvements along the Horningsea village to Fen Ditton Primary School NMU route as part of that project.	
Federation of Cam Residents	Carbon		Residents challenge the carbon expenditure involved in decommissioning and decontamination of the current site. There is little evidence to support the statements in PEI Carbon.	n	An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan, Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES,

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	Chapter10: Carbon
Lucy Frazer MP	Carbon		Carbon impact of both the existing facility on Cowley Road and the proposed new facility are advertised as low carbon developments but given the absence of a publicly available assessment, local residents are worried about the carbon impact of decommissioning the large site on Cowley Road, followed by the development of a large new facility.	n	An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan and Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon
Quy Fen Trust	Carbon		No supporting information has been provided regarding the AW 70% construction capital carbon reduction or a draft carbon assessment published for either the CWWTP relocation or corresponding North East Cambridge Development. Additional information should be provided including a draft	n	An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			carbon estimate, additional details of the renewable energy sources and sufficient information to allow consideration of the 70% reduction claim		Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	
Teversham Parish Council	Carbon		Concerns raised about the carbon accounting, there does not appear to be full accounting for the decommissioning of the current site.	n	An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan
The Combined Authority	Climate		April 2022 the Combined Authority adopted its Sustainable Growth Ambition Statement that sets out its approach to	n	The Applicant is mindful of the comments and within the Environmental Statement has included a chapter that	Application Document Ref

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			climate and nature as one of the six capitals vital to good growth. This follows adoption in March 2022 of the Climate Action Plan. This reiterates our support given to the goal of Anglian Water in reaching net zero carbon emissions by 2030, and the project's role in that target.		contains the assessment of the effects, and the significance of climate change as it applies to the infrastructure that forms the Proposed Development and also considers in-combination climate impacts on the wider environment and community. The design of the Proposed Development includes various embedded mitigations that will provide resilience to the effects of climate change. The design incorporates flexibility and capacity within the Proposed Development, ensuring that in the future, as the climate continues to change, additional infrastructure or solutions can be introduced as part of maintenance and upgrade procedures to further enhance resilience. This includes the ability for the Proposed Development to manage higher storm flows in the future and to continuously meet evolving permitting requirements even in the case of low flow and future drought conditions. There is also capacity to add additional infrastructure including more storm storage, additional heat recovery and cooling, additional treatment infrastructure.	5.2.9 ES, Chapter 9: Climate Resilience
South Cambridgeshire District Council	renewable energy		The District Council welcomes the green energy initiatives highlighted and considers these to be an important benefit to the local area and should be part of the required elements of the proposed project.	n	The Applicant notes the comment.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Carbon	Water quality	The District Council would expect as part of such a solution (for carbon reduction) detail to be provided as to whether any opportunity to utilise natural processes to "polish" the treated water within the landscape has been investigated to minimise the need for energy intensive processes within the plant	n	The Applicant investigated opportunities for natural processes, however due to the large volume of final effluent proposed to be discharged, a feasible natural solution could not be found. The option of ditches and reed beds were considered but the volumes and areas required were too large.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Carbon	Decommissioning	It is noted that the Scoping Opinion adopted by the Planning Inspectorate in respect of the DCO proposal requires an assessment of the cumulative impacts of the proposal for the new works together with the effects of waste generated from demolition activities at the existing sewage works. This will need to include an assessment of cumulative carbon impacts as well. Such details will need to be provided in relation to any SA for either or both the AAP and the GCLP and therefore ought to be included in the assessment of the DCO application. It is also relevant to note that Policy 2 of the AAP requires planning applications under the 1990 Act to calculate carbon emissions through a Whole Life Carbon Assessment to demonstrate actions to reduce life-cycle carbon emissions and	n	An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP (for the purpose of permit surrender), construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon, Application Document Ref

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			also to reduce construction waste. The Environmental Assessment supporting any such planning application for V4 SCDC development on the NEC site would be expected to include consideration of the demolition of existing structures on the site and the potential for waste reduction and reuse on site. This would inform the Whole Life Carbon Assessment required by the AAP. To that extent therefore the District Council considers the same should apply to a DCO.		existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	5.4.10.1 GHG Assessment.
Cambridge City Council	Carbon	Decommissioning	It is noted that the Scoping Opinion adopted by the Planning Inspectorate in respect of the DCO proposal requires an assessment of the cumulative impacts of the proposal for the new works together with the effects of waste generated from demolition activities at the existing sewage works. This will need to include an assessment of cumulative carbon impacts as well. Such details will need to be provided in relation to any SA for either or both the AAP and the GCLP and therefore ought to be included in the assessment of the DCO application. It is also relevant to note that Policy 2 of the AAP requires planning applications under the 1990 Act to calculate carbon emissions through a Whole Life Carbon Assessment to demonstrate actions to reduce life-cycle carbon emissions and also to reduce construction waste. The Environmental Assessment supporting any such planning application for V4 SCDC development on the NEC site would be expected to include consideration of the demolition of existing structures on the site and the potential for waste reduction and reuse on site. This would inform the Whole Life Carbon Assessment required by the AAP. To that extent therefore the District Council considers the same should apply to a DCO.	n	An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Carbon		The following Information needs clarifying: Data of the 2010 baseline on which the evaluation of carbon neutrality will be based. We understand from the discussion on 19th April that this relates to a generic design for works of a comparable size. Data to support the claim that biogas generation will result in the calculated reduction of 4680 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year against the 2010 baseline solution. Figures for gas production and power consumption of the existing WWTP have not been given but should also be included.	n	There was an error on the information on solar power information, it should have stated approx. 7 Giga Watt Hours per year. Solar Panels will be set within the inner slope of the earth bank. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP.	Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon, Application Document Ref 5.4.10.1 GHG Assessment.

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Details of the integration of solar power generation for low carbon electricity; the stated 7 MWh per year is ludicrous since it is insufficient to run an electric kettle continuously. It is not clear if this figure was intended to refer to peak or likely maximum average in a year or how the power demand is calculated for the proposed plant. Correct values and a comparison with the existing works should be provided. Photovoltaic panels - the location of the PV arrays, to make up the deficit, need to be explained; it is not clear if they will be visible above the earthwork bund. Energy demand -it is not clear if Waterbeach effluent pumping has been included in the energy demand calculations; More detail must be given on how these carbon proposals will be monitored and reported		Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are also covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application. The Applicant will continue to monitor and report their annual operational footprint; the proposed development will form part of this monitoring and reporting. Monitoring is required in relation to annual carbon accounting in accordance with mandatory reporting to Ofwat of operational emissions for 2021-22 onwards.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Carbon	Vehicle fuel	We believe that there should be electrification of HGV fleet, why are Anglian Water moving to Liquified Natural Gas (LNG), another fossil fuel?	n	A large part of the Anglian Water commercial van fleet is made up of electrical vehicles. Currently there are no feasible solutions for HGV's to be electric.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Carbon	Materials	We would like AW to firmly commit to low carbon concrete and other construction materials.	n	The Applicant confirms sustainable materials have been an important consideration in the design of the project, including the use of low carbon concrete will be used.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Carbon	Assessment	We request full information on the carbon payback in terms of plant and pipeline for this project.	n	The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future	Application Document Ref: 5.2.10 ES Chapter Carbon

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Carbon	Traffic	We request a full assessment of carbon impact of construction traffic.	n	The ES includes a chapter on Carbon. Owing to the uncertainty in the trip origin and fleet mix there is not an assessment of the projected vehicle trip numbers. However, within the assessment of Carbon, it makes an allowance for construction effort based on a % uplift of carbon within the materials and products themselves and an estimation of vehicle movements required for decommissioning and transport of materials and product from assumed supplier locations to site.	Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon
Cambridgeshire and P'Boro Combined Authority	Carbon	Net Zero	This reiterates our support given to the goal of Anglian Water in reaching net zero carbon emissions by 2030, and the project's role in that target.		The Applicant notes the comment.	
Save Honey Hill	Carbon	Sludge treatment	There are no published proposals to reduce carbon inefficiencies arising from importing sludge for processing via multiple HGV trips from both satellite and wider regional Waste Water Treatment Plants, including reported imports from the growing populations of Huntingdon and Ely. In our view this historical practice would be worth exploration in terms of carbon savings and efficiencies for both the existing and if approved, proposed relocation. The latter could also have implications for the size of plant required.	n	Smaller satellite sites do not have the ability to treat sludge, the existing and proposed Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant provides a vital role in providing this service. As a business the Applicant continually seeks to improve environmental performance including efficiency and environmental performance of vehicles such as HGVs.	
Save Honey Hill	Carbon		Carbon Neutrality No data has been presented on the 2010 baseline on which the evaluation of carbon neutrality will be based. There is no data on how re-using excavated material on site would reduce the carbon emissions and the impact from construction traffic	n	The target is for the project to be operationally carbon neutral. Further details can be found in the Carbon Chapter of the Environmental Statement. An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed	Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	
Save Honey Hill	Renewable energy		Biogas generation - there is no data to support the claim that this generation will result in the calculated reduction of 4680 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year against the 2010 baseline solution. Figures for sludge production, gas production and power consumption of the existing WWTP have not been given.	n	The new plant will be treating more flows to a higher standard. Therefore, it would not be comparable to the data from the existing Cambridge WWTP. Information is provided in the Carbon Chapter of the Environmental Statement.	Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon
Save Honey Hill	Renewable energy	Solar	Integration of solar power generation for low carbon electricity - 7 MWh per year is only sufficient to drive a few electric kettles. It is not clear if this figure, even once corrected, refers to peak or likely maximum average in a year. Photovoltaic panels - the location of the PV arrays, to make up the deficit, need to be explained; it is not clear if they will be visible above the earthwork bund. Energy demand -it is not clear if Waterbeach effluent pumping has been included in the energy demand calculations	n	Details of estimated carbon emissions are provided in the Environmental Statement and attached appendices. There was an error in the PEIR on the information on solar power information, it should have stated approx. 7 Giga Watt Hours per year. Solar Panels will be set within the earth bank.	Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon, Application Document Ref 5.4.10.1 GHG Assessment,
Save Honey Hill	Renewable energy	Solar	We agree with the use of solar panels, but these must remain within the bund and if visible should be included in data on structure heights and include in visualisations.	n	The solar panels will not be visible as they will be on the inner slope of the earth bank.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.2. Project Description
Save Honey Hill	Climate resilience	Storm water	Clarity is needed on the design inlet and outlet storm water flow at the works under the 1:100 +20% condition in 2040 and 2050. Will the storage provision really be – 23,000m3 total? How will this work without extra CSO events if the existing storage is also 23,000m3 total? Data should be given to support the statement that the ground storm tank storage and transfer tunnel will attenuate future storm flows at 68 L per day. This is an insignificant value, and a corrected value is needed. The upper design air temperature range of 40° C needs to be clarified as being a daily average or peak value. It is not clear if water supply to the transfer tunnel, in order to	n	The Applicant has modelled network performance at 1:100 years plus 20% condition as standard, this results in the TPS being able to pump 7000 l/sec in a storm event, which is split between 2000 l/sec FFT (full flow to treatment) and 5000 l/sec storm flow to storm tank. The current modelling for storm performance predicts no CSO discharges from the WWTP. Water supplied in low flow will not be sourced from drinking water it is usual to recirculate effluent onsite.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			alleviate low flows, will be sourced from drinking water or elsewhere.			
Ian Gilder	Carbon		The paper provides no useful information about whether the capital carbon target is sufficiently challenging. The case for adopting a 70% reduction from a notional 2010 baseline for capital carbon will need to be justified when the assessment is published as part of the DCO. Given that AW is happy to be pursuing this target across all of its facilities and maintenance programmes, it is almost certainly true that a single large new build project will be able to do better than this average.	n	The 70% reduction of carbon from a 2010 baseline is the target that has been set for new infrastructure within Anglian Water. The Carbon Chapter in the Environment Statement provides further details on the assessment of carbon over the assessment lifetime.	Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon
Cambridgeshire & South Cambridgeshire Green Party	Carbon		There will be a large and totally avoidable carbon cost associated with building the new site and with decommissioning the existing plant.	n	The new facility, as well as being operationally net zero carbon, will be energy neutral. It is designed to adapt to changing social and environmental priorities, increasing resilience to storm flows and flooding and provide a long-term solution to how we best treat waste water for a growing Greater Cambridge population. This will better serve the community and the environment for future years. The Environmental Statement assesses the carbon impact of the project.	Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon, Application Document Ref 5.4.10.1 GHG Calculations, Application Document Ref 5.4.10.2 Land use change calculations
Stow Cum Quy PC	Carbon		Has the carbon emission from the decommissioning of the current site been included in those calculations?	n	The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning	Application Document Ref: 5.2.16 ES Chapter Carbon

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	

Table 1-6 Community & Health

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cambridgeshire County Council	Community	Rights of Way	The Council welcomes the recognition that a number of PROW will be temporarily affected by the scheme, as identified on pages 25-28 of this PEI. The County Council as the LHA would request that the detail as to how these will be managed is agreed through the Access Technical Working Group in advance of the DCO submission and documented as part of the Traffic Management Plan. This is because it is helpful for all traffic management issues for all classes of highway to be held together in one place for ease of reference. The Council asks that this is cross-referenced in the Rights of Way Management Plan.	n	The PROW TWG includes Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. Discussions held and agreement made in respect of temporary PROW impacts, this will be set out in the Statement of Common Ground	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 Code of Construction Practice, Application Document Ref 4.6 Rights of Way Plans
Central Bedfordshire Council	Community		Stakeholder responded with no comments to make.	n		
Cllr Claire Daunton	Community	Recreational Space	The proposals recreational use needs more detail; and access to these areas from outside needs to be given careful consideration. It will be important to encourage active-travel access to the area, making sure that there are good links and signage to local transport; and that any new footpaths and bridleways link in with those currently in use.	n	This has been incorporated into the landscape masterplan design.	Application Document Ref 4.6 Rights of Way Plans
CPRE	Community		(Page 1 point 1) The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Branch of CPRE strongly objects to the Anglian Water proposal to relocate the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP) from its present site at Milton to Honey Hill in the Cambridge Green Belt.	n		
East Cambridge District Council	Community	Odour	Any reduction in odour and mitigation measures should be implemented and consultation should be carried out with the relevant Environmental Health Officers.	n	Chapter 2 (Project Description) of the ES describe intrinsic design measures to minimise odour. Environmental Health Officers have been involved in the assessment and mitigation through the Technical Working Groups	Application Document Ref. 5.2.2 Project Description, Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour, Application Document Ref: 5.4.18.4 Preliminary Odour Mgmt Plan

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
East Cambridge District Council	Discovery Centre	Discovery Centre	We would suggest making it available to local residents to visit whether this is via open days during the year. It is important that they understand the working of the site.	n	There will be programmed visits to the Discovery Centre in order to manage numbers and address concerns of the potential for increased traffic from the local community.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description
Federation of Cam Residents	Community		Endorse and support the submission that Friends of Cams, CPRE, SHH which raise all the points that we would make at this juncture and to reiterate the points and objections that they make.	n	The Applicant notes the comment, these stakeholder responses have been considered.	
NATS Safeguarding	Community		Stakeholder responded with no comments to make.	n		
NATS Safeguarding	Community		Amendment to contact details as per email			
Natural England	Recreational pressure	LERMP	Natural England supports these proposals; however, we also support recognition within the PEIR that these enhancements could increase visitor footfall and recreational pressures within Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI, in addition to Low Fen Drove CWS. We agree with the statement in the PEIR that impacts should be avoided. In our view the proposed mitigation measures set out in the LERMP underplay the severity of current visitor pressure at Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI and the likely combined effects of future development on this site and the wider area.	n	The Applicant acknowledges the comments about the wider opportunities and impacts of the project. The Applicant has undertaken recreational user counts. These have covered a work day, weekend and a day outside of term time and cover different times throughout the day. The data from these surveys have been used together with other public available information on recreational facilities and usage to assess the impact of visitor pressure on Stow-cum-Quy and are reflected in the LERMP. The purpose of the landscape is to improve recreational connectivity and connectivity to surrounding landscape and proposed nature networks rather than to create a visitor destination.	Application Document Reference 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Natural England	Recreational pressure	LERMP/Collaboration with other projects	In view of the scale of the project and potential for in combination effects with the Local Plan development, NE believe recreational effects and greater benefits for people nature and climate change should be addressed through a separate collaborative strategy.	n	The Applicant is mindful of the comment and potential effects from developments which have planning permission, in addition to the potential effects of the Proposed Development. These effects are considered and assessed within the cumulative impact assessment and makes reference to the plan level HRA Report for the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) prepared by SCDC, The Greater Cambridge Local Plan HRA Scoping Report, the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan HRA Report, and the Cambridge East Area Action Plan HRA Report. The CEA is included within the Environmental Statement. Engagement has been held with stakeholders who have interest in the wider area in order to discuss the ensure the project complements local initiatives such as the Wicken Fen Vision and Cambridge Nature Network.	Application Document Ref 5.2.21 ES, Chapter 21: Cumulative Effects
Natural England	Recreational pressure	LERMP/Collaboration with other projects	Natural England's view is that the Proposed Development should take a collaborative approach, in partnership with relevant	n	The Applicant notes the comments and has, within the scope of the DCO, set out a full assessment within the Landscape and Visual Chapter of the Environmental	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			developers and other stakeholders, to fully explore opportunities for delivery of strategic landscape scale enhancements that will contribute towards the Nature Recovery Network and the Strategic Green Infrastructure Initiatives of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Together with the National Trust we have identified potential opportunities between the development site, SSSIs, CWSs, Anglesey Abbey and the Wicken Vision Area for these developments to deliver greater benefits for wildlife, people and climate change, including mitigating the adverse effects of recreational pressure on more sensitive sites.		Statement. The Applicant will continue to engage with Natural England and other stakeholders to consider other opportunities and benefits that can be delivered collaboratively outside of the DCO.	
Natural England	Recreational pressure	Partnership with other projects and schemes	We believe there is a major opportunity here to create a new area/s of multifunctional accessible green space, as part of the Applicant's proposals to enhance public access. Natural England's advice is that appropriately designed and managed 'alternative natural greenspace' could provide a new destination for visitors which could help to intercept and divert additional pressure away from more sensitive sites.	n	The Applicant agrees with Natural England's observation about the potential opportunity but is keen to ensure that the additional greenspace is not treated as a new destination that people are likely to travel from further afield to but serves to formalise existing use of the area currently made by the existing communities.	
North Herts Council	Community		Responded to consultation with no specific comments to make.			
UK Health Security Agency	Community	Health	All developments will have some effect on the determinants of health, which in turn will influence the health and wellbeing of the general population, vulnerable groups and individual people. Although assessing impacts on health beyond direct effects from, for example emissions to air or road traffic incidents is complex, there is a need to ensure a proportionate assessment focused on an application's significant effects. We have considered the submitted documentation and can confirm that we are satisfied with the proposed approach and wish to make no further comment at this stage.		The Applicant acknowledges the comment made.	
Peterborough City Council	Community		Responded and no comments to make			
RSPB	Community	Closure /diversion of PROW	We welcome that Anglia Water will consult over proposed diversions and closures. Whilst we	n	The Applicant agrees and this is outlined in CTMP and framework Community Liaison Plan	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP,

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			agree that local authorities, residents and businesses must be notified of all such actions, it is important that all users of the public rights of way be able to find out about closures and diversions in advance of their journey.			Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan
RSPB	Community	Closure /diversion of PROW	We strongly recommend that Anglia Water (or its contractors) maintain and advertise a publicly accessible webpage identifying (and bringing together) in narrative and map format all current and forthcoming closures and diversions of public rights of way, including dates and timings.	n	The Applicant agrees and this is outlined in CTMP and framework Community Liaison Plan	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan
RSPB	Community	Closure /diversion of PROW	If a public right of way is temporarily closed with no local diversion possible, information should be provided for alternative routes even if this is less enjoyable, or on a road.	n	The Applicant agrees and this is outlined in CTMP and framework Community Liaison Plan	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan
The Environment Agency	Recreational	LERMP	The landscape masterplan has been limited to the immediate site where the new wastewater treatment plant will go. However, the work plans (e.g., workplan 6) show the draft scheme boundary reaches the River Cam due to connection to old works and outfall. We would have expected the management plan to also cover these areas and show how the landscape will be managed for ecological benefit.	Y	The LERMP provides a comprehensive plan for management and monitoring of the proposed site. Works outside of the proposed site boundary (i.e., outfall, pipe work) are assessed and mitigations set out in the Environmental Statement. The mitigations will be included in the relevant mitigation plans in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) e.g., the Code of Construction Practice.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 COCP A & 5.4.2.2 COCP B
Uttlesford District Council	Community		no comments to make	n		
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Recreation	Connectivity	The District Council welcomes this as a commitment from Anglian Water as part of its DCO proposal and supports and encourages the proposed bridleway along the disused railway line. However, it is not clear how this will connect with other public rights of way. The plans show that the path ends quite abruptly on Station Road, and it is unclear which users will be able to transfer onto the wider routes up to Quy Fen and Anglesey Abbey. The District Council considers it is important that these issues are addressed. The creation of the three walking loops proposed is also welcomed, but there is again need for more information/detail in relation to how users will access these routes in the first instance. It would also need to be	n	The Applicant has discussed this at the PRoW TWG. With regards to connections to the site, the LERMP set out the connection - the new paths connect to other public rights of way at Station Road, where a right turn is taken on to the byway and within approximately 370m of a straight road there is a turning on to the bridleway to Anglesey Abbey and Stow cum Quy. The improvements in connectivity will be of benefit to the local community. The Applicant does not seek to increase the provision of parking for use of the green space. Public Rights of Way surveys took place during July 2022 to understand current usage of the space. The new landscape at CWWTP creates a series of new recreational connections, on site and linking to the wider network. The Landscape, Ecology and Recreation Management Plan (LERMP), illustrates the connectivity to the existing public rights of way network.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP, Application Document Ref 4.6 Rights of Way Plans

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			clarified if residents/dog walkers etc. will be able to use the ReCWWTP on-site car park or not. Further details on the strategy for providing cycle and pedestrian access to the ReCWWTP to utilise the discovery centre, parkland and walking/cycling need to be provided. Connectivity to the bridleway along the former railway alignment should also be considered further given the direct connections that this could provide for dog walkers and local residents.		On the site itself, new links will be created. A publicly accessible path will traverse the eastern part of the site, set between a hedgerow with hedgerow trees, and the edge of the eastern woodland. The path surface is of a suitable width to be shared by pedestrians and recreational cyclists. Internal paths lead around the slopes of part of the earth bank and through the open ridge and furrow grassland. Where paths are in open areas these will be delineated by low level post and rail features, designed to promote the use of the paths, but not prohibit access to the open green spaces. The green space is not intended as a recreational destination in its own right. The landscape masterplan provides alternative access and routing for use by pedestrians and those on non-motorised transport through the area and in so doing diffuses and disperses footfall by offering more choice and creating positive experiences for recreational users of this area within the wider landscape.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Communities	EQIA	It is noted Anglian Water has identified potential employment opportunities associated with the proposed development. The District Council considers it needs more details around the opportunities for all members of society to engage in and benefit from the project should be provided – with a particular emphasis on underrepresented groups. This would enable the District Council to assist in the weighing up of the positive and negative effects of the proposals. There is reference to changes to the visual environment and the adverse effects on the elderly, disabled and particularly children with autism. This is also true for noise exposure so this should be included in the assessment	n	Post Phase Three Consultation a meeting was held with Council officers (June 2022)to set out the benefits of the project and to go through the Equalities Impact Assessment, which considered the effects on the community, including underrepresented groups.	Application Document Ref 7.12 Equalities Impact Assessment
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Recreation	Bridleway	The District Council considers that there be a requirement that any "Funding and Implementation Plan" for the bridleway should be shared with the District Council as it is aware the land is in multiple ownership, and these would likely need certification and handover to the local highway authority.	n	The Applicant has discussed the plans for the Bridleway with the Councils through the PROW TWG. The LERMP provides details on pathways and connectivity. We will continue to engage the Councils as part of the drafting of the Statement of Common Ground.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Recreation	LFDW status	Upgrades to sections of the Low Fen Drove Way track as proposed would also be positive elements of the proposal in the District Council's	n	The Applicant has discussed Low Fen Drove Way Status in the PRoW Technical Working Group, which involves the relevant Officers at Cambridgeshire County Council and	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			view. In addition, the proposals should be considered to enable further safeguarding for users of this track by inhibiting public vehicular access. The District Council is aware of Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) issues in this area including fly-tipping and hare-coursing taking place. The District Council considers the DCO process should facilitate safer and more accessible green infrastructure for the local community as a benefit from the development.		South Cambridgeshire District Council. The EIA process has concluded that the CWWTPR project would be unlikely to lead to an increase in ASB and therefore it would be difficult to justify making the change of status to LFDW through DCO powers. These EIA conclusions have been reached following consultation with the Police and with the Highway Authority and District Council. However whilst the ability to change status is outside of the project scope the Applicant understands the community concerns about this issue and will continue the discussion with local authorities with the aim of reaching a final conclusion in the Statements of Common Ground.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Recreation	Car parking	The creation of the three walking loops (9.3km, 3.3km and 4.5km) as noted above is also supported but it is unclear how users travelling by vehicle will access these areas in the first instance. The access to Anglesea Abbey and beyond will likely attract users from further afield and opportunities to park do seem limited. It is noted that the small car park on Low Fen Drove Way to the north of the WWTP site will be retained but this may not be adequate which may result in users then being displaced to Horningsea Village. Any relocation of the current Newmarket Road Park and Ride could facilitate access to the recreational facilities of the WWTP and this presents the opportunity for this to become the primary point of access if it is at the end of High Ditch Road. Further details are therefore required in the District Council's view.	n	The Applicant expects the improvements in connectivity to be of benefit to the local community, the project is not seeking to increase the provision of parking for use of the green space. The green space is not intended as a recreational destination in its own right. The landscape masterplan provides alternative access and routing for use by pedestrians and those on non-motorised transport through the area and in so doing diffuses and disperses footfall by offering more choice and creating positive experiences for recreational users of this area within the wider landscape.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Recreation	PRoW	A Public Rights of Way Management and Communication Plan should be provided with details on how these diversions and closures will be managed as well as in what way temporary routes will be communicated to local villages and users and be the subject of a requirement	n	Details of PROW diversions and closures are set out within the CTMP and the Community Liaison Plan sets out communications with the community during construction.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Recreation	Changes to roads/pathways	We recommend an alternative location of the Waterbeach pipeline river crossing to a point north of the A14 would reduce construction traffic running along Horningsea Road and its cycleway through J34 and south of the A14; A complete realignment with a shorter, more direct route from Waterbeach to the existing	n	This is not the optimum route for the waterbeach pipeline corridor and will not reduce traffic on Horningsea Road.	Application Document Ref 4.14 Design Plans - Waterbeach Pipeline Long Sections

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			works would remove a substantial amount of construction activity from areas of recreational use.			
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Recreation	Changes to roads/pathways	Omitting Shaft 4 would remove construction activity from the area of a well-used footpath.	y	In response to stakeholders comments the Applicant has conducted a further assessment. As a result, the ventilation shaft has been relocated further east to reduce potential impact, the construction technique will be (horizontal directional drilling) and the shaft will now be temporary for construction so no permanent vent will exist adjacent to Poplar Hall.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 Project Description
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Recreation	Changes to roads/pathways	Banning some turning movements at J34 are necessary to avoid vehicles short cutting along Low Fen Drove	n	The Applicant is working with the National and Local Highways Authorities to ensure that design prevents traffic taking short cuts. Highway design plans are included in the application.	Application Document Ref 4.11.1 Design Plans - Highways - Horningsea Road & Proposed WWTP access layout plan
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Recreation	Changes to roads/pathways	Option 3 access would reduce vehicle use on Horningsea Road.	n	The Applicant has carried out a detailed assessment access options, which evidences that Option 1b provides the optimum access route. Chapter 3 (Alternatives) in the ES describes the alternatives considered and assessment of each access option.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 Chapter 19; Traffic & Transport, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.6 Junction Capacity Reports, Application Document Ref: 5.2.3 Alternatives
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Recreation	Changes to roads/pathways	The proposed new path running east from the landscaped area outside the bund should be omitted; and the former railway line should not be included in the red line boundary but an alternative alignment further to the north west should be substituted.	n	The Applicant is confident that the pathways included in the design provide the greatest opportunity for improvements in recreation and connectivity. The Applicant has considered this alternative pathway suggested by FDPC and following further assessment will retain the existing new bridleway proposed utilising the old railway line.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Recreation	Changes to roads/pathways	Construction traffic must be banned from Low Fen Drove east of the Waterbeach pipeline unless engaged in changes to the recreational path network	n	Construction traffic will use the northern section of LFDW for a short period whilst the main access is being constructed. Otherwise, use of LFDW will be for minor works on recreational paths and minor landscape works.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Recreation	Gates	We request information about the gates shown as access points to some of the footpaths, p19 of the PEI: Recreation. Are these part of a fence?	n	The Applicant can confirm that the gates are to prevent vehicular access, they are not part of a fence.	Application Document Ref 4.4 Land Plans
Horningsea Parish Council	Recreation	Cycle routes	Footpath 130/1 could be substantially improved as it is dangerous in winter months and would allow access to cycle paths for those using active transport for work, to Cambridge along cycle path 11 and to Milton and the science park. AW	n	Footpath 130/1 is outside of the scheme order limits. The aim of the project is to improve recreational connectivity as opposed to improve cycling commuting routes. The Applicant confirms that there has been engagement with the Greenways Project, as well as Local Highways Authority and other Council Officers have provided input	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			should connect with the Greenways project to collaborate for the best solution.		into the plans for connectivity to ensure that they link together and that there are no conflicts in the proposals.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Recreation	Cycle routes	We are also concerned that the proposed WWTP could disrupt the cycling routes used by children; via Fen Drove Way and High Ditch Road to Quy and on to Bottisham Village College	n	The Construction Traffic Management Plan included with the Application sets out details for mitigating construction impacts including implementing traffic management to minimise disruption to cycleways.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Recreation	Surveys	We request that surveys of footpath use in the area are included in the reports.	n	Surveys of recreation use have been completed and will be provided as part of the application.	Application Document Ref: 7.10 Common Land and Open Space Land Use
Save Honey Hill	Community impact	Health	We object to the relocation because of its impact on mental well-being by depriving residents of the current recreational aspects of the area, the impact of construction and operational activity and the presence of an industrial site on previous rural aspect. The area is used by visitors from other places as well as residents of Fen Ditton, Horningsea and Cambridge City Abbey Ward. The latter is recognised as one of the most deprived areas of Cambridge and the continuing access to an area of green space is vital for well-being	n	The design of the project will improve recreational facilities providing better green space for people and nature. The proposed new paths will be connected to the wider network of public rights of way, and a new bridleway will improve access to Quy Fen and Anglesey Abbey. This improved space will be beneficial for well-being.	Application Document Ref 5.2.11 ES Chapter Community, Application Document Ref 5.2.12 ES Chapter Health
Save Honey Hill	Community impact	Mitigations	Some reduction in stress could be achieved by using Option 3 Site Access (dedicated service road from the lay-by on northern carriageway of the A14 between Junctions 34 and 35) for construction and for permanent traffic instead of the proposed reconfiguration of A14 Junction 34. 2 The impact of noise, vibration and disruption from sludge lorries could be reduced by not increasing the secondary treatment facility, thus reducing the level of imported sludge. This might also reduce the need for night-time lighting. 3 Both close and distance screening with sufficiently dense trees and hedges would improve the impact on visual receptors; a tree and hedge maintenance programme for the whole life of the site would be needed. Maintenance of footpaths and Rights of Way would facilitate exercise, but the area would only be used for recreation if odour levels were reduced to zero.	n	Option 1b has been assessed as the best option for access, mitigation at Junction 34 will reduce the impacts for the community. The Environmental Statement shows construction traffic would not result in significant adverse effects and operational traffic noise effect will not be significant. Landscape mitigation will reduce visual impact and odour levels will not be significant in recreational areas. The Community Liaison Plan sets out how the applicant will communicate with the community to keep them informed and engaged in the project.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19 Traffic & Transport, Application Document Ref 5.2.17 ES, Chapter 17: Noise & Vibration, Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan
Save Honey Hill	Recreation	PRoW	AW has referred to the creation of new paths for which they would apply to make definitive Public	n	This information is provided in the works plans, traffic plans and PRoW plans within the application.	Application Document Ref 4.3 Works Plans,

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Rights of Way, but these do not appear to have been included within the land boundary. The reference to temporary gates on PRoWs is not clear or the diversions of PRoWs during the construction of Waterbeach pipeline.			Application Document Ref 4.6 Rights of Way Plans, Application Document Ref 4.7 Access & Traffic Order Regulation Plans
Cllr Bulat	Community	Carbon	Many Abbey residents are also concerned about the wider environmental impact, and in this sense having full details of the carbon footprint of decommissioning the current site would be welcomed.	n	The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan, Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES Chapter Carbon
Stow Cum Quy PC	Connectivity	bridleway	Need to make sure that if the proposed new bridleway goes ahead, vehicular access is restricted by substantial lockable physical barriers so that only those that need access have access. It's currently a problem and the gate was recently rammed by hare coursers trying to access the fields off the old railway line	n	The Applicant notes the comment. Details on the Bridleway is covered in the LERMP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Table 1-7 Construction

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cadent Gas Limited	Construction	General	Requirement for an easement or relocation of Cadent apparatus within project boundary. Formal objection needs to be removed.	n	Comments noted and has been dealt with.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Construction	Traffic	Residents may have local safety concerns with construction traffic and access, in number of locations such as Station Rd and Car Dyke Rd, Bannold Rd and Denny End Rd, Waterbeach for LGV and HGVs. Particularly regarding conflict between HGVs/ LGVs and both cyclists and pedestrians. It should be demonstrated all opportunities to avoid routes through residential streets have been considered, and the number of vehicle movements minimised.	n	The Applicant has considered the comments and construction traffic and operational Transport Assessments for the Junction 34 have included all construction routing and traffic flows during the construction period and have assessed the potential conflict between HGV's and NMU's. Mitigation sets out plans for Junction 34, Waterbeach, Horningsea Road, Fen Road and Cowley Road. This includes but is not limited to the use of clear signage routing vehicles to appropriate routes, avoid peak hour and school pick up and drop off and appropriate speed restrictions.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.3 Transport Assessment
Cambridgeshire County Council	Construction	Traffic	The Council would also welcome details of how the applicant will communicate the diversion and closures of all the cycle and walking routes affected by the proposals to ensure active travel remains a practical travel option during construction.	n	The Applicant will be working closely with the LHA and community working groups to make sure cycle and walking route diversions or adjustments are communicated and do not impact on the active travel plans for people using the greenway. A Community Liaison Plan is included with the Application to set out how the Applicant will communicate with the community.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.9 Construction Travel Management Plan. Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan.
The Environment Agency	CoCP PART B	Outfall structure	A fish rescue may be required during dewatering of the Coffer dam area around the new outfall, or for any other dewatering activities on site,	y	The requirement for fish rescue has been added as a requirement within the COCP Part B in relation to the outfall construction works. It is also expected that this will be included as a condition within the final FRAP. In relation to the COCP Part A the comments in relation to flow rates and screening is welcome and will be added to the COCP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A and Application Document Ref 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part B
The Environment Agency	CoCP PART B	Dewatering activities	Sediment management measures may also be required during construction activities to minimise sediment mobilisation in watercourses. Screening of pumps may be required to protect fish and eels (section 4.14.2, page 23). Appropriate flow rates should be used during pumping to maintain appropriate water levels, avoiding upstream and/or downstream reaches becoming depleted.	n	Sediment management measures are dealt with within the COCP Part A-.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 Code of Construction Practice, Section 6.7

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
The Environment Agency	CoCP PART B	Air quality and decommissioning	The outline details for air quality and existing site decommissioning seem reasonable. A decommissioning plan will be required.	n	The Applicant notes that the Environment Agency is satisfied with the proposals so far. A copy of the decommissioning plan has now been shared with the Environment Agency.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Construction		A clearer understanding and details of the range of temporary works (and their landscape impact) that link the CWWTP to the ReWWTP should be provided to ensure that no prejudice to any of the other site preparation works such as the undergrounding of the electric lines would arise.	n	The undergrounding of electric lines would be the responsibility of the developer. However, the transfer main will not impede the future developments plans for the housing and proposed infrastructure changes.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Construction	Community liaison	Community Liaison Officer to be employed by the Applicant which is welcomed. The District Council wishes to be consulted upon and agree the full job specification of this officer including the nature of complaints they would investigate, and how these would be escalated. The District Council considers the Community Liaison Officer should also be required to provide routine updates to the District Council on the project, complaints received and their resolution throughout the duration of the works. In addition, the District Council considers the Community Liaison Officer should also be engaged during the decommission phase of the CWWTP as well as any transitional arrangements associated with moving onto the ReWWTP. As such coordination with both the District and City Councils is crucial and should be provided for.	y	The Applicant will consult with the Councils on the job specification of the Community Liaison Officer	Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Construction	COCP and CTMP	Working hours: It is noted that the consultation material also makes reference to a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) and a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and the hours of work including start up and set down. Whilst noting that the hours quoted are typical for infrastructure works such as road and rail projects, given the circumstances this project should be directed at in the District Council ‘s view minimising any potential for disturbance to surrounding communities through careful phasing and scheduling of construction works. The District Council	n	Consultation with the Council on working hours, will take place as part of the process of discharging requirements for construction. The working hours set out at application are in the Code of Construction Practice.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part B

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			considers this information will also assist in preparing a robust Local Impact Report by enabling it to comment upon the opportunities and details of how the above aims might be achieved, including how relevant codes of practice and construction standards have been applied. This can then inform the requirements to be attached to the DCO itself.			
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Construction	Noise	Extra mitigation is required and should include A commitment to informing residents and PCs of the approvals sought from Local Authority under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act (CoPA) or alternative consenting regime. A commitment to providing noise insulation at properties affected by 24hr operations at HDD sites etc. and close to construction sites such as the Discharge Works; A commitment to reducing noise from night time operations by postponing deliveries/spoil removal to engineering hours and minimising use of reversing alarms at night	n	The Applicant confirms approvals with the Local Authority under Section 61 are still under discussion. The Applicant is committed to actively reducing noise emissions, using solid hoarding and other control measures in the COCP. The Applicant does not believe noise insulation will be required it is also unlikely HDD sites will be 24 hrs. unless there are unforeseen circumstance. A commitment to reducing noise from night time operations by postponing deliveries/spoil removal to engineering hours and minimising use of reversing alarms at night. The Applicant does not propose to move spoil at night, reverse alarms will be minimised where residents are close by.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.17 Chapter Noise and Vibration, Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 COCP
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Construction	COCP	FDPC recommends the following three points which have been noted in relation to construction and must be included in the CEMP: Treated Sewage Effluent used for pipeline pressure testing must not be discharged into drains connected to the Black Ditch. This should be possible since there will be twin pipelines connected to a WWTW at both ends; The Veteran and other notable trees and the CWS must be fenced off to protect root zones and canopies from passing equipment; and A feedback mechanism to the Community is needed and independent specialist oversight provided as part of this.	n	The Applicant agrees that effluent should not discharge to Black Ditch; those trees should be fenced off to protect root protection zones and canopies and that the community should be informed during construction. These aspects will be considered in the COCP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.21 CoCP Part A, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part B
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Traffic	We are also very concerned about the potential underestimation of construction traffic. We want to see detailed figures about the amount of spoil that will need to be removed from tunnelling operations, as we feel that this could increase HGV movements.	n	These movements are accounted for in the vehicle movements assessed and reported within the Traffic Assessment. There will be up to 35k tonnes of material excavated during the construction of the transfer tunnel and intermediate shafts. Excluding material used for backfilling of the shafts the movement of this material is estimated to require up to 1728 vehicle movements to transfer the material for re-use within	Application Document Ref. 5.4.19.3 Transport Assessment

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					the landscape masterplan (or 864 movements for each year of the tunnelling operation). The vehicle movements will only occur in accordance with the working hours which are defined within the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). Section 3 of the CoCP (Community Consultation and Engagement) requires a proactive approach to communication with the local community and stakeholders. Through a Community Liaison Plan the local community and stakeholders will be informed of the works taking place, including durations, particularly where these will involve works outside of the core working hours or impact community facilities and business and local infrastructure such as Public Rights of Way (PRoW)/cycleways.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Working hours	The operating hours are unacceptably long – 7am to 6pm early start, noting that initial start-up and closedown operations are understood to be permitted to start 1 hour earlier / later e.g., 6am to 7pm in summer months. These are long hours to put up with heavy traffic, pollution and noise. The tunnels and pipelines work are close to residences. We request that there be no construction work on weekends.	n	The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) specifies working hours and includes location specific restrictions such as prohibiting works activities at shaft 4 before 7am. The CoCP also includes a requirement for the Applicant/the Principal Contractor(s) to keep the local community regularly informed with regard to the construction activities taking place and the working hours associated with those activities. This will include notifying the local community and any other relevant stakeholders before an activity falling within the very special circumstances category takes place or before a period of continuous working commences. The notification will include a description of the activity which will be carried out and details of how long the activity will last.	Application Document Ref. 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Traffic	7-9am is the peak commuter period and construction traffic access should be between 9am-5pm.	n	The Applicant will be actively managing when vehicles arrive at the proposed works through employment of a Logistics Manager to ensure that there is no adverse impact on traffic levels. Furthermore, it is a requirement within the CTMP that the Principal Contractor(s) implements a system for monitoring the movement of vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Development.	Application Document Ref. 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Traffic	300-400 movements a day between 7am -6pm would result in 1 movement every 2 minutes, which is too much for the proposed 4-way entrance to the site and therefore Option 3 dedicated access from A14 is the only viable	n	The Traffic and Transport Chapter in the Environmental Statement sets out the modelling of traffic, including modelling of the junction. This has shown that the junction has capacity and would not lead to significant effects on driver delay. Furthermore,	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			option. The proposed 4-way junction will lead to tailbacks onto the A14.		there will be a requirement to implement a CTMP which, amongst other things, specifies that that all deliveries will be made outside of peak hours (8am-9am and 3-4pm) unless it is determined to be essential that the delivery is to be completed during peak hours and requires that the scheduling of vehicle movements adheres to works hours.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Traffic	Waterbeach pipeline construction will cause delays in Waterbeach and at Clayhithe with knock on effect on Horningsea High Street. At Clayhithe construction vehicle access via Hartridge's Lane is problematic. This is narrow and bends sharply with ditches at some points and access points to houses. The lane serves a barn used for agricultural machinery. The land is in private ownership and widening or new route would require CPO. Congestion caused by slow, large construction vehicles entering Hartridge's Lane would cause delays to traffic on the B1047 impacting both Waterbeach and Horningsea. Clayhithe Bridge over the River Cam is narrow and we believe this will cause problems and delay people accessing health facilities in Waterbeach and access to the rail station	y	Traffic surveys took place in early December 2021 with agreement from Cambridgeshire County Council to collect baseline traffic data at the junctions that would be used for construction and operational traffic. This has been supplemented by surveys in May 2022 to provide a check that the volumes counted in 2021 were suitable for use as a baseline. This has been shared and agreed with the Traffic and Access Stakeholder Technical Working Group. Future scenarios have been looked at for 2026 as peak construction year, 2028 as the opening operational year and 2038 operational year plus 10 years. The traffic modelling methodology has been discussed and agreed with Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority. The traffic modelling has included an analysis of traffic around Waterbeach. Mitigations during construction are set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.1 & 5.4.19.2 Traffic Surveys, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.3 Transport Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.4 Pedestrian Counts, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.5 Traffic Flow Diagram, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Noise vibration	Temporary moorings at Clayhithe and the Cam Conservators' workshop and maintenance area will be affected by noise and vibration from the pipeline construction.	n	The Environmental Statement provides an assessment of noise and vibration during construction and operation. This assessment takes into account the application of mitigation measures, which would be secured by requirements of the DCO. The assessment shows no significant adverse effects during construction at this location and negligible impacts during operation.	Application Document Ref 5.2.17 ES, Chapter 17: Noise and Vibration
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Traffic	We want to know how you will effectively prevent HGVs involved in the construction and maintenance of Waterbeach transfer pipeline using Horningsea High Street or Clayhithe Road.	n	The Applicant has set out information on managing construction traffic in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). No HGV's will go to Horningsea or Fen Ditton during construction or operation.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Traffic	Construction will cause disruption to cyclists using National Cycle Route (NCR) 11 commuting, or for leisure, from Waterbeach to Cambridge and NCR 51 from Bottisham to Barnwell. We request that these routes should	n	The Construction Traffic Management Plan sets out details for mitigating construction impacts including implementing traffic management to minimise disruption to cycleways. The Applicant notes the	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.1 & 5.4.19.2 Traffic Surveys, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.3 Transport Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.4 Pedestrian Counts,

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			be reinstated as soon as possible and not left to completion of the plant. We disagree that construction traffic for Waterbeach pipeline using the A10 at Milton interchange will have little effect within Milton. The A10 does not have sufficient capacity for additional traffic movements at peak times		comments regarding the A10, however traffic modelling concludes there is sufficient capacity.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.5 Traffic Flow Diagram. Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Traffic	We request more details on the impact of the construction traffic proposals on the safety of children, cyclists and pedestrians	n	The Construction Traffic Management Plan sets out details for mitigating construction impacts for the safety of children, cyclists and pedestrians.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Road infrastructure	HPC believes the current bank of the off ramp of the A14 bridge is prone to subsidence and should be investigated for safety in view of large increase in HGV traffic proposed.	n	The Applicant confirms that this will be surveyed, Investigated and assessed for safety before the works begin.	
Horningsea Parish Council	COCP	Excavation	Broaden the scope of impact in relation to vibration, dust and pollution control in relation to the excavation of foundations.	n	The Applicants proposals for vibration, dust and pollution management will be set out in the COCP and will be worked through with local stakeholders.	Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 COCP
Horningsea Parish Council	COCP	Noise vibration	Vibration control, especially of drilling associated with pipeline and transfer tunnel.		The Applicants proposals for vibration, dust and pollution management will be set out in the COCP and will be worked through with local stakeholders.	Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 COCP
Horningsea Parish Council	COCP	Dust	We request that CoCP dust control measures be enhanced because this site is dry and very open.		The Applicants proposals for vibration, dust and pollution management will be set out in the COCP and will be worked through with local stakeholders.	Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 COCP
Horningsea Parish Council	COCP	Health	Consideration for the mental health of those living close to the routes for construction and traffic access.	n	The Health Chapter and the Community Chapter of the ES assesses potential impacts and effects on the community and human health. The Health chapter includes an appended Mental Health and Wellbeing Assessment.	Application Document Ref 5.2.11 Community Chapter, Application Document Ref: 5.2.12 Health Chapter, Application Document Ref: 5.4.12.3 Mental Health and Wellbeing Assessment
Horningsea Parish Council	Construction	Traffic	Construct all construction access from ramp off A14	n	It is not viable to create any form of new access off the A14, whether temporary or permanent. This is set out in the traffic and transport assessment.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport
Save Honey Hill	Construction	CEMP	Three points have been noted in relation to construction and must be included in the CEMP: 1 Treated Sewage Effluent used for pipeline pressure testing must not be discharged into drains connected to the Black Ditch. This should be possible since there will be twin pipelines connected to a WWTW at both ends. 2 The Veteran and other notable trees and the CWS must be fenced off to protect root zones and canopies from passing equipment. 3 A feedback mechanism to the	n	The Applicant can confirm that treated effluent will not be used for the Waterbeach pipeline pressure testing. Trees should be fenced off to protect root zones and canopies and that the community should be informed during construction. These aspects are considered in the COCP and the Community Liaison Plan	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A, Application Document Ref. 7.8 Community Liaison Plan

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Community is needed and independent specialist oversight provided as part of this.			
Save Honey Hill	Code of construction practice		We support the use of Code of Construction Practice (COCP) and Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to manage and monitor noise. In addition, we ask AW to Commit to informing residents and Parish Councils of the approvals sought from Local Authority under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act (CoPA) or equivalent to process. 2 Commit to providing noise insulation at properties affected by 24hr operations at HDD sites etc. and close to construction sites such as the Discharge Works 3 Commit to reducing noise from night-time operations by postponing deliveries/spoil removal to engineering hours and prohibit use of reversing alarms at night.	n	The Applicant confirms approvals with the Local Authority under Section 61 are still under discussion. The Applicant is committed to actively reducing noise emissions, using solid hoarding and other control measures in the COCP. The Applicant does not believe noise insulation will be required it is also unlikely HDD sites will be 24 hrs. unless there are unforeseen circumstances. With regards to a commitment to reducing noise from night time operations by postponing deliveries/spoil removal to engineering hours and minimising use of reversing alarms at night. We can advise that we do not propose to move spoil at night, reverse alarms will be minimised where residents are close by.	Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1
Save Honey Hill	Construction		Stringent traffic management of construction and banning of permanent works traffic at Low Fen Drove Way. Care during construction of existing vegetation and where necessary replacement	n	Mitigation for traffic during construction is set out in the CTMP. Mitigation for vegetation is set out in the CoCP. Travel during operations is set out in the Operational Travel Plan.	Application Document Ref: 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP, Application Document Ref: 5.4.19.8 Operational Workers Travel Plan
Save Honey Hill	Construction		The exact location of the horizontal directional drilling (HDD) required to tunnel under the River Cam and to cross the railway line is not clear. It is not clear if HDD or open cut will be used to cross Bannold Road north of Burgess Drove. More information is required on the traffic route for construction vehicles to the start of HDD.	n	HDD will be used to cross Bannold Road. The locations are set out in the application in works plans and general arrangements. Information on the traffic route for construction vehicles to the start of HDD are set in the traffic, land and works plans within the application.	Application Document Ref 4.14.0 Waterbeach Pipeline Key Plans
Save Honey Hill	Construction		Clayhithe The main impact would be construction vehicle access via Hartridge's Lane. This is narrow, with a sharp bend and restricted by a ditch and in places access to houses. The lane serves a barn used for agricultural machinery. The land is in private ownership and widening or new route would require CPO	y	Following Phase 3 Consultation feedback we have amended plans to improve access along Hartridge's lane, order limits and works plans are amended and include provision for a temporary access track next to Hartridges lane so as to minimise disruption.	
Save Honey Hill	Construction		Recommendations: 1 Stringent monitoring of HGVs involved in construction and maintenance will be required. Reinstatement of land to its original use when damaged	n	The Applicant notes the comments, plans for monitoring and remediation post construction are set out in the CTMP and COCP. All flows from Waterbeach will go directly to the new site.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			during construction of the transfer pipeline should not be delayed to the end of the construction period but remedied in sequence. 2 Waterbeach pipeline should be connected directly into the new WWTP as soon as that is available/commissioned. The section of the pipeline from the new WWTP to the existing WRC will be redundant; if left in place underground measures must be taken to prevent collapse or contamination. 3 Incorporating some form of emergency overflow/escape at the Waterbeach pumping station could protect residents and might also protect residents from cross flow between the old and new town areas.			
Save Honey Hill	Construction		Recommendations: 1 Stringent monitoring of HGVs involved in construction and maintenance will be required. 2 Reinstatement of land to its original use when damaged during construction of the transfer tunnel should not be delayed to the end of the construction period but remedied in sequence	n	The Applicant notes the comment, plans for monitoring and remediation post construction are set out in the CTMP and COCP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A
Save Honey Hill	Construction		Recommendations 1 Stringent monitoring of HGVs involved in the construction and maintenance of Waterbeach transfer pipeline to ensure no access via Horningsea High Street or Clayhithe Road	n	The Applicant notes the comment, plans for monitoring and remediation post construction are set out in the CTMP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Ian Gilder	Construction		No explanation has been offered as to why the alignment of the Waterbeach pipeline and the construction access from Horningsea Road to the west have not been placed in a single 100m wide corridor alongside the transfer tunnel. This would move construction.	n	The two construction methodologies are different and work in two different planes the transfer tunnel is underground and has no surface effect whereas the Waterbeach construction is open cut and follows field boundaries. Therefore, it is not appropriate for both pipelines to follow the same corridor.	Application Document Ref. 4.14 Design Plans - Waterbeach Pipeline Long Sections
Ian Gilder	Construction	CoCP	The Code of Construction Practice is proposing to adopt 'core working hours' which are markedly longer than those normally used on major projects, moving start times on weekdays to as early as 0600 and extending Saturday working from 1300 up to 1800 in the summer. No real justification has been provided for this. Once construction noise assessments have been undertaken, the	n	The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) specifies working hours and includes location specific restrictions such as prohibiting works activities at shaft 4 before 7am. The CoCP also includes a requirement for the Applicant/the Principal Contractor(s) to keep the local community regularly informed with regard to the construction activities taking place and the working hours associated with those activities. This will include notifying the local community and any other	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part B, Application Document Ref 5.4.17.3 Construction Noise Assessment, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Project needs to consider whether these extended hours are actually reasonable across different parts of the construction site. BS 5228 states clearly[1], as acknowledged on page 13 of the PEI, that noise disturbance is likely to be perceived as much greater during 'waking-up' hours, evenings and on Saturday afternoons. Extended working hours may be acceptable on the core works site but are likely to be inappropriate along the pipeline and transfer tunnels routes, where these come much closer to residential receptors. If extended hours are adopted, much stricter noise limits should be applied during these sensitive periods.		relevant stakeholders before an activity falling within the very special circumstances category takes place or before a period of continuous working commences. The notification will include a description of the activity which will be carried out and details of how long the activity will last. There will be a Community Liaison Plan that will set out how the community can make contact if there are any issues with working hours, together with a Community Liaison Officer who will work with the community to ensure that construction impacts are mitigated.	
Stow Cum Quy PC	Construction		Restrict HGV movement to the site during rush hour and school drop off, pick up times.	n	Details of the management of HGVs during construction is set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and the CoCP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP

Table 1-8 Design

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cam Valley Forum	Design	Water recycling	The EA are calling now for a 60-70% reduction in ground water abstraction on the present levels of demand. This is to address the needs for adequate river and stream flow, most of which are greatly depleted and polluted Chalk Streams. Groundwater abstraction is at present limited by licences (that have never been revised downwards) and do bear on the sustainability of groundwater sources for the ecosystems they serve. Rather than merely exploring options for recycling water not only to the River Cam but also to the public supply to support this need for domestic Water. This is a fundamental operational question which we feel you continue to ignore.	n	The option of water recycling to the public supply is not feasible at this point in time, on this project. The Applicant, as a business has a Water Resources Strategy and works with Cambridge Water and Water Resource East to look at further opportunities for waste water recycling, as part of that strategy.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Design	Lighting	It is noted that there will be impacts on ecology from operational lighting. It will be important to demonstrate how the scheme has been designed to minimise such impacts.	n	The Project Description of the Environmental Statement describes the proposed lighting that would form part of the design for the Proposed Development as well as a Lighting Strategy, which is submitted as part of the DCO Application. An Environmental Lighting Impact Assessment (ELIA) is provided as part of the Application. This includes any specific mitigation including design features to avoid or reduce potential lighting impacts.	Application Document Ref. 5.2.2 Project Description
Cllr Claire Daunton	Design	Gateway	The Discovery Centre should be located within the bund. It should be a facility to which access will be controlled and based on educational or advance-booking limited visits. In this way it should be possible to control noise and traffic at the site. It will, however, be important that when open there are sufficient parking mitigation and other resources to deal with visitor access. More work is needed to reduce the size and impact of the Gateway building. Details should be provided of on the number of staff who need to be housed there regularly.	y	Following on from stakeholder comments at Phase Three Consultation further design work has been carried out to minimise the visual impact of the Gateway Building.	Application Document Ref 4.10.1 Design Plans - Buildings - Gateway building floor and roof plans, Application Document Ref 4.10.2 Design Plans - Buildings - Gateway building elevations
CPPF	Design	Digester Towers	We are supportive of the circular earth bank enclosing the majority of the structures. We understand that you are seeking to minimise the height of the structures as much as possible. We are pleased to read in the consultation leaflet that the digester towers would have 'sky-like' finishes to soften their appearance against the skyline, which we had suggested - but we would appreciate more details on this.	y	The Applicant has worked within the design to reduce the heights of structures within the proposed WWTP. Further reductions will be sought during the detailed design stage which will also include the final presentations of colour palette for the structures. The Applicant notes that CPPF are supportive of the skylike finishes proposed.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.2 Project Description, Application Document Ref 4.10 Design Plans - Buildings
Historic England	Design	Shaft 4	We note that there is reference to a ventilation shaft sited adjacent to Poplar Hall. This is something that we had not been aware of previously. Although Poplar Hall is listed grade	y	In response to stakeholders comments the Applicant has conducted a further assessment as part of the ES. As a result, the ventilation shaft has been relocated further east	Application Document Ref 5.2.2

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			II and therefore outside of our remit, we are concerned that it might impact upon the setting of other heritage assets. We are therefore happy to see that it will be assessed as part of the final ES and will comment further in due course.		to reduce potential impact, the construction technique will be (horizontal directional drilling)and the shaft will now be temporary for construction so no permanent vent will exist adjacent to Poplar Hall.	ES, Chapter 2: Project Description
Marshall Group	Design	Building height	The new waste water treatment plant site is located beneath an 'Inner Horizontal Surface', which is a horizontal plane above an aerodrome and its environs whereby the height of buildings, plant and roof structures is restricted to ensure they do not interfere with Airport activities. The height of this surface at the proposed site is 55.82m AOD. If any structures exceed this height, then further consultation with Cambridge Airport should be sought to enable further Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) aeronautical studies to be completed. In addition, the proposed site sits beneath the 'Instrument Flight Procedures' associated to Cambridge Airport; therefore, any proposed structure or construction equipment that is proposed above 15m above ground level will require further consultation with Cambridge Airport to enable any further aeronautical studies to be undertaken. It is also requested that MGP has sight of the detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan so it can assess the potential impacts on the safe operation of the Airport.	y	The Applicant is mindful of MGP's comments and has modified the heights of structures within the bund so that these structures are now as low as possible. Any structure that exceeds 15m are identified in the ES and their impact, if any, will be discussed further with Cambridge Airport.	Application Document Ref 4.10 Design Plans - Buildings and Application Document Ref 4.9 Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant
Marshall Group	Design	Bird strike	The proposed location of the new Cambridge Waste Water Transfer Facility nearer to Cambridge Airport has the potential to increase the risk of bird strike with birds looking to utilise both the feeding and breeding opportunities present on site, thereby, increasing the strike risk due to the movement of these birds through the critical airspace. relatively short duration. However, the safe operation of the Airport remains a priority, and MGP would recommend continued close liaison between Anglian Water and Cambridge Airport to ensure these matters are addressed. Cambridge Airport recommends that a Bird Hazard Management Plan is required to cover both the construction and operational phases. The precise content of this may vary depending on the relative phasing of construction of operations at the new plant, relative to the status of ongoing operations at Cambridge Airport and the timescale for closure of the Airport.	n	The Applicant has discussed bird strike directly with Cambridge Airport. The management of bird hazard is set out in an outline Wildlife Hazard Management Plan included as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.17 Wildlife Hazard Management Plan
Marshall Group	Design	Renewable energy	The airport is also interested to understand any renewable energy proposals so that implications for Cambridge Airport can be understood. If any of the above factors trigger a requirement for additional aeronautical studies to be undertaken, the cost of these studies will need to be covered	n	The Applicant is not intending to utilise Wind Turbines within the design of the Proposed Development but will have solar panels -positioned on the earth bank surrounding the proposed WWTP- and on the roof of the Gateway Building. Any potential impact will be discussed	Application Document Ref 4.10 Design Plans - Buildings and Application

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			by Anglian Water. The use of renewable energy's such as Photo Voltaic Cells (PVC's) or Wind turbines could have the potential to impact the operations at Cambridge Airport. If such technologies are being adopted, then further details should be provided to Cambridge Airport to allow the necessary aeronautical studies to be completed.		with Cambridge Airport. A Glint and Glare assessment is included within the application.	Document Ref 4.9 Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant, Application Document Ref. 5.4.15.4 Glint & Glare Assessment
Quy Fen Trust	Design	Change to visual amenity / views	The use of renewable energy sources is positive but little information is provided in support to allow review and assessment. Solar panels located on building roofs and above car parks could compound the problems already faced regarding the impact of the plant on the flat fenland landscape.	n	The placement of solar panels is on the inner facing slope of the earth bank.	
Quy Fen Trust	Design	Change to visual amenity / views	The gateway building remains unacceptable, it is unclear why the gateway building is required to be circa 10m high. There appears to be significant difference between the illustrative visualisations and indicative ground level views contained in page 15 making it difficult to access.	y	The Applicant acknowledges these comments and has undertaken a review of the Gateway Building. The building has now been redesigned to be more integrated within the earth bank structure. Furthermore, the exterior has included more defined planting and low-level screening earth works as part of the car parking area.	Application Document Ref 4.10.2 Design Plans - Buildings - Gateway Building elevations
Quy Fen Trust	Design	gateway building	Educational visits to the proposed replacement site should be continued on the same basis as the current. No detail has been provided of the revised education facilities planned and how these related to the proposed gatehouse building.	n	Educational Visits to the new facility will be undertaken on a managed, by appointment only basis for the benefit of local schools and community groups. This is on the same basis as the existing site.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Quy Fen Trust	Design	Change to visual amenity / views	The current proposals are damaging to the setting and character of the landscape and require more effort in all aspects of the design, construction and mitigation; to lower plant height, restore bund height, and to improve natural screen.	y	Design has been reviewed post Phase Three Consultation to improve building height and screening .	Application Document Ref: 5.2.2 Project Description. Application Document Ref: 4.10 Design Plans
Quy Fen Trust	Design	Change to visual amenity / views	The reduction in bund height will have consequential effects such as additional lighting impact and additional risk of odour transmission	n	The setting of the earth bank at 5m is coupled with a reduction in the height of structures within the proposed WWTP and reducing massing. Lighting infrastructure is limited to a maximum height of 5m. The large majority of the street and operational lighting within the proposed WWTP sits below the level of the earth bank. Lighting above this is for task purposes and will only be used during a maintenance activity . From an odour perspective the earth bank has no function in relation to odour control therefore its reduction will not impact this.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.3 Lighting Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.4 Glint & Glare Assessment
Quy Fen Trust	Design	Odour	Reference to lack of Odour management plan which would show details of processes for spills and emergencies etc.	n	We note your comments on Odour and confirm that the Applicant has now finalised the Odour Chapter within the	Application Document Ref

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					ES which presents the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on odour during its construction (including commissioning), operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases, how these have been assessed and how they will be mitigated. The Odour Impact Assessment Report demonstrates that 'negligible' odour impact is predicted for all known Receptors, as it supports Anglian Water's approach to maintain 'negligible' odour impact for receptors through effective active management of operation, maintenance and incidents that may arise.	5.4.18.2 Odour Impact Assessment
Teversham Parish Council	Design	Design Scope	We are concerned that the design is not suitable for long-term expansion. It seems to be a fairly short-term (50 year) proposal which with things like the earth bank and tree planting which will limit expansion.	n	The CWWTP DCO design capacity will have a waste water treatment population equivalent of 300,000 and sludge treatment population equivalent capacity of 548,000. This capacity will be sufficient to serve all identified and committed residential and commercial development within the Cambridge catchment as a minimum to 2041 (being the end of the next Local Plan period) based on emerging needs and allocations identified in the First Proposals for the new local plan. The infrastructure provided as part of the main works will have a design life to at least 2080, and the supporting infrastructure (i.e. the transfer tunnel, pipelines and outfall) will have a designed capacity sufficient to meet population growth projections plus an allowance for climate change to at least 2080. Furthermore, there is capability for expansion in space that has been provided within the earth bank and by modification, enhancement and optimisation of the design to accommodate anticipated flows into the early 2100s. The proposed development is therefore capable of accommodating the capacity of all the identified strategic sites within the Cambridge catchment that will be built out beyond 2041.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.2. Project Description
The Environment Agency	Design	Sludge Treatment	The sludge treatment (anaerobic digestion) and directly associated activities will be controlled by an environmental permit regulated by the us(this will not include the wider waste water treatment site). The details of the proposed treatment capacity for the sludge treatment anaerobic digester have not yet been provided. A treatment capacity of greater than 100 tonnes per day would require an installations environmental permit. Specific pre-application advice on the environmental permit has not been sought.	n	The IED permit requirements for the Proposed Development have been discussed with the EA and a formal application will be made.	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
The Environment Agency	Design	Odour	The anaerobic digestion plant should be designed and constructed to the standards required in our technical guidance (appropriate measures for the biological treatment of waste) and in the best available techniques reference document for waste treatment (see below).This includes CIRIA736 as the construction standard for Anaerobic digestion sites. The odour report discusses preliminary odour modelling. Modelling Data or assumptions have not been reviewed as part of this consultation. As part of the application and determination for an environmental permit, modelling data on the effects on the sensitive receptors will need to be submitted for review by our air quality team.	n	It is acknowledged that the permitting under the IED refers to the H4 Odour Management guidance. The modelling activities have included disaggregated modelling 'most offensive' sources which demonstrate that the 1.5ou_E/m^3 contour referred to in the context of the H4 guidance is within the boundary. This information is not presented within the Odour chapter in the ES as it pertains to environmental permitting requirements only. The Odour chapter of the ES sets out the results from the odour modelling that has been undertaken. The assessment of impacts within the Odour Chapter of the ES follows the IAQM Odour assessment guidance. The IAQM assessment accepted at scoping and in subsequent engagement meetings considered all potential odour sources that can be reasonably included within a dispersion model. In alignment with this guidance the closest receptors 'pathways' within the landscape masterplan would for some sections experience odour levels of up to 5ou_E/m^3. - as a low sensitivity receptor with this predication the impact remains negligible.	Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour and Appendices Application Document Ref 5.4.18.1 to 5.4.18.4
The Environment Agency	Design	Odour	The odour paper refers to some of the techniques required, for example abatement of emissions to air, containment, and minimising storage times, but no specifics have been provided at this stage. We anticipate this will be reviewed during the permitting process. The techniques will form part of the permits Environmental Management System and odour management plan. Odour in relation to the decommissioning of the existing plant should be addressed in the decommissioning plan and revised EMS and OMP for the permit.	n	Operational compliance with Best Available Techniques (BAT) conclusions and BAT Associated Emissions Limits (AEL) will be demonstrated through the IED permitting process. The Environmental Statement includes a Preliminary Odour Management Plan and a Preliminary Decommissioning Plan. These will be live documents and be updated to form the detailed management plans as part of the permitting process. A copy of the decommissioning plan has now been shared with the Environment Agency.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan
Waterbeach Parish Council	Design		It is important to understand who the overall regulating authority who will be responsible for delivery and operational management of the Waterbeach Zone and the proposed relocated CWWTP.	n	The Applicant Anglian Water Services Limited (AWS) will be the owner and operator of the new CWWTPR and Waterbeach Rising Main. AWS is regulated by Water Services Regulation Authority (Ofwat).	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Design	decommissioning	Details relating to the decommissioning activities at the existing site and an assessment of those activities should be provided as part of the DCO. It is anticipated such details will include the draining / cleaning of existing tanks (waste treatment / disposal), ensuring mechanical and electrically safety and security, and prevention of rainwater storage in open top tanks.	n	The Applicant has produced an Outline Decommissioning Plan which is included within the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Design	decommissioning	The District Council also considers it important for further information on the demolition of structures and site preparation for the site's redevelopment to be provided as part of the DCO. It is noted that the Scoping Opinion adopted by the Planning Inspectorate (Nov 2021) adopted pursuant to Regulation 10 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 states that the Environment Statement for the Proposed Development should describe the future decommissioning activities at the existing CWWTP that will be required, "…to the extent that they can be reasonably foreseeable to facilitate any future development that will be subject to a separate planning permission." In accordance with the above, details in relation to the decommissioning activities involved including the identification of any waste arising and any temporary and permanent effects should be provided and assessed as part of the DCO.	n	An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Earth bank		There are, however, opportunities to alter the gradient along the length of the bunds to create a landscape more capable of supporting vegetation. This could include sections of shallower gradients which tie-in into the proposed ridge and furrow concept. This will enable a more scalloped effect that will become more vegetated over time allowing better screening of the bunds. The establishment, maintenance and long-term maintenance of these areas will need to be detailed as part of the DCO	y	Discussions with Officers on landscape, heritage and visual impact have enabled amendments to the landscape design, including the earth bank. The Applicant has reviewed design, building heights, mass of buildings and planting. They have also modified planting design to be more aligned with the local landscape. The amended planting designs have significantly improved the visual impact. Ongoing discussion is taking place in order to define areas of agreement around landscape value, heritage, and interpretation of NPS policies, with the aim of reaching an agreement through the Statements of Common Ground. The Applicant is confident that our landscape architects have produced the best balance between visual impact, landscape, and heritage. If a position cannot be agreed whilst preparing the Local Impact Report, then this issue will remain under discussion and be explored through examination.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Earth bank		In particular, the District Council is concerned that topsoil may eventually become thinner and less fertile, and watering may be essential for both establishment and long-term	y	Discussions with Officers on landscape, heritage and visual impact have enabled amendments to the landscape design, including the earth bank. The Applicant has	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			maintenance. In addition, the flat top of the earthwork will eventually become more rounded with a potential for a hard packed walking trail along the top depending on the use. Dykes and other earthworks in the Fen character areas tend to have tree growth at the base of the embankments, which usually also have a small ditch on one or both sides. These depressions/ditches allow enough water to collect to water trees and scrub landscape which collect along the bases of the earthworks. Sustainable means to support growth on key landscape elements (given lessons from other infrastructure projects) should be carefully considered and identified in the District Council's view		reviewed design, building heights, mass of buildings and planting. They have also modified planting design to be more aligned with the local landscape. The amended planting designs have significantly improved the visual impact. Ongoing discussion is taking place in order to define areas of agreement around landscape value, heritage, and interpretation of NPS policies, with the aim of reaching an agreement through the Statements of Common Ground. The Applicant is confident that our landscape architects have produced the best balance between visual impact, landscape, and heritage. If a position cannot be agreed whilst preparing the Local Impact Report, then this issue will remain under discussion and be explored through examination.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Design		The proposal should demonstrate 'good design evolution' and show that the proposed design of the scheme (rotunda) reduces odour emanating from the site compared to other design options which have been considered and discounted, with details of what those were	n	Quality design has been a key factor in the design process, this is set out in the Design & Access Statement, including in the DCO Application. The design of the earth bank was not to reduce odour, but to provide mitigation to visual impact.	Application Document Ref 7.6 Design and Access Statement
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Design	Sludge treatment	Understanding that there is a relationship between HGVs trips and sludge imports, please confirm: what approximate import limit on sludge imports AW envisage when the new the works opens and in subsequent decades; that this figure is incorporated in predicted HGV usage; how much sludge is produced at the current works; and how much sludge they expect to produce at the proposed works. Please note our concerns about STC capacity are not just based on traffic but include the visual intrusion and odour issues AW document elsewhere.	n	The predicted HGV movements are set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter on Traffic. The Applicant has used the forecasted maximum allowance of 16,000 tds/year for sludge. Mitigation measures are in place for emptying sludge into the treatment plant at the site and is considered in the odour modelling.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport, Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Design	Gateway Building	We consider the Discovery Centre and associated car park should be located inside the bunded area or omitted. Another alternative would be to incorporate a Discovery Centre at the site of the Cambridge Museum of Technology on Riverside.	y	Following Phase Three Consultation the Applicant has made modifications to the design to further reduce the visual impact of the Gateway Building and car park.	Application Document References 4.10.1 Design Plans - Buildings - Gateway building floor and roof plans & Application Document References 4.10.2 Design Plans - Buildings - Gateway building elevations

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Design	Lighting	FDPC will object if the height of the continuously lit lighting columns on roads inside the bund is such that the light is visible outside the bund. We request AW prioritise the use of movement controlled lighting in office buildings or car parks inside the bund. If our objection to its siting is not taken up, we have no objection to the Gateway/Discovery car park not being continuously lit since AW stated on 19th April that this area would be supervised by operations staff. We also welcome AW's comment that the proposed extension of highway lighting on Horningsea Road between Low Fen Drove/Biggin Abbey turnings and J34 would be re-examined and possibly curtailed.	y	Following Phase Three Consultation the lighting columns have been amended to 5 metres. The lighting will be directed downwards and generally used for tasks only. There should be no lights visible under normal operation. Lighting outside of the rotunda will be discrete and kept to a minimum for safety reasons. It will also be active for use, not activated all through night-time hours. A lighting assessment has been carried out, lighting plans are set out in the Project Description and a Lighting Strategy is submitted as part of the DCO Application.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.3 Lighting Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.4 Glint & Glare Assessment
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Design	Shaft and tunnels	FDPC also objects to the possible vent shaft at Shaft 4 and considers this should be omitted or relocated to the western side of the Cam. FDPC request AW explain why AW has not chosen to align a more direct and shorter route from Waterbeach to the Milton Works rather than the current alignment east of the River Cam and Horningsea village. Confirmation that AW intend to arrange supply of precast tunnel and shaft segments or rings from offsite manufacture and not from a casting yard inside the redline boundary.	y	Following Phase Three Consultation the design has been modified to relocate shaft 4 to a less intrusive position. The shaft has now moved East by c50m and no longer means hedgerows will be removed or access required to the same field. Due to technical constructability risks shaft 4 cannot be moved any further east. Shaft 4 is a temporary, construction shaft not a permanent feature. Otherwise, the Applicant intends to arrange supply of precast tunnel and shaft segments or rings from offsite manufacture and not from a casting yard inside the redline boundary.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description,
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Design	Land take	Our suggestion to substitute a more northerly connection from Low Fen Drove and exclude the former railway line from the red line area; subject to landowner agreement, modify the red line boundary alignment on the northeast side of the works since the current arc narrowly misses an o/h pylon and leaves at awkward re-entrant corner by the CWS. This decreases the scope for arable operations just outside the current red line boundary. Possible use of land west of the Cam and north of A14 opposite Biggin Abbey to accommodate a realigned river crossing and route to the existing works for the Waterbeach pipeline.	y	The Applicant has considered the proposed boundary alignment on the north-east boundary of the works, this has changed slightly since Phase Three Consultation to follow field boundaries more closely. The Applicant intends to retain the current path layout (as explained to FDPC it provides the best option from an environmental and cost perspective).	Application Document Ref. 4.1 Location and Scheme Order Limit plans
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Design	Car parking	It is recommended the visitor car park is out of view and contained within the secure area inside the earth bank framework.	y	Post Phase Three Consultation design has been reviewed to further mitigate the visual impact of the car park. The applicant notes the comments with regards to security, however measures will be put in place to mitigate security issues such as anti-social behaviour.	Application Document Ref 4.10 Design Plans - Buildings
Horningsea Parish Council	Design	Solar	Given the prominence of the buildings in the latest proposal, how visible and effective will they be? Could you also provide a target of the energy yield from these solar panels?	n	The solar panels will not be visible as they will be within the interior facing slope of the earth bank and they will produce approx. 7 Gigawatt/hrs of clean electricity per year.	Application Document Ref 5.4.15.4 Glint & Glare Assessment

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
						Application Document Ref 4.9 Design Plans - Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant
Horningsea Parish Council	Design	Sludge treatment	It would be beneficial to reduce trucking of sludge into the proposed site from other countywide locations and to find nearer WWTPs to handle the sludge.	n	The satellite sites in the Cambridge catchment do not have the ability to treat sludge, the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant is a key site for providing sludge treatment services to waste water customers.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Design	Gateway building	The Gateway Building should be removed or substantially reduced – we do not support these prominent structures in this sensitive Fenland Green Belt landscape. We also object to the Discovery Centre and object to associated parking inside and outside the bund, for around 100 spaces, including HGVs and a coach. This is not appropriate on the Green Belt and brings the added issue of light pollution. In terms of design aspects, the more natural selections are considerably better than the previous statement corporate structure proposed in Consultation 2. Statement architectural finishes remain inappropriate for this Green Belt Fenland location.	y	Following Phase Three Consultation stakeholder responses the design has been reviewed to further minimise the visual impact of the Gateway Building. Lighting will not create a significant impact. A lighting assessment has been carried, plans for lighting are set out in the project description and a Lighting Strategy is included in the application.	Application Document Ref 4.10.1 Design Plans - Buildings - Gateway building floor and roof plans, Application Document Ref 4.10.2 Design Plans - Buildings - Gateway building elevations Application Document Ref 5.4.15.3 Lighting Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.4 Glint & Glare Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project description
Horningsea Parish Council	Design	Car park	We request more information on the lighting proposed here, there is very little detail. We request the visitor car park to be positioned out of view within the secure area inside the earth bank framework.	y	The Applicant advises that post Phase Three Consultation the design has been amended with additional planting in the car park and changing the orientation of the building to reduce the impact as much as possible. A lighting assessment has been carried out lighting in the car park will be provided as a safety measure but will not be intrusive.	Application Document Ref 4.10.1 Design Plans - Buildings - Gateway building floor and roof plans, Application Document Ref 4.10.2 Design Plans -

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
						Buildings - Gateway building elevations
Horningsea Parish Council	Design	Visibility of building	HPC were shocked and disappointed by the Phase Three photomontages and impressions of the plant in the surrounding landscape. This is a substantial difference from the impressions presented at Consultation 2 which sought to conceal the plant, albeit with a significant land mass that also intruded on the landscape. The communities here aspire to a far better design solution, and are asking why we aren't being presented with a solution like the Solrødgård Water Treatment Plant which is hardly visible in the flat landscape of Denmark? We requested detailed information on why the design could not bury the structures. This is one of the most important mitigation measures that could be undertaken at this site. We believe that the lack of information about this decision is totally unacceptable. HPC formally requests a copy of the corresponding assessment conducted into sinking the plant into the ground.	y	Following Phase Two Consultation the Applicant recognised that more work was needed to mitigate visual impact. Post Phase Three Consultation further design modification and having taken on board further stakeholder comments the Applicant has significantly reduced the visual impact and are now aligned with our initial design principles. There are a number of different considerations as to why the structures could not be buried any further than they already are, this includes but is not limited to, safety, environmental permit compliance, ground water considerations, geology, operational efficiency, carbon, energy usage and capital cost.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Horningsea Parish Council	Design	Visibility of building	AW needs to place significantly more effort into reducing the height of the plant, in lowering the overall plant footprint height, to reinstating aspects of the bund height so a correct balance is achieved between screening and imposition and the provision of additional screening / mitigation.	y	Following Phase Three Consultation the design has been reviewed in order to reduce the visual impact further. This has been done through a combination of reducing the size and massing of the buildings as well as enhancing the landscape design. Details are provided in the application together with photomontages. The amendments to post Phase Three Consultation has removed the need for further offsite mitigation.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Horningsea Parish Council	Design	Capacity	HPC requests an enforceable guarantee that the area will not be expanded/built upon further.	n	There is flexibility and capacity within the operational footprint of the proposed WWTP to allow for future expansion ensuring the proposed development can accommodate growth to at least 2080. These elements are likely to be modular process tanks and units with associated equipment within the footprint of the operational WWTP and not require works to transfer infrastructure outside of this area	
Horningsea Parish Council	Design	Earth bank	We also request an undertaking from AW that it will not expand the WWTP outside the bund.	n	There is flexibility and capacity within the operational footprint of the proposed WWTP to allow for future expansion ensuring the proposed development can accommodate growth to at least 2080. These elements are likely to be modular process tanks and units with associated equipment within the footprint of the	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					operational WWTP and not require works to transfer infrastructure outside of this area	
Horningsea Parish Council	Design	Light pollution	HPC requests more information about the light pollution as a result of the proposed development. This is acknowledged in the documentation as a tranquil unlit area, even the A14 is not lit here. The proposal does not give clear information about areas of the development that will be lit 24/7, and at other times. It is noted that the reduction in bund height will have a knock-on effect on the light transmission.	y	The height of the lights inside the earth bank will be no greater than 5m. This lighting will also be directed downwards and generally only when carrying out tasks. Lighting outside of the earth bank will be discrete and kept to a minimum for safety reasons. It will also be active for use, not activated all through night time hours. Lighting along Horningsea Road will be agreed with the local highway authority and only installed if absolutely necessary for safety reasons. A Lighting Assessment has been carried out, plans for lighting are set out in the Project Description and a Lighting Strategy is submitted as part of the DCO Application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.15.3 Lighting Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description
Save Honey Hill	Design	Gateway Building	The Discovery Centre is unnecessary and adds to parking, which should be sited within the earthworks bank. The Gateway Building should be reduced in size; its mass and industrial design is inappropriate in a rural setting.	y	Following stakeholder response to Phase Three Consultation the Gateway Building has been reviewed in order to reduce the visual impact. The scheduled use of the discovery centre is part of the gateway building and is a cornerstone to the design narrative.	Application Document Ref 4.10.1 Gateway Building Plan
Save Honey Hill	Design	Building finishes	Details of proposed finishes with illustrations of the exposed plant should be provided.	n	A palette of colours and materials are provided as part of the DCO Application.	Application Document Ref: 7.6 Design and Access Statement
Save Honey Hill	Design	Detailed drawings	To understand the nature of the structures better, AW should make available outline, annotated plans sections and elevations, including sections through the site and principal comprehensive elevations.	n	Design Plans are provided in the application.	Application Document Ref 4.9 Design Plans - Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant, Application Document Ref 4.10 Design Plans - Buildings
Save Honey Hill	Design		It is recommended the visitor car park is out of view and contained within the secure area inside the earth bank framework.	n	The Applicant advises that Post Phase Three Consultation the design has been amended with additional planting in the car park with the inclusion of a smaller earth bank to shield the carpark and changing the orientation of the building to reduce the impact as much as possible. Security measures will be in place to mitigate against issues such as anti-social behaviour.	Application Document Ref 4.10 Design Plans - Buildings
Save Honey Hill	Design	Capacity	AW should include an assessment of what changes in effluent quality may be required as a result of climate change and what assumptions they have made to ensure the future	n	The Applicant is confident that there is space within the earth bank to accommodate future growth	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description,

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			expansion to 300,000PE can be accommodated inside the bund.			Application Document Ref 4.9 Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant
Save Honey Hill	Design	Capacity	It is unclear how the scheme provides for Future Population growth, having similar capacity to the current site, i.e., 270,000 to 300,000 PE (WRC). Although the Sludge Treatment Centre is said to be designed for additional imported sludge, the current import limit is approximately 600m3 per day. It is not clear if there is sufficient capacity for imported liquid sludge treatment if an increased limit is set. The statement that the plant could accommodate growth to at least 2080 is not supported by any data or the impact of additional modular process tanks and equipment.	n	The CWWTP DCO design capacity will have a waste water treatment population equivalent of 300,000 and sludge treatment population equivalent capacity of 548,000. This capacity will be sufficient to serve all identified and committed residential and commercial development within the Cambridge catchment as a minimum to 2041 (being the end of the next Local Plan period) based on emerging needs and allocations identified in the First Proposals for the new local plan. The infrastructure provided as part of the main works will have a design life to at least 2080, and the supporting infrastructure (i.e. the transfer tunnel, pipelines and outfall) will have a designed capacity sufficient to meet population growth projections plus an allowance for climate change to at least 2080. Furthermore, there is capability for expansion in space that has been provided within the earth bank and by modification, enhancement and optimisation of the design to accommodate anticipated flows into the early 2100s. The proposed development is therefore capable of accommodating the capacity of all the identified strategic sites within the Cambridge catchment that will be built out beyond 2041.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description
Ian Gilder	Design	RLB	The draft Order limits are far too widely drawn on the land to both the west and east of Horningsea Road. These need to be reduced to just include land take that can definitely be justified as part of the CPO.	y	The majority of the order limits are for temporary areas of construction rather than defined for land to be compulsory purchased. However, following Phase Three Consultation scheme order limits have been amended and show a reduction in total area. These are provided within the DCO application.	Application Document Ref 4.1 Location and Scheme Order Limits
Ian Gilder	Design	Waterbeach	No explanation has been offered as to why the alignment of the Waterbeach pipeline and the construction access from Horningsea Road to the west have not been placed in a single 100m wide corridor alongside the transfer tunnel. This would move construction activity away from the housing on the east side of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton and reduce the amount of unnecessary removal of hedgerows and other existing features. There is also an important viewpoint of the new works from Horningsea Road (at the junction with Field Lane) which needs screening by a rectangular area of landscape	n	The transfer tunnel construction is primarily below ground and therefore does not need to take into account the same surface constraints that the Waterbeach pipeline does. This results in different routes being taken for both the transfer tunnel and the Waterbeach pipeline. Both pipelines in their permanent state will not be seen from the surface.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			planting on the east side of the road. This should be part of the advanced planting and moving the Waterbeach pipeline to the north will avoid a potential conflict at this location. Minimising the impacts of this section of the Waterbeach pipeline is particularly important given that CPO powers are being sought for this section, which will have, at most, a very short 3 or 4 year operational life.			
Ian Gilder	Design	Earth bank	There should also have been a response to an argument that I and other consultees have previously made, that the finished floor level of the new works should be lowered by 1 to 2 metres, to reduce the visual impact and provide more excavated material to allow the surrounding earthwork to be higher than the 5 metres above existing ground level now proposed, with more naturalistic outer slopes feathered off at the foot to say 1:8	y	The Applicant confirms that modification in design has reduced the finished floor level of the structures and finished ground level within earth bank by up to 1 metre, this alongside further reduction in size and massing of building has further mitigated visual impact. The outer slopes have also been amended in line with consultation feedback.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description, Application Document Ref 4.9 Design Plans - Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant
Ian Gilder	Design	Building mass	Breaking up the visual mass of the complex of buildings. The photomontages, particularly those at Year 15, show an undifferentiated grey mass of buildings, akin to a giant warehouse, with little screening. This can only be addressed by careful choice of building colours, following the principles in the Landscape Institute guidance;	y	Following responses stakeholders at Phase Three Consultation the design has been modified to take on board the comments made about the need to improve visual mitigation. The design has been reviewed with reduction in building heights, massing of buildings and increased planting. The amended designs have significantly improved the visual impact.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages, Application Document Ref 7.6 Design and Access Statement
Stow Cum Quy PC	Gateway Building		Support the new design, which has definitely moved in the right direction.	n	The Applicant notes the comment.	
Stow Cum Quy PC	Gateway Building		Could the visitor car park be moved inside the bund.	y	The Applicant confirms this is not possible. However, following comments made by stakeholders at Phase Three Consultation there has been a design modification of the Visitor Car Park in order to mitigate the visual impact.	Application Document Ref 4.10 Design Plans - Buildings
Stow Cum Quy PC	Design		Supportive of the design proposals, while opposing the overall project. The proposals are moving in the right direction when it comes to mitigating the impacts on the surrounding villages, however, Quy PC do not feel that that project's necessity has been sufficiently established.	n	The Applicant notes the comments including support for design proposals. As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process the Applicant evidences the special circumstances for building on Green Belt with the submission of a full assessment of the need of the proposed development in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Waste Water and the national planning policy for Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF),	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					local development plan policies and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) performance indicators.	
Save Honey Hill	Capacity		Commit to maintaining construction of future expansion of the treatment works within the existing bund in the period to 2050 to allow for population growth to, say, 2070	n	The Applicant confirms that there is capacity within the existing earth bank to allow for future growth into the 2080s	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description

Table 1-9 Historic Environment

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cambridgeshire County Council	Historic Environment	Archaeology	A programme of archaeological evaluation has been commissioned, with the intention of determining the extent and significance of undesignated heritage assets of archaeological interest likely to be affected by the development. This will enable the scope of works required in mitigation of the development impact. Fieldwork has been completed, but as the report is yet to be completed, we cannot at present comment on the scope of mitigation likely to be required. We do however expect discussions regarding mitigation to resume with the applicant when the evaluation results are available	n	The archaeological investigation mitigation strategy (AIMS) will set out historic environment mitigation measures. This process is separate to the delivery of the DCO and will sit as a supporting document to the CEMP. The mitigation strategy will be agreed with Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team as part of the Statement of Common Ground process. There is a requirement in the Code of Construction Practice for the AIMS to be prepared and for the principal contractor to prepare the CEMP.	COCP, Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1., 5.4.2.2
Cllr Claire Daunton	Historic Environment		The Historic Environment Report (HER) identifies three categories of heritage assets which will be affected. These are archaeology, built heritage and historic landscapes. The list includes local historic buildings such as Biggin Hall and conservation areas in Fen Ditton and Horningsea. To these I would add the Grade II* Quy parish church. This is not only a building of historical importance but also a local landmark on which proximity to the site will have an impact.	n	The Applicant confirms that the Grade II* Quy Parish Church is included in the assessment and a site visit has been carried out on this asset.	Application Document Ref 5.4.13.4 Historic Environment Impact Assessment Tables
Historic England	Historic setting	Classification	We note however that as well as looking at archaeology and built heritage - as would be expected, the report also has a section on 'historic landscape'. We are concerned that this should not become confused with setting of heritage assets – particularly as the report asserts that the development is unlikely to affect historic landscape. We therefore wish to make the point that whilst this consideration may be useful in understanding and assessing the visual impacts in terms of setting, that 'historic landscape' is not of itself a heritage designation in planning terms (other than registered parks and gardens). For the sake of clarity and to avoid any misunderstanding we therefore suggest that this distinction is fully drawn out and made clear in the final draft of the ES.	n	The Applicant notes the comment and this has been clarified within the Historic Landscape characterisation narrative of the Environmental Statement.	Application Document Ref 5.2.13 ES, Chapter 13: Historic Environment, Application Document Ref 5.4.13.3 Historic Landscape Characterisation
Historic England	Historic Environment	Archaeology	We are also pleased to note that other environmental factors that have the potential to affect heritage assets including noise vibration, light and odour are also to be assessed within the ES. We understand that there are no designated archaeological heritage assets that would be directly impacted, but that there are undesignated remains that would be impacted due to the construction of the facility. We therefore defer to the local authority archaeological staff to comment and advise as appropriate	n	The Applicant is mindful of this comment and can confirm that the appropriate guidance has been followed in the Environmental Statement chapter and appendices for Historic Environment.	Application Document Ref 5.2.13 ES, Chapter 13: Historic Environment, Application Document Ref 5.4.13.3 Historic

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			We also refer you to good practice advice notes produced by Historic England on behalf of the Historic Environment Forum in GPA2; Managing Significance in Decision-taking in the historic Environment and GPA 3; The Setting of Heritage Assets. We recommend this guidance is both used and referenced in the full ES.			Landscape Characterisation
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Historic Environment		Various comments on historic environment impacts: detail on construction impact for heritage assets, additional measures for mitigation of lighting and their impact on historic env; historic landscape characterisation exercise as part of DCO; want to understand why this site chosen above the other two considering the impact on historic environment; further analysis and explanation provided as to how the level of permanent harm to the setting of Biggin Abbey and Baits Bite Lock has been assessed as moderate in such circumstances. The District Council does not consider that the conclusion that the level of harm identified is 'not substantial' is robust in light of the impacts recorded. The District Council considers further explanation as to the basis for this assessment of impact and its conclusions is required. It would be helpful if the terminology used to identify harm for all the assets was that used within the NPPF or in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The District Council requires further details on the proposed ventilation shafts and the river outfall. It would also be beneficial to understand the rationale for the location of the shafts and outfall to understand whether alternative siting could reduce the likely impact on the identified heritage assets. Further detail on the material detailing and colour of the proposed finishes to the structures of the development and the LVIA would aid in providing a more realistic representation of the potential impact of these finished structures on the landscape and built heritage assets.	n	The Applicant has had ongoing engagement with council officers on the impact on historic environment, in order to define areas of agreement around landscape value, heritage, and interpretation of NPS policies, with the aim of reaching an agreement through the Statements of Common Ground. The Applicant is confident that the landscape architects have produced the best balance between visual impact, landscape, and heritage. If a position cannot be agreed whilst preparing the Local Impact Report, then this issue will remain under discussion and be explored through examination. The Landscape Characterisation Report has been completed as part of the final Environmental Statement. Otherwise, site selection information is provided in a report as part of the DCO Application. Following phase three consultation design modifications have included removing the proposed intermediate ventilation shafts. Potential material types and colour palette options are provided as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.2.13 ES, Chapter 13: Historic Environment, Application Document Ref 5.4.13.3 Historic Landscape Characterisation, Applications Document Ref. 7.3 Site Selection Report , Application Document Ref 7.6 Design and Access Statement
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Historic Environment	Archaeology	If potential archaeological remains are not already known in relation to 'Quir Hal' (known as Quy Hall) and the surrounding area, further research is undertaken to inform the potential of finding archaeological remains that may be of significance	n	The archaeological remains within the Quy estate (including the known Roman site) are outside the scheme's study area. Their presence or absence will not affect the archaeological potential of the scheme area. All of the available datasets have been used, there has been consultation with the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team and there has been a geophysical survey and trial trenching to identify the archaeological potential of the scheme area. The Applicant has considered the potential setting impacts on Quy Hall but	Application Document Ref 5.2.13 ES, Chapter 13: Historic Environnent

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					have identified that there is no intervisibility with the scheme due to intervening vegetation and topography.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Historic environment	Assessment	Within 500m of the site boundary are three Conservation Areas containing historic villages. The rural setting, scale, character and special identity of these 'necklace' villages are established as important characteristics and qualities of the Green Belt and these should be protected. Within 1km of the site boundary are many listed buildings of Grade I and II* (Horningsea alone has over 25 on the Historic England Register of the Most Important Historic Places in England). There is also a Registered Park and Gardens (National Trust) ; a range of valuable Strategic Green Infrastructure including the River Cam Corridor, several National Trails, an SSSI site, County Wildlife Sites and the National Trust's Wicken Fen Vision. HPC requests that the impact on the setting and character of the Conservation Areas of Fen Ditton, Horningsea and Baits Bite Lock are included in the assessment of the impact of change in landscape and view. Approaches to the Villages via road and PROW network should also be included in the assessment.	n	A chapter on Historic Environment is included within the ES. The Applicant is confident that there has been a comprehensive methodology, that has been reviewed by technical stakeholders and in conjunction with Historic England.	Application Document Ref 5.2.13 ES, Chapter 13: Historic Environnent
Save Honey Hill	Historic environment		If potential archaeological remains are not already known in relation to Quy Hall and the surrounding area, further research is undertaken to inform the potential of finding archaeological remains that may be of significance.		The archaeological remains within the Quy estate (including the known Roman site) are outside the scheme's study area. Their presence or absence will not affect the archaeological potential of the scheme area. All of the available datasets have been used, there has been consultation with the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team and there has been a geophysical survey and trial trenching to identify the archaeological potential of the scheme area. The Applicant has looked at the potential setting impacts on Quy Hall but have identified that there is no intervisibility with the scheme due to intervening vegetation and topography.	Application Document Ref 5.2.13 ES, Chapter 13: Historic Environment
Save Honey Hill	Historic environment		Wildfowl Cottage should be included amongst the cluster of properties: Biggin Abbey, Poplar Hall, Quy Hall etc. identified as within the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Development where there will be both transient and permanent significant effect. Mitigation measures in association with the property owners, such as additional single line tree planting to existing in the vicinity of the property, may be appropriate.	n	Wildfowl Cottage is included in the assessment. Following Phase Three Consultation modification to the visual impact through improvements to buildings and to landscape has reduced the need to provide off-site planting.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 photomontages
Save Honey Hill	Historic environment		There are a number of graded properties Grade II and of the higher value II* within the Fen Ditton Conservation Area on High Ditch Road and High Street Fen Ditton within 1km of	n	Following Phase Three Consultation modification to the visual impact through improvements to buildings and to landscape has reduced the need to provide off-site planting.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			the Proposed Development which may have views of and taller plant structures from rear gardens, ground and second floor windows and thus setting of the built asset affected. Recommendations Mitigation measures in association with the property owners such as additional single line tree planting to those existing in the vicinity of the property may be appropriate.			15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 photomontages
Save Honey Hill	Historic environment		There are a number of Grade II properties within the Horningsea Conservation Area on High Street Horningsea that may have views of the Proposed Development and taller plant from first floor windows and or gardens and thus character and setting of the built asset affected. Recommendations Mitigation measures in association with the property owners such as additional single line tree planting to those existing in the vicinity of the property may be appropriate.	n	Following Phase Three Consultation design has been modified to reduce the visual impact. The new design, including changes to the building heights and mass of building and changes to the planting, mean that the Applicant believes that no further off-site mitigation planting is required.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 photomontages
Save Honey Hill	Historic environment		Recommendations have been made in section 2.3.2 to include mitigation proposals such as single row tree planting along the length of High Ditch Road beyond the disused railway bridge towards Newmarket Rd.	n	Following Phase Three Consultation design has been modified to reduce the visual impact. The new design, including changes to the building heights and mass of building and changes to the planting, mean that the Applicant believes that no further off-site mitigation planting is required.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 photomontages
Save Honey Hill	Historic environment		The PEI HE91 report states that 'The changes to character caused by the temporary presence of construction traffic on Horningsea Conservation Areas will be mitigated by preventing construction traffic travelling through Horningsea'. Recommendations 1 This should also be afforded to Fen Ditton, High Ditch Road and Ditton Lane, each of which already have weight restrictions. 2 Further, measures should be put in place to prevent operational traffic travelling through either village.	n	Traffic mitigation measures include preventing construction and operational traffic travelling through Horningsea and Fen Ditton. During construction, this restriction is a requirement within the CTMP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Save Honey Hill	Historic environment		Uniquely, if the proposed relocation of CWWTP is granted a Development Consent Order the Conservation Areas, Villages and communities living within them will in combination be significantly negatively impacted by the introduction of a highly visible large scale industrial plant with odour risk and multiple increase in HGV traffic in open Green Belt within 500 m of Conservation Area boundaries to the east and a new high density urban multiple storey	n	The ES Chapter on Historic Environment assesses the historic impact and the Planning Statement includes a Green Belt Assessment as well as setting out how the project relates to local planning policy.	Application Document Ref 5.2.13 ES, Chapter 13: Historic Environment ; Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			housing development within 500 metres of the Conservation Area boundaries to the west.			
Ian Gilder	Historic Environment		Generally, I agree with the assessment of the significance of effects on the historic environment, reported on pages 19 to 21 of the paper. The one aspect where I differ from the authors' assessment is in relation to the permanent impact on the Fen Ditton Conservation Area. Here, I would suggest that unless the landscape mitigation to the north of High Ditch Road is more comprehensive and carefully sited, views into and out of the conservation area will be adversely affected, on what is probably the least altered and important approach to the CA. This will also affect houses on the north side of High Ditch Road inside the Conservation Area, which will be inter-visible with the works, possibly indefinitely, unless those views are closed off with well sited planting close to High Ditch Road. Unless these design changes are made, I would rate the permanent effect as 'moderate adverse'.	y	Following responses from stakeholders at Phase Three Consultation the design has been modified to take on board the comments made about the need to improve visual mitigation. The design has been reviewed with reduction in building heights, massing of buildings and increased planting. The amended designs have significantly improved the visual impact.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Historic England	Historic Environment	Project Impact	We consider the effects on the historic environment - by way of increased activity along with the introduction of new structures and landscaping into the existing agricultural landscape, are likely to be significant and in need of detailed consideration through the EIA process, including through the development of an Environmental Statement (ES	n	The Applicant notes the comments and the impact of the Proposed Development into the existing landscape and the impact on the Historic Environment has been fully assessed and is set out in the chapter (Historic Environment) of the Environment Statement. The effects of construction (temporary activities) and of operation (traffic, etc.) of the Proposed Development on heritage assets are also considered in this chapter in addition to permanent structures/changes.	Application Document Ref 5.2.13 ES, Chapter 13: Historic Environment
Historic England	Historic Environment	Project Impact	Whilst we acknowledge that there are no designated heritage assets within the actual site area that would be directly impacted, there are various heritage assets in relative proximity whose settings are likely to be affected. Our records indicate that within 1.5 km there are 1 scheduled monument; 72 listed buildings (including 1grade I listed and 10 grade II* listed buildings); 6 Conservation Areas	n	The Applicant notes the comments on the heritage assets in relative proximity to the development site whose setting are likely to be affected. All assets within the relevant study areas have been assessed for impact. The Parish Church of St Mary, Quy (Grade II* listed) was reviewed in accordance with the ZTV study area methodology. The asset was not identified within the ZTV, however, a setting assessment was undertaken as a precaution. Through this, impacts on the asset was scoped out.	Application Document Ref 5.2.13 ES, Chapter 13: Historic Environment, Application Document Ref 5.4.13.1 to 5.4.13.6 Chapter 13: Historic Environment Appendices
Historic England	Historic Environment	LVIA's	The preliminary assessment has concluded that construction of the proposed scheme would result in adverse impacts on cultural heritage assets. We note however that the PEIR only discusses those assets that would be most significantly affected, and that a more comprehensive assessment will be	n	The Applicant notes the comments and can confirm that the viewpoints were discussed within the Technical Working Group on 7th December 2021 and agreed with the response and advice provided by stakeholders.	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			undertaken of all other affected assets in the ES. We would expect any assessment to include the use of appropriate photomontages/wire frame and rendered images to substantiate the claims of the assessment. We note that some such material is included in the LVIA, but we recommend that images that relate specifically to heritage asset viewpoints and that demonstrate the specific impact upon settings are included. Viewpoints should be agreed with Historic England and the LPA's historic environment advisers to assess the impact of the proposed development on the setting of these assets.			
Historic England	Historic Environment	Mitigation	In terms of the impact of the development on Grade II listed assets, we would expect the historic environment advisors to the Local Planning Authorities to provide comments (and we do not intend to offer comments). We welcome the inclusion of mitigation measures, including the control of noise, lighting and construction traffic during construction, and also the provision of bunding and additional planting to mitigate visual impact of the facility. We acknowledge that the proposed scheme preliminary design is ongoing and will continue to be influenced by environmental factors to avoid or reduce effects where feasible.	n	The Applicant notes the comments which are welcomed and noted within the CoCP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part B

Table 1-10 Landscape / Visual Amenity

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cambridgeshire County Council	Landscape and visual amenity	Recreational space	The proposed multi-functional recreational area is most welcome and will include a number of elements that have the potential to improve both physical and mental health, new circular routes and enhancing accessibility with the help of local partners such as: the local Primary Care Surgery and local library in Waterbeach have the potential to provide long term health benefits to the wider communities to the north of Cambridge and the surrounding area.	n	The Applicant notes the comments and that the multi-functional recreational areas are welcomed. The Applicant would like to see the project contributing to the wider health benefits that the space has the potential to help create.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Landscape and visual amenity	New bridleway	The Council welcomes the proposed creation of a new public bridleway from the Horningsea Public Byway No. 17/Fen Ditton Byway No. 14 to Station Road in Lode as a community benefit of the waste water treatment plant scheme. This will provide a key link in the public rights of way network in the area, enabling non motorised users to access the countryside to the north-east of Cambridge all the way over to Wicken Fen nature reserve and other destinations. Similarly, it will provide safe off-road access for villages such as Stow-cum-Quy and Lode back towards Cambridge without having to use the busy Sustrans cycle route or A roads. This will assist the physical and mental health and well-being of communities in the area	n	The Applicant notes the comments and that the creation of the new bridleways are welcomed. The DCO application will seek to establish bridleway status over the track through DCO powers. The Applicant will continue to work with stakeholders, including Cambridgeshire County Council through the PRoW Technical Working Group, in the delivery of the new bridleway and circular routes.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Landscape and visual amenity	New bridleway	Whilst it is appreciated that there is a track of some sort already in place along the line of the proposed bridleway, the construction specification and certification and handover process for the bridleway and any associated infrastructure will need to be discussed, agreed and documented with the Local Highway Authority (LHA) who will be responsible for taking on the new asset	n	The Applicant, through the PRoW TWG, has discussed the designation and certification of the new bridleway with the relevant Officers at Cambridgeshire County Council and will continue to work with stakeholders through the PRoW Technical Working Group. Subject to survey, the surface of the existing private access between the Gatehouse and Station Road is considered to be suitable for a rural bridleway, therefore there is no intention to upgrade the surface. The private track is currently gated at one end with a single bar gate to prevent vehicle access. In addition to changing the status of the private track to a bridleway, AW is proposing to seek DCO powers to upgrade the gated access and improve signage. It is likely that some form of rights of way management plan would be required to regulate this but this is not required for the DCO Application and would be developed through further consultation with landowners and the local highway authority. Other	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					management and maintenance measures are set out in the LERMP as part of the DCO Application,	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Landscape and visual amenity	Recreational Space	As set out in the County Council's response of July 2021, Horningsea Public Byway No. 17/Fen Ditton Byway No. 14, this route is a 'moiety' byway that runs half in the parish of Fen Ditton and half in the parish of Horningsea, along the parish boundary, providing the middle link between the unclassified carriageway sections of Low Fen Drove. The Byway, which is predominately a gravel track, currently provides access to all modes of travel, including public and private access by motor vehicle. The County Council is aware that the local community have long held concerns regarding the use of Low Fen Drove, including the section of byway, for fly tipping, hare coursing, burglary and other anti-social behaviour. The proposed DCO provides an efficient mechanism by which the status of the byway can be easily modified to help control unwanted activity that is blighting local communities and inhibiting the enhancement of appropriate public access, particularly that aligned to the government's Active Travel agenda. The DCO could either permanently amend the status of the byway to a restricted byway, which does not permit use by public vehicles, or through a Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting motorised vehicular traffic. The County Council, together with South Cambridgeshire District Council and other stakeholders, would be happy to explore this further with the Applicant.	n	The Applicant has considered the comments and this issue has been discussed in the PRoW Technical Working Group, which involves the relevant Officers at Cambridgeshire County Council. The EIA process has concluded that the CWWTPR project would be unlikely to lead to an increase in ASB and therefore it would be difficult to justify making the change of status to LFDW through DCO powers. These EIA conclusions have been reached following consultation with the Police and with the Highway Authority and District Council. However whilst the ability to change status is outside of the project scope the Applicant understands the community concerns about this issue and will continue the discussion with local authorities with the aim of reaching a final conclusion in the Statements of Common Ground.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Cambridgeshire County Council	Landscape and visual amenity	Permissive paths	The LHA is pleased to see that the Applicant proposes to create a number of permissive paths across the plant site which will connect into the public byway and Low Fen Road. The LHA would welcome discussion to establish how NMU traffic egressing onto and off the public highway will be managed	n	The Applicant has considered the comments and continues has discussed with the relevant officers within the Technical Working Group (TWG) for Traffic and Access and the TWG for PROW. Agreements will be set out in the Statement of Common Ground with the Council.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Cambridgeshire County Council	LERMP	Impacts to grazing marsh	Impacts to the floodplain grazing marsh must be avoided, or if this is not possible mitigated. We welcome the proposed usage of directional drilling. However, HDD is not confirmed for this area within the Working Areas During Construction (page 13, PEI: Introduction). Details of how temporary loss of floodplain grazing marsh will be restored, should be included within the landscape masterplan etc.	y	This area will now have directional drilling in order to minimise the impact on grazing marsh.	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cambridgeshire County Council	Landscape and visual	Early planting	Early planting is encouraged and appropriate fast-growing species selected in order to deliver the relevant visual mitigation measures in the shortest timeframe possible. This should include the southwest corner of the site and entrance	y	The Applicant agrees with the comment and confirms that the LERMP -includes initial planting comprising: a hedge with standard trees along the southern side of the western end of Low Fen Drove Way; a woodland belt approximately 7.5m wide along the southern boundary and part of the eastern boundary of the land required for the proposed WWTP; and trees planted in gaps between existing trees along the eastern side of Horningsea Road between Low Fen Drove Way and Horningsea. The landscape architects for the project (RMA) have been in discussion with the landscape and ecology officers and have incorporated their recommendations to add faster growing species such as black poplar into the tree species proposed on the landscape masterplan.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Landscape and visual	Visual receptors	The Applicant should be mindful that users of the PROW network are visual receptors and so the visual impact of construction works on PROW should be minimised where possible in order not to discourage NMUs from using the network during the course of construction	n	Access will be maintained during the short-term works. Working widths have been minimised to limit temporary disturbance. The Landscape and Visual Amenity chapter of the ES includes an assessment of PRoW.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES Chapter Landscape & Visual
Cambridgeshire County Council	LERMP	Identity of place in landscape	The Council is pleased to see that there has been consultation with a wide range of stakeholders including NMU groups which has thoughtfully helped to shape the current proposals, linking in NMU routes with ecological, heritage and landscape factors. NMU routes not only offer opportunity for green infrastructure but also are often intrinsically linked to the character and history of the local landscape and communities, so it is important to consider them in this context and any enhancement that can be made. It is not clear from the current paper this has been done. For example, there could be interpretation boards explaining the history of the Horningsea/Fen Ditton moiety public byway and at each end the proposed new bridleway highlighting the history of the former railway.	y	Interpretation boards will include engaging content on the character and history of the local landscape and communities.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Cambridgeshire County Council	LERMP		Features should be enhanced to be visually attractive at all times of the year, in-keeping with the heritage and ecological character of the area.	n	This has been considered in the landscape design.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	LERMP	Prow & Access Mgmt. Plan	The Council has raised a number of issues in relation to the existing PROW network, particularly Byway Horningsea No. 17/Fen Ditton No. 14 and the proposed	n	The management plans are set out in the LERMP. The ongoing management of routes is set out in the LERMP as follows: The landscape design will encourage natural	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			bridleway and permissive paths. Whilst there are technical issues that need to sit with the appropriate technical documents such as the Traffic Management Plan or within the DCO itself, the Council would support the development of a ROW & Access Management Plan to provide an overarching means of addressing them, and the ongoing management of routes if this would be helpful to all parties.		colonisation where possible adjacent to the Low Fen Drove Way Grasslands and Hedges County Wildlife Site (CWS). Enhancement and potential extension of the CWS by the creation of a new area of semi-improved neutral grassland buffering (minimum 15-20m wide) the northern boundary of the CWS has also been designed to ensure no shading or encroachment on the existing habitats associated with the CWS. It is also proposed to improve the condition of the CWS through habitat management proposals, which could include clearing scrub in areas to restore semi-improved neutral grassland and unimproved calcareous grassland. The aim is to buffer, enhance, and improve the resilience of the CWS, keeping tree planting away from the margins of the CWS to maintain the grassland, which is used by a diverse invertebrate assemblage. The buffer will in time become a ride type habitat between the CWS and new planting within the site, this is visible in both the Landscape Masterplan and the Proposed Ecology Features Plan within the LERMP. Hedgerow planting with fencing, where required will also be used in places to deter visitors from accessing ecological sensitive areas such as the CWS to maintain reserved areas for wildlife and prevent trampling of the grassland. Signage and interpretation boards will be used to divert pressure away from designated sites such as Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI and Low Fen Drove Way Grasslands and Hedges CWS, encouraging use of the alternative greenspace within the site.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Landscape design		The Council also requests that the detailed design of the landscape scheme, such as grassland seed mixes and pond designs, are discussed with the relevant ecology and landscape specialists at the relevant local authorities	y	Following Phase Three Consultation Responses further information on the landscape masterplan including grassland mix, tree species and further detailed information was shared with council officers and their input has been used to amend the design. These details are contained with the LERMP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Cambridgeshire County Council	LERMP	Management period	The Council seeks that the proposed 5-year management period be extended, so that the scheme can deliver the proposed BNG scores. We recommend that a minimum of 30-year management period is included, which includes monitoring to confirm whether the scheme will deliver the 20% BNG, which has been proposed. The proposed management / monitoring for 30 years should be incorporated into this document. We recommend the principles of the	n	The 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) on the proposed development site will be managed for the 30-year period.	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			proposed management scheme be discussed with the stakeholders			
Cambridgeshire County Council	LERMP	DCO provisions	Any further details of the proposed landscape scheme or long-term management plan, that are not submitted as part of the DCO application, will need to be secured through a suitably worded requirement.	n	This is noted by the Applicant.	
Cllr Claire Daunton	Landscape and visual amenity	Change to visual amenity / views	Acknowledged that the height has been reduced but it will still have a serious impact on the landscape and screening is of great importance.	y	Post Phase Three Consultation there has been a combination of reducing the size and massing of the buildings as well as enhancing the landscape design in order to reduce the visual impact further.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Cllr Claire Daunton	Landscape and visual amenity	Change to visual amenity / views	The visualization provided for Year 1 shows how seriously significant the impact of the site and its buildings will be if improvements are not made to the tree-planting plans. More work is needed on this crucial aspect of the landscaping to make it acceptable. To wait 15 years for effective screening of the plant from the Horningsea Road and other views, is not acceptable. In addition, more effective and more diverse green screening will provide more improved wildlife habitats	y	Post Phase Three Consultation there has been a combination of reducing the size and massing of the buildings as well as enhancing the landscape design in order to reduce the visual impact further.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Cllr Claire Daunton	Landscape and visual amenity	Lighting	There is no lighting in the immediate vicinity; it is open rural landscape. If we put this alongside the current landscaping plans which indicate a 15-year time lag before mature tree and other growth , this is entirely unacceptable. Lighting design and technology is improving all the time and it ought to be possible to seek out more acceptable lighting solutions which both avoid light pollution and allow for safe working. It is hoped that a more appropriate solution can be found before final submission.	y	The height of the lights inside the earth bank will be no greater than 5m. This lighting will also be directed downwards and generally only when carrying out tasks. Lighting outside of the earth bank will be discrete and kept to a minimum for safety reasons. It will also be active for use, not activated all through night time hours. Details of lighting considerations are included within the Project Description and the Lighting Strategy submitted in the DCO Application. Lighting along Horningsea Road will be agreed with the local highway authority and only installed if absolutely necessary for safety reasons.	Application Document Ref. 5.2.2 Project Description
CPPF	landscape and visual amenity	Photomontages - High Ditch Road visual	Fen Ditton and High Ditch Road are still prominent even after 15 years. Accordingly, we would ask you to review whether you can do more to shield the structures from view (e.g., reducing the height of structures or increasing the height of the earth bank, or both	y	Design development has reduced the heights of a number of structures and the massing of the buildings within the proposed WWTP. This means more structures will be screened by the 5m high earth bank than were screened in the design assessed in the PEIR and shown on the photomontages. The height of the earth bank has been determined by balancing the need for screening with minimising the landscape and visual impact of the bank itself. Most of the structures of the revised design within the WWTP will now be fully or almost fully screened by the	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					earthwork bank. Raising the bank would not noticeably reduce the visual impacts of the remaining tall structures such as the digesters at 20m high as they are too tall to screen with earthworks. It would make the bank a more prominent feature in the landscape and difficult to integrate into the landscape satisfactorily.	
CPPF	landscape and visual amenity	Planting	Our experience is keeping trees on banks well-watered can be difficult, especially in drought prone Cambridge. We would recommend that the design of the bank should incorporate some form of irrigation or watering system and that any dead trees are replaced.	n	Plans for irrigation are set out in the LERMP as part of the DCO application. All planting will be carried out in the winter months (dormant season) to improve chances of successful plant establishment. The earthwork bank will be designed to minimise rainwater run-off but it is agreed that embankments tend to be dry and it can be difficult to establish vegetation on them especially when the spring following planting is dry. All failed planting will be replaced. Replacements to be installed the next planting season, i.e., the following late winter to early spring. If a particular species fails to thrive, a replacement species may be considered, under advice of the landscape architect.	Application Document Ref 5.4.15 Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
CPPF	landscape and visual amenity	Photomontages	Opportunities for screening close to viewpoints should be maximised. This is successfully shown for Low Fen Drove Way. We suggest that this is replicated elsewhere. It is important that fast-growing species are used for close to view points. This means that close up views of the Works will be screened more quickly whilst slower growing species eventually help to provide screening from longer view points. Use of evergreen species can also be helpful (although native species such as holly and yew are slow growing). The new junction is elevated above the site and the access road has the potential to open up views of the plant. The landscaping should be designed to shield these views from the entrance into the site.	n	The Applicant has included faster growing species have been included in the species mix for the landscape masterplan. All tree planting will be deciduous to reflect local landscape character. Holly will be included in the hedgerow mix. The screen planting shown on the landscape masterplan provides a balance between the need for screening and maintaining the existing openness of the landscape.	Application Document Ref 5.4.15 Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
CPRE	landscape and visual amenity	Green Belt	(Page 1 point 3) The modified size and scale of the proposed CWWTP, including the stacks, will be highly intrusive on the local Fen Edge landscape and provide a potential bridge for further development and the urban and industrial sprawl into the surrounding countryside that the Cambridge Greenbelt was designed to prevent.	y	The Applicant has continued to work within the design to reduce the heights of structures within the proposed WWTP. The sludge storage structures have been reduced from 14 m height above finished ground level to 8.5 metres. Further reductions are sought during the detailed design stage which will also include the final presentations of colour palette for the structures.	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement, Application Document Ref. 7.6 Design & Access Statement, Application Document Ref 4.10 Design Plans - Buildings
CPRE	Landscape and visual	Green Belt	Page 3 point 6, 7 8) Much of the Green Belt land within the proposed sites is Grade 2 and 3a, best and most versatile, agricultural land. This factor appears to not	n	The Applicant notes the comment and can confirm that desktop and field surveys were completed in order to determine the distribution of Agricultural Land Classification	Application Document Ref 5.2.6 ES, Chapter 6: Agricultural Land and

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			have been a consideration in proposing this development. Due to the effects of climate change the Environmental Audit Committee has warned government that it will not be possible to rely on food imports in future years and therefore CPRE consider it even more important to protect best and most versatile land in the interest of national food supply. Furthermore, also due to climate change, large areas of Grade 1 best and most versatile land in the Fens are under increasing threat of fluvial and tidal flooding. In the latter case, due to the presence of nematodes in seawater, land that is flooded will result in no or reduced crop yields for up to seven years as happened after the 1947 and 1953 floods.		(ALC) grades within the area of land required for the proposed WWTP . The survey results form and Appendix to the Agricultural land and soul resources chapter of the Environmental Statement. This document also reports soil baseline information and provisional ALC grades of Waterbeach pipeline based on desk study. While the provisional baseline indicated that the whole of the area required for the proposed WWTP and landscape masterplan consisted of BMV land (Grades 1 to 3a), the ALC survey determined that BMV land constituted 80% of the area. The large prevalence of BMV land in the local area means that there is no alternative location to building the Proposed Development at this location. The land required for the Proposed Development is not with the tidal floodplain.	Soils, Application Document Ref 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Management Plan, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A and Application Document Ref 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part B
CPRE	Landscape and visual	Green Belt	Page 3 point 9 - CPRE notes that new haul roads and proposed layouts will need to be constructed to enable access to the proposed site during the construction phase and operationally. This will remove more land from the Cambridge Green Belt and result in general-purpose HGV, WWT tanker traffic and other commercial and car traffic to service the site. This traffic will cause additional environmental damage to the surrounding countryside and additional greenhouse gas emissions	n	The vehicle movements from the existing Cambridge WWTP will be redistributed to the proposed WWTP and would not result in an increase from the vehicle movements currently associated with operational activities. The assessment considers future growth in vehicle movements, these are less than 10%. In addition, there would be progressive decarbonisation of the fleet during this period. The change in vehicle movements and associated emissions is negligible. Further details available in the Application, alternatives are considered (chapter 3), Construction and Operation traffic assessed in Chapter 19 and its associated appendices), Mitigation relating to construction traffic movements in CTMP, mitigation relating to other elements such as dust management in CoCP Part A, mitigation relating to operational workers (Operational Worker Travel Plan)	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport and its associated appendices (Application Document Ref 5.4.19.1 to 5.4.19.6), Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 COCP Part A, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.9
CPRE	Landscape and visual		Page 3 point 10 - 10. CPRE is concerned that the impact of the proposals for the Waterbeach Zone pumping station, pipeline and haul roads on Waterbeach residents, village and countryside have not been fully assessed in the Scoping Report and that a public consultation should be held to address this. It is important that a functional system with sufficient capacity is put in place to ensure Waterbeach and Horningsea are not at risk of sewer overflows and that the effects of haul roads and pipelines on Green Belt land they may traverse is properly and fully evaluated.	n	The Applicant notes the comments made in relation to the Waterbeach rising main connection that will take flows from the Waterbeach New Town development and the existing Waterbeach catchment for treatment at CWWTPR. The capacity required for this combined population has been taken into account in the size and design of CWWTPR. The flows from Waterbeach New town will connect into the new rising main and not into the existing infrastructure in Waterbeach. The full pipeline route is set out within the Design Plans for Waterbeach Long Sections and the pipeline has been included within the ecological surveys. The	Application Document Ref 4.14.0 - 12 Design Plans Waterbeach pipeline long sections, CTMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					temporary access provision required during construction of the pipeline is accounted for and assessed within the CTMP.	
CPRE	Landscape and visual	Green Belt	Page 3 point 11 - The proposed CWWTP has the potential to generate noise, dust, light pollution, odour and vibration in the Cambridge Green Belt and tranquil areas in the adjoining landscape. Although a 400-metre buffer is proposed this is a "policy" and does not "organically" measure the true effect on either the environment or nearby communities. It is unclear at this stage what the implications will be and CPRE wish to see evidence of studies that accurately measure such factors.	n	The impacts are fully assessed in the Environmental Statement. The Applicant has engaged with a range of Environmental Health officers to agree the scope of assessments required for noise, air, odour and light pollution. Each of these environmental factors have study areas relating to zones of influence and sensitivity of the receptors assessed. The study areas were agreed as part of the scoping exercise and through engagement with the relevant stakeholders.	Application Document Ref 5.2.7 ES, Chapter 7: Air Quality, Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape and Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.2.17 ES, Chapter 17: Noise and Vibration and its associated appendices (Application Document Ref 5.4.17.1 to 5.4.17.4), Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour and its associated appendices (Application Document Ref 5.4.18.1 to 5.4.18.4), Application Document Ref 5.4.7.1 Air Quality Assessment methods, Application Document Ref 5.4.7.2 Dispersion Model Results, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.3 Lighting Assessment Report, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.4 Glint and Glare Assessment
East Cambridge District Council	Landscape and visual	Planting	There should be some images in the intervening years. The landscape looks very raw at year 1 and little has changed by year 15. I would consider that more needs to be done to assimilate the development into the landscape. The 3 viewpoints have different results and concern is raised over the landscaping from Fen Ditton	y	Photomontages were agreed with technical stakeholders as part of the scope of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). Further changes to design following phase three consultation have been made to minimise the visual impact. This includes a combination of reducing the size and massing of the structures within the proposed WWTP as well as enhancing the landscape design. The	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					updated photomontages are included in the Application and these illustrate the efforts to minimise visual impact.	
Federation of Cam Residents	Landscape and visual amenity	Presence	The Discovery Centre is unnecessary and adds to parking which should be sited within the earthworks bank. The Gateway Building should be reduced in size. The scale and industrial design are inappropriate in this lovely rural setting.	y	The Discovery Centre is a key part of the project to provide education opportunities. Following Phase Three Consultation, the Applicant has reviewed the Gateway Building in order to further minimise the visual impact.	Application Document Ref 4.10 Design Plans - Buildings
Federation of Cam Residents	landscape and visual amenity	Presence	Details on the choice of technology and design and other elements such as the exact location of the outfall and heights and depths of the structures should be available now to enable all residents to respond to the application. For example, we understand that reduction in the height of the perimeter earthworks and new information on the position of the transfer tunnel under the River Cam and the Waterbeach pipeline have been introduced without any previous discussion with residents. Feasibility studies which underpin site selection and design have not been made available to residents.	n	The Applicant provided information on the outfall, earth bank, transfer tunnel and the Waterbeach pipeline as part of the Phase Three Consultation, all of this information is available on the project website and in hard copy format. A Site Selection report was provided at Phase One Consultation and is available on the project website, a site selection report is also provided as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2. ES, Chapter 2: Project Description, Application Document Ref 7.3 Site Selection Report
Federation of Cam Residents	landscape and visual amenity	Green Belt	Anglian Water claims to be green yet the screening proposed for this major site is constructed rather than tree/organic/natural screening. This is obviously the antithesis of green and is completely alien to the landscape. Why isn't a water company that is a partner of the new Cambridge Centre for Landscape Regeneration who hosted the nature theme at Cop 26 addressing the visual impact of such a huge, ugly industrial site and employing a leading landscape architect to create something of beauty? A scheme in the spirit of the Wicken Fen vision that will enhance rather than create industrial ugliness that needs to be mitigated?	n	Following feedback from Phase Two Consultation in summer 2021, the project went with natural screening not engineered screening. . Extensive work with technical and community stakeholders to design a site that is mitigated through the use of nature. We have ensured that the design complements the Wicken Fen Vision and will achieve a 20% Biodiversity Net Gain.	Application Document Ref 6.1 Consultation Report, Application Document Ref. 7.6 Design & Access Statement
Historic England	Landscape and amenity	Fen Ditton Conservation Area	We would question the suggestion in the report that there would only be temporary impacts upon Fen Ditton Conservation Area during construction. It seems apparent that the facility and its infrastructure would be visible in longer views from High Ditch Road - as illustrated in the photomontage included in the Landscape report. We would expect the final submission to conduct a more thorough final assessment that examines all aspects of the potential impact in a comprehensive way and that clearly demonstrates the effects of the proposal more	n	The Applicant notes the comments and although visible the scheme is not significantly affecting the character of the conservation area. Following stakeholders' responses in Phase Three Consultation the design has been reviewed in order to further mitigate visual impact and new photomontages are provided in the application.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			conclusively. This should include clear demonstration that all other heritage assets within the study area would not be affected and why.			
Lucy Frazer MP	Landscape and visual	Planting	I remain concerned that the site chosen for this relocation is in the greenbelt and that only green belt locations were considered. You will, of course, be aware that this area of greenbelt land was not identified for development in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, precisely because it acts as a buffer between various planned developments including that at Waterbeach and on the Airport site. Firstly, the CWWTP would be visible all along the A14 and therefore, the industrial structures would not only impact local residents, they would also impact a much wider group given that they would be visible to commuters and tourists etc. moving in/out of the area. Secondly, it is necessary to be mindful of the flat landscape which means that the CWWTP would be visible for miles around, in particular, it would be visible on national footpaths (e.g., Fen Rivers Way, Harcamlow Way etc. Further, AW's current proposals for "natural screening" are not adequate. For example, the new samplings that AW will plant to screen the site will take 15 years to reach maturity and even then, they will not completely screen the site.	n	The Applicant applied a rigorous 4-stage site selection process considering alternative sites outside of the Green Belt and there were none that are suitable. The creation of a sustainable, low carbon community in North East Cambridge relies on Anglian Water's Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant being relocated elsewhere. The chosen site was found, on balance, to perform best across a range of key assessment criteria, and opportunities for delivering enhancements including improving access to the countryside. The design show how natural screening will be used to mitigate the visual impact including early planting measures.	Application Document Ref 7.3 Site Selection Report
Marshall group	Landscape and visual amenity	Ecological connectivity	MGP has been engaging with Anglian Water through a series of workshops to explore how the respective green infrastructure strategies could be conjoined. the projects are in relatively close proximity and there is still potential for the design (its implementation or operation) to affect the ability to deliver the Cambridge East. Therefore, MGP request that the workshops and discussions between MGP and Anglian Water continue to take place as the DCO application process	n	The Applicants notes the comments on the continued discussions in relation to wider projects and connectivity and will continue the engagement with MGP and The National Trust to ensure the plans as set out in the LERMP are compatible and to continue to explore wider opportunities beyond the project.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
National Trust	Landscape and Visual impact	Design	The National Trust is disappointed that at this stage of the process Anglian Water has not been able to publicly share more detailed plans of the proposal, including detailed site layouts and scaled elevational drawings of buildings. The Trust has previously raised concerns about the justification for the proposed rotunda design and circular earth bank forming a new key feature in the landscape within the Fen Edge character area. The Trust is concerned about the	n	There has been ongoing engagement with the National Trust in order to provide information as soon as it has been ready for publication, at the different phases of consultation. Works Plans and general arrangement drawings as part of the Application together with Chapter 2 (Project Description) of the ES setting out the Proposed Development, maximum design parameters that have been used within the assessment, and the full Landscape and	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 Project Description, Application Document Ref 4.9 Design Plans - Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant & Application Document

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			proposed design approach and its compatibility with the landscape character of the immediate and wider area, which part of the Wicken Fen Vision area falls within. The Trust reserves further comment on the design and landscape/visual impact of the proposal until it has seen more detailed plans and the full Landscape and Visual Assessment which will be submitted with the formal DCO application.		Visual Assessment are provided as part of the DCO application.	Ref 4.10 Design Plans - Buildings
National Trust	LERMP	Recreation	The National Trust is generally supportive of the proposals for enhanced access through paths and green space, linear routes. Enhancing public access aligns with the Wicken Fen Vision which aims to provide a varied landscape for visitors to explore with benefits for health, well-being and community engagement. The proposed new bridleway access is very welcome and will result in two attractive walking, cycling and horse-riding routes (one shorter 4.5km route, half of which goes through the new habitat area, and one longer 9.3km route that connects with footpath routes up to Anglesey Abbey and Quy Fen). Request made: Proposed cycle route needs greater connection with Anglesey Abbey. The trust welcomes the opportunity to explore this outside of this project. Proposed 3.5 km route could encourage antisocial behaviour. Physical barriers should be considered. Pressure of Stow Cum Quy SSSi and recreational pressure should be assessed. Opportunities should be sought to contributions to Nature Recovery Network and green infrastructure.	n	The Applicant notes the response and that the Trust is satisfied with the proposals for additional bridleways presented. The Applicant will continue to work with the Trust in the development of the recreational proposals and the opportunities to complement the wider nature network.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Natural England	landscape and visual	LVIA	The project area is not within or close to any statutorily designated landscape and is unlikely to have any significant impact on these sites. Whilst Natural England does not generally provide detailed advice on non-statutory landscape matters, we welcome recognition of sensitive receptors such as PRoW including the Harcamlow Way Trail, the River Cam and Anglesey Abbey registered park and garden. The LVIA should include a detailed assessment of effects on these receptors and identify appropriate mitigation to address adverse impacts.	n	The Applicant has noted these comments and the LVIA has assessed the impact of the proposed development on recreational receptors' views from four locations along the Harcamlow Way, two locations along the River Cam and from Anglesey Abbey. Mitigation is proposed to reduce the effects of the WWTP on landscape and visual receptors. Along the pipeline routes, as the pipelines will be underground, there is no mitigation proposed but vegetation removed will be replaced, except where pipeline easements preclude planting.	Application Document Reference 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity
Quy Fen Trust	Landscape and visual	Green Belt	The AW landscape document excludes key summary findings from the Green Belt assessment for the proposed site in regard to the parcel A02	n	There is a separate Green Belt assessment as part of the application and so assessment of Green Belt Issues is excluded from LVIA.	Application Document Ref. 7.5 Planning Statement

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Quy Fen Trust	landscape and visual	Planting	Additional focus should be placed on the sufficient mitigation including a mix of nearby and distant planting and where necessary using semi mature trees to ensure sufficient by way of mitigation. The existing planting scheme between Horningsea and the proposed site on the east of Horningsea Road is in its 5th year and showing little growth.	y	The Applicant notes the comments. The condition of the existing shelter belt on Horningsea Road will be improved with maintenance and new planting. Further offsite planting closer to receptors and the addition of larger trees to the early planting and woodland edges instead of whips and transplants is now proposed.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Quy Fen Trust	Landscape	Recreation/LERMP	The paths around the bund are proposed as being by appointment and other paths being gated but it is unclear how the gated arrangements will work.	n	The Applicant has considered the comment and all path use around the will be via appointment. The use of gates within other pathways are to prevent vehicular access or use.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Quy Fen Trust	Landscape and visual	Lighting	No details have been provided as to the extent of the lighting that is proposed and the reduction of the bund height will presumably also have a detrimental impact.	n	The setting of the earth bank at 5m is coupled with a reduction in the height of structures within the proposed WWTP and reducing massing. Lighting infrastructure is limited to a maximum height of 5m. The large majority of the street and operational lighting within the proposed WWTP sits below the level of the earth bank. Lighting above this is for task purposes and will only be used during a maintenance activity .	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.3 Lighting Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.4 Glint & Glare Assessment
Waterbeach and District Bridleway	Landscape	Recreational connectivity	It would be an asset for countryside access for all non-motorised users if a route alongside the ditch marked on the image below in blue, could be created as a rural bridleway/byway. We aren't clear if this is on the proposed site or not but would very much ask for it be considered as part of the design plans for related equestrian/pedestrian/cyclist access routes.	n	We believe that the option proposed would lead to increased environmental impact and greater interference with land rights compared with our current proposals. The proposed use of the former railway line north-east from Low Fen Drove Way would use the existing surface for its entire length rather than requiring the construction of a new path over farmland. While the option proposed would deliver a small recreational improvement by being a more direct route, this benefit would not outweigh the additional cost and environmental impact when compared with the Station Road route. We therefore intend to retain the Station Road route for the DCO application.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Landscape and visual	Photomontages	Numerous comments pages 12-14 of stakeholder response regarding landscape and visual impact. Including "It is also noted that the impact of the development on the Landscape Character Areas (LCA) at both local and national level, particularly the Eastern Fen Edge during the construction and early years of the development, remains significant even after the proposed planting becomes more established (year fifteen plus). Further and continued engagement should be undertaken with the District Council for consideration through the formal DCO submission to mitigate these impacts. "	y	Discussions with Officers on landscape, heritage and visual impact have enabled amendments to the landscape design, including the earth bank. We have reviewed design, building heights, mass of buildings and planting. We have also modified planting design to be more aligned with the local landscape. The amended designs have significantly improved the visual impact. Ongoing discussion is taking place in order to define areas of agreement around landscape value, heritage, and interpretation of NPS policies, with the aim of reaching an agreement through the Statements of Common Ground. We are confident that our landscape architects have produced the best balance	Application Document Ref: 5.2.15 Landscape & Visual Chapter

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					between visual impact, landscape, and heritage. If a position cannot be agreed whilst preparing the Local Impact Report, then this issue will remain under discussion and be explored through examination. The Landscape Characterisation Report has been completed as part of the final Environment Statement.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Landscape and visual	Woodland	Consideration should therefore be given to ensuring an approach is adopted which opens out the woodland planting to create a distinct mosaic habitat of pockets of trees, grasslands and scrapes. This would have the added benefit of increasing biodiversity across the planted areas. In the District Council's view trees are needed mostly at the edges of the development and at the base/edge of the proposed rotunda to perform screening duties. Significant infill planting will provide very little additional benefit to screening. It is the District Council's view that a wider mosaic habitat should be provided which will instead provide more diverse habitats and connectivity for wildlife than a blanket of woodland planting	y	Discussions with Officers on landscape, heritage and visual impact have enabled amendments to the landscape design, including the earth bank. We have reviewed design, building heights, mass of buildings and planting. We have also modified planting design to be more aligned with the local landscape. The amended designs have significantly improved the visual impact. Ongoing discussion is taking place in order to define areas of agreement around landscape value, heritage, and interpretation of NPS policies, with the aim of reaching an agreement through the Statements of Common Ground. We are confident that our landscape architects have produced the best balance between visual impact, landscape, and heritage. If a position cannot be agreed whilst preparing the Local Impact Report, then this issue will remain under discussion and be explored through examination. The Landscape Characterisation Report has been completed as part of the final Environment Statement.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
South Cambridgeshire District Council	LERMP	BNG/Timings	The District Council welcomes the principle of a Management and Maintenance Plan (MMP) to be agreed with key stakeholders and considers this should be a requirement of the DCO which should include clarity as to its timing. In addition, the District Council would seek a longer thirty-year plan for all landscape features as part of any such requirement, not just those which contribute to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).	n	The LERMP has been revised to incorporate maintenance provisions for BNG and landscaping. The 20% BNG at the site of the proposed WWTP will be maintained for 30 years. The LERMP will contain appropriate and proportionate monitoring provisions which will be agreed with Natural England and SCDC.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Landscape and visual		Based on conclusions formed within the Heritage Assessment (HA), there is also potential for the works proposed outside of the main area of the ReWWPT, including the outfall into the river and the proposed ventilation shafts, to have a visual or landscape impact due to their height, shape or form. More information is therefore needed to allow the Council and stakeholders to have a full understanding of the project and properly assess the placement and impact of these features.	y	With regards to structures outside the main site area, design modifications post Phase Three Consultation, means there is now only one vent shaft planned. This is located at the interception shaft in the existing WWTP boundary. It will be 10 metres and will have a filter upon it. Otherwise, the Applicant has engaged with the existing site's development team, in order to inform them of the assets that will remain on the site and any covenants or impacts that they may have.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.2 Project Description

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Landscape and visual		Extra mitigation is required and should include A commitment to raise the embankment bund height by at least 2 m to a minimum of 7m above existing, external ground level. A commitment to provide on top of the bund, denser planting of semi mature trees as well as saplings and hedging and a possibly wire strand fence capable of supporting creepers like honeysuckle etc.; . A commitment to plant the screening on the bund as soon as possible after the bund is completed which will be many months before commissioning of the proposed plant is finished; Consider an early phase of tree planting in the tree belt along the A14. This could be widened later if adjacent land is to be used during construction. The aim should be to mirror eventually the existing screening at the Milton sewage works.	y	Following Phase Three Consultation the design has been reviewed in order to reduce the visual impact further. This has been done through a combination of reducing the size and massing of the buildings, reducing ground level by up to a metre as well as enhancing the landscape design. The combination of these changes has significantly improved the visual impact. Details are provided in the application.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Landscape and visual		Our questions related to Landscape and Visual issues are: Q4)Please provide us with a copy of the advice AW received from independent design experts, in particular from the Design Council Panel and, if AW are using them, the Cambridgeshire Quality Panel; Q5)Why is the street lighting planned to continue north along Horningsea Road as far as Low Den Drove from the proposed, permanent access at the J34 on the A14? Q6)Please provide additional winter, night time visualisations including a set with the lighting that will be permanently switched on and taking account of the glare reflected of the structures. Q7)Please provide details of how the proposed finishes of the exposed structures will be 'designed to minimise their prominence in the landscape'. There is no reference to the materials or finishes on which FDPC or our residents can comment or be assured by.	n	Advice from the Design Council has been considered in the design and is set out in the Design & Access Statement. The Applicant is working with the National and Local Highways Authorities to agree lighting proposals that balance safety and visual impact. A Lighting strategy is included in the DCO Application, there is no intention to illuminate the site at, only urgent task lighting will be used. The photomontages with the application illustrate the outline of visible structures. A colour palette for finishes and material options are provided with the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages, Application Document Ref 7.6 Design and Access Statement
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Landscape and visual		Appendix 1 contains a review of AW's material and has been prepared by a resident before inclusion in the consultation response submitted by the Save Honey Hill community group. FDPC fully supports the recommendations contained in the Appendix and considers that: these should be treated as either demonstrating the need for further information or additional mitigation; As a general point, we would welcome the chance for further involvement in AW's overall development of proposals for offsite impact	y	The Applicant has fully considered all comments provided by all stakeholders on landscape mitigation, during development of the project and formally as part of the Phase Three Consultation. The viewpoints with a sub set of photomontages were discussed with the Technical Working Group (TWG) for Landscape and Heritage. The locations were then adjusted based on the feedback from the members of this group. Prior to these walkovers were alongside initial ZTV models and GLIVIA3 guidance to understand locations where the Proposed Development	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			assessment and design of mitigation as there is a such a wealth of local knowledge available. Ignoring this until the final submission by AW would be a wasted opportunity.		could be viewed from. Parish Council input and Save Honey Hill responses (Appendix 1) have been considered and taken into account. Therefore, the Applicant is confident that there has been a comprehensive methodology put forward for assessing visual impact.	
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Landscape		Particular damage is likely from the combined use of the former railway NE of Low Fen Drove as a Bridleway (Work No 32) and the link path (within the scope of Work No 2?) running east of the AW proposed works to Low Fen Drove. The latter element will cause extra severance of the CWS and should be omitted. At least one alternative layout, proposed elsewhere, exists with a more northerly access from Low Fen Drove towards Allicky Fm, (Station Rd Quy) using the branch of the concrete strip road which runs east from Snout Corner, beyond the steel barrier, to Black Ditch. Here there would be a footbridge and after that, following the edge of two fields, the path would link to the lovely drove road which meets Station Rd at the triangular plantation. Such a layout would retain two, not three, entrances to the paths AW propose immediately outside the bund and thus still maintain a circular walk whilst avoiding all use of the former railway line. In addition, this alternative would provide better linkage towards the Wicken Fen Vision's spine access paths although a longer route to Anglesey Abbey.	n	The Applicant has considered the proposed replacement of the bridleway to Station Road by one via Black Ditch and Allicky Farm, taking into account the main environmental effects relevant to both routes. The Applicant believes that the Allicky Farm option would lead to increased environmental impact and greater interference with land rights compared with the current proposals. The proposed use of the former railway line north-east from Low Fen Drove Way would use the existing surface for its entire length rather than requiring the construction of a new path over farmland. While the option proposed by FDPC would deliver a small recreational improvement by being a more direct route, this benefit would not outweigh the additional cost and environmental impact when compared with the Station Road route. The Applicant therefore intend to retain the Station Road route for the DCO application. The link path to the south-east of the project is an important part of the overall recreational mitigation, providing a short circular route for pedestrians which is not currently available. We disagree that the link path would cause "extra severance of the CWS" as it utilises an existing gap in the hedgerow and is therefore unlikely to cause significant impacts to the CWS. We are therefore intending to retain this feature for the DCO application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Fen Ditton Parish Council	LERMP	Outfall	Appendix 1 Mitigation measures and provision for long term maintenance should be included in the Master Landscape Plan relating to the engineering works associated with the proposed new outfall area affecting the landscape character of the river bank and essential habitat for nesting water birds. This should be undertaken in association with residences of Red House Close, Poplar Hall Farm, Cam Conservators and Townlands Trust (Osier Holt) with a view to achieving a net 20% gain in biodiversity in the immediate area.	n	The proposed outfall has been designed to balance the engineering requirements with environmental input aimed at reducing as far as practicable the landscape and visual impacts (amongst others) during construction and operation and has included significant consultation with technical stakeholders . All activities for the engineering works both within and outside of the Landscape Masterplan area, will be controlled during construction and reinstated as per the commitments within the [CEMP/CoCP], the ES and secured through the DCO requirements. In terms of achieving BNG, details are set out in the BNG Report as part of the DCO Application. In the riverside area the project is	Application Document Refs. 5.4.2.1 COCP A & 5.4.2.2 COCP B, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13 BNG Report

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					proposing new wet ditches in this area which in time will establish reedbed habitats for wildlife such as aquatic invertebrates, water vole and birds.	
Fen Ditton Parish Council	LERMP	Trees	There is no reference to a watering/irrigation scheme for mature specimen trees. Commit to using biodegradable tree guards and ties instead of plastic the production of which is carbon heavy and their breakdown harmful to wildlife.	n	Irrigation plans are set out in the LERMP as part of the DCO application. This includes collection of water from the gateway building. Some losses of young woodland planting are expected and therefore the density will compensate to a degree. All standard and semi-mature trees will be included in the irrigation strategy. The Applicant is looking into biodegradable tree guards and ties.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Landscape	Visual impact	Since the local communities here have always requested that the structures be hidden, why has this statutory Consultation made them even more prominent? The bund has now reduced to 5 meters and air gaps have been introduced which will limit visual screening. We request information on why the bund has been reduced. Is this a cost issue? Or isn't there enough soil onsite to build the bund?	y	Following Phase Three Consultation responses the design has been reviewed to further mitigate visual impact, therefore bund height needs to be considered alongside the other amendments that have taken place to the infrastructure and internal levels of the site. The ground level inside the earth bank has been lowered by 1m and therefore the 5-metre earth bank is the equivalent of a 6m screening barrier compared to that shown at CON3 before any structural height changes to the infrastructure internal to the proposed WWTP. The design approach has therefore aimed to find the right balance between the height and mass of the earth bank and its screening function. The higher the earth bank the more it will screen but the greater the impact the earthwork itself will have on the landscape and historic environment. From existing ground levels in the wider context, a 5m high earth bank will be perceived as a long, linear form in the landscape which, from all but the closest locations, will not appear above the skyline. It will be integrated into its landscape setting with woodland, scrub, trees, hedgerow, and meadows softening its profile and appearance. Increasing the height of the earthwork by 1-2m would substantially increase its presence in the landscape and enlarge the area from where it would appear above the skyline. A 7m high earthwork would be more prominent in close views than a 5m high earthwork but would not have a noticeably greater screening effect when viewed from more distant locations because the tallest elements on the proposed WWTP would remain visible above the earth bank. Through the process of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) the Applicant is confident that that there would be no reduction in the significance of landscape or visual effects of the development with a 7m high earthwork compared with the 5m high earth bank.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Horningsea Parish Council	Landscape	Visual impact	There is a single stretch of mixed standard tree planting extending from Horningsea Village along Horningsea Rd towards the Proposed Development. This mitigation is only really effective if you are standing right behind the thin line of hedging/ trees. We request a much greater depth to the planting here, at least 15 metres of trees with horizontal east/west spurs of planting to break up the views. Overall, we do not think the density and location of the planting proposed is nearly enough to reduce the visual impact of the new facility and it needs much more offsite mitigation. We request more consideration to screening from the riverside footpaths to the south and west of listed Biggin Abbey. The approach to Horningsea Road from Baits Bite Lock is extremely open and Honey Hill is elevated.	n	The planting along Horningsea Road responds to earlier feedback requesting that the openness of the landscape be preserved along the road, therefore the current proposals to plant trees in gaps (but not below) would mitigate upper views whilst retaining long views. Otherwise, a design review post Phase Three Consultation has improved the mitigation for visual impact further.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Horningsea Parish Council	Landscape	Visual impact	It is currently unclear how AW intends to deliver the mitigation proposed on land that is not proposed to be purchased by AW under a compulsory Purchase Order (CPO). We need to know how this very important mitigation can be achieved outside the land included in the DCO?	n	The CPO will cover all land that is required for mitigation. Thereafter all the land will be in the legal ownership of the Applicant.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Landscape	Visual impact	The views from Waterbeach from the north looking south towards Honey Hill are extremely open and are not mitigated by the planting. An example is, is an important PRoW the Harcamlow Way from the layby to Quy Fen which is very open for about 500m Gayton Farm Campsite for example has completely uninterrupted views across this landscape and the proposed development would have an impact on their business.	y	The proposed woodland, earth bank and earth planting are designed to find the balance between screening and openness in the fen landscape. New iterations allow some long views through the woodland which are angled to avoid views of the earthwork. Planting is targeted toward the most sensitive views with additional tree planting on the northwest and southwest sides of the earthwork.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Horningsea Parish Council	Landscape	Visual impact	The plan does not include mitigation measures for more distant views from visual receptors identified in the PEILVA as having high sensitivity and 'significant visual effect' from the Proposed Development identified in Group B such as residences on High Ditch Road and parts of Horningsea Rd Fen Ditton.	y	The review to design post Phase Three Consultation to mitigate visual impact further means that the off-site planting need is reduced. New photomontages are provided as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Horningsea Parish Council	Landscape	Visual impact	We are very concerned by the comparison between Fig 8 p38 and Fig 7 p32 in the PEI: Landscape & Visual Amenity: this shows very little difference in visibility of the proposed WWTP from Year 1 to Year 15. The only area which is slightly improved is the immediate area of the plant; this is obviously going to happen because the viewer will be standing right in front of it. The bulk	y	Following Phase Three Consultation the design has been modified further in order to provide extra mitigation for visual impact. New photomontages in the application show a significant improvement to mitigation of visual impact.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			of the views show the plant to still be highly visible in this open landscape.			
Horningsea Parish Council	Landscape	Visual impact	It should be stated that no structures in the current design are in keeping with the landscape. They are too high for Fenland. Therefore, lower structures are needed in the design.	y	The Applicant notes the comment. Structure heights have lowered significantly following a review post Phase Three Consultation, details are provided in the application documentation.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Horningsea Parish Council	Landscape design	Tree planting	The Landscape Phasing Plan on p16 of the PEI: LERMP shows a very small area of Phase One planting. Along Horningsea Road and Low Fen Drove there is just a gap filling exercise with a total of 47 trees planned, which is a rate of about 1 every 10 meters. The thin line of planting proposed is inadequate and we request a wider belt of planting. A thin line will have very little impact early on or even at 15 years	n	The planting along Horningsea Road responds to earlier feedback requesting that the openness of the landscape be preserved along the road, therefore the current proposals to plant trees in gaps (but not below) would mitigate upper views whilst retaining long views through.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Horningsea Parish Council	Landscape design	Tree planting	We request that the early planting along Low Fen Drove Way, described on p23 of the LERMP also needs to be much more extensive than a hedge on either side with some standard trees. There is very minimal early planting around the A14 and railway line, we request a wider belt. The plants here will be a maximum height of 1 meter and will provide very little early screening No early planting is described for High Ditch Road, which we feel needs substantial early screening for the people of Fen Ditton and Marleigh. In general, the LERMP Phasing Plan P-9 shows that the great majority of the planting will be made at the end of the 4-year construction period which means residents will be exposed to the ugliness of the development for an unacceptably long time.	y	Early planting locations are determined by the construction phasing and no early woodland planting has been proposed south of LFDW hedgerow due to the need for access. The Applicant is adding larger trees to the early planting belts. It was determined that 7.5 cm depth was wide enough to contribute to mitigation as early as possible and the benefits of the additional depth were minimal .	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity,
Horningsea Parish Council	LERMP		We have a query about LERMP p20 diagrams E:1 to E:3, is this a realistic representation? Vegetation growth E:1 – year 1 suggests trees of about 5m high – is this correct? E:2 – 5 years they are at 7m high and year 15 tree height is 10.5m high. We request that these diagrams E:1 to E:3 include a representation of the buildings so we can evaluate the screening potential on the lowered bund. We are also very concerned that the LERMP will not be robust and failure in planting success will significantly delay the cover of the massive structures . Also of concern is the LERMP 3.3.10 p20 where there is no reference to watering/irrigation in	y	With regards to growth rates the LVIA shows worst case scenario with low growth rates, well below the average of 30cm per year. The LERMP can be updated to be consistent with this, given the harsh conditions on the earth. Semi-mature trees are defined as 20cm girth, with an installed height of 5m+ and Heavy Standard trees are generally between 4.5 to 6.25m tall when installed. The Applicant is increasing the size of the trees planted at the edges of the site, as well as the density of planting on the earth bank, to create a dense thicket over time. Plans for irrigation are set out in the LERMP as part of the DCO application. This includes watering the larger trees during the first two years,	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			the aftercare commitments. Newly planted mature trees will particularly need a frequent watering regime. The location is open and windy. The plants will need nurturing; the Royal Horticultural Society cite insufficient watering in the first 2 years of planting is the main cause of poor establishment, so we need a commitment to irrigation for at least 2 years for any newly planted areas. The area on top of the bund will be particularly exposed. AW should also commit to using biodegradable tree guards and ties - plastic waste in the environment from tree planting is a significant problem - highlighted by recent studies		including collection of water from the gateway building. Some losses of young woodland planting are expected and therefore the density will compensate to a degree. All standard and semi-mature trees will be included in the irrigation plans.	
Horningsea Parish Council	LERMP		The LERMP states that the plan only applies to the core site. Mitigation measures and provision for long term maintenance should include all areas outside the core site.	n	Mitigation measures for areas outside of the area of land required for the proposed WWTP and landscape masterplan are described within the ES. Design measures are included in Chapter 2 Project description and referred to in each technical chapter together with relevant control plan references.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.2 Project Description
Horningsea Parish Council	LERMP		We want to see an enforceable agreement to caring for the planting after the expiry of the DCO 5-year enforcement period. In view of the concerns about slow establishment of plants in the area, 5 years is an unacceptably short time.	y	The LERMP has been revised to incorporate maintenance provisions for BNG and landscaping. The 20% BNG on the Proposed WWTP site will be maintained for 30 years. The LERMP will contain appropriate and proportionate monitoring provisions which will be agreed with Natural England and SCDC.	
Horningsea Parish Council	LERMP		HPC are very concerned about the potential damage to the ecology of Low Fen Drove Way Grasslands and Hedges CWS. This area is highly valued by residents and visiting naturalists. It is a rich site for biodiversity and home to some very rare invertebrates. In the LERMP AW lists many potential harms to this area, that could arise during construction and operation of the proposed WWTP	n	During construction the DCO will require the appointed contractor(s) to implement the CoCP. The CoCP will form part of the application and secured through a requirement of the DCO. The CoCP has specific measures in it relating to Ecology and Nature conservation, including but not limited to providing a buffer between works areas and ecological features of interest such as the CWS, controlling noise, dust and lighting. Furthermore, throughout the implementation of the Proposed Development there will be a dedicated Community Liaison Officer through which concerns and complaints can be raised. There are very limited works within the CWS and these primarily related to the landscape masterplan and creating habitat features intended to benefit the CWS and provide better habitat connectivity. Protection during operation of the site is provided through the habitat management proposals, species rich hedgerows and information boards for education as set out in the LERMP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 Code of Construction Practice, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Save Honey Hill	Landscape and visual	Earth bank	The reasoning behind reduction in height of the proposed earth bank should be ignored since the outcome is unacceptable. The earth work bank should be built to a minimum of 7m with dense vegetation included on the top.	y	Following Phase Three Consultation responses the design has been reviewed. The earth bank height needs to be considered alongside the other amendments that have taken place to the infrastructure and internal levels of the site. The ground level inside the earth bank has been lowered by 1m and therefore the 5-metre earth bank is the equivalent of a 6m screening barrier compared to that shown at CON3 before any structural height changes to the infrastructure internal to the proposed WWTP. The design approach has balanced the height and mass of the earth bank and its screening function. The higher the earth bank the more it will screen but the greater the impact the earthwork itself will have on the landscape and historic environment. From existing ground levels in the wider context, a 5m high earth bank will be perceived as a long, linear form in the landscape which, from all but the closest locations, will not appear above the skyline. It will be integrated into its landscape setting. Increasing the height of the earthwork by 1-2m would substantially increase its presence in the landscape and enlarge the area from where it would appear above the skyline. A 7m high earthwork would be more prominent in close views than a 5m high earthwork but would not have a noticeably greater screening effect when viewed from more distant locations because the tallest elements on the proposed WWTP would remain visible above the earth bank.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description, Application Document Ref 4.9 Design Plans - Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant
Save Honey Hill	Landscape and visual	Assessment	The impact on the setting and character of the Conservation Areas of Fen Ditton, Horningsea and Baits Bite Lock should be included in the assessment of the impact of change in landscape and view in the context of the Villages and the Baits Bite lock area. Approaches to the Villages via road and PROW network should be included	n	These areas are included in the assessment and are set out in the Historic Environment chapter of the Environmental Statement.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity
Save Honey Hill	Landscape and visual	Photomontages	Note our comments re visual impact assessment - see page 16 - page 20 of SHH and Appendix I of the consultation response with alternative photomontages that should be considered.	y	The Applicant has fully considered all comments provided by all stakeholders on landscape mitigation, during development of the project and formally as part of the Phase Three Consultation. The viewpoints with a sub set of photomontages were discussed with the Technical Working Group (TWG) for Landscape and Heritage. The locations were then adjusted based on the feedback from the members of this group. Prior to these walkovers were alongside initial ZTV models and GLIVIA3 guidance to understand locations where the Proposed Development	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					could be viewed from. Parish Council input and Save Honey Hill responses (Appendix I) have been considered and taken into account. Therefore, the Applicant is confident that there has been a comprehensive methodology put forward for assessing visual impact.	
Save Honey Hill	Landscape and visual	Mitigation	The extent of off-site planting proposed should be reviewed in relation to the critique of the PEI LVA assessment and recommendations above (section 2.3.1 to 2.3.5. 2 A more ambitious approach is taken to mitigation in order to soften longer distant views of the large number of taller elements from all aspects north, south, east and west of the surrounding area in association with stakeholders and local communities. Single rows of tree planting and filling hedgerow gaps are examples	y	Following Phase Three Consultation the design has been amended to improve the visual impact. Following Phase Three Consultation stakeholder responses the Applicant has reviewed the landscape masterplan and a significant modification has been made in design to take on board the comments made about the need to improve visual mitigation. The Applicant has reviewed design, building heights, mass of buildings and planting. They have also modified planting design to be more aligned with the local landscape. The amended designs have significantly improved the visual impact. Colour palette and final design of Gateway Building are to be determined under DCO Requirement and so will remain indicative only at this point. Furthermore, following Phase Three Consultation, there is an addition of larger trees to the early planting and woodland edges, instead of just whips and transplants. The new mitigation measures work to reduce impacts as far as possible within this landscape, through a combination of visual screening from the earthwork and over time the vegetation and a balance of openness and woodland blocks and belts. These changes remove the need for further off-site mitigation planting.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Save Honey Hill	LERMP		1.Master Landscape Plan relating to the engineering works associated with the proposed new outfall area affecting the landscape character of the riverbank and essential habitat for nesting water birds. This should be undertaken in association with residences of Red House Close, Poplar Hall Farm, Cam Conservators and Townlands Trust (Osier Holt) with a view to achieving a net 20% gain in biodiversity in the immediate area. 2. Mitigation measures in relation to the proposed vent shafts impacting residences and users of footpaths in the Cam Corridor LCA and Fen Ditton Conservation Area should be included in the Master Landscape Plan. Planting to protect visual receptors from distant views of the Proposed Development and identified as extending into the longer term should be undertaken in phase 1 of the Landscape Management Plan. 3.	n	1. The proposed outfall has been designed to balance the engineering requirements with environmental input aimed at reducing as far as practicable the landscape and visual impacts (amongst others) during construction and operation and has included significant consultation with technical stakeholders . All activities for the engineering works both within and outside of the Landscape Masterplan area, will be controlled during construction and reinstated as per the commitments within the [CEMP/CoCP], the ES and secured through the DCO requirements. The BNG Report assesses BNG. In the riverside area the project is proposing new wet ditches in this area which in time will establish reedbed habitats for wildlife such as aquatic invertebrates, water vole and birds. 2. Mitigation measures during construction are set out in the CTMP 3. The Applicant has created a robust LERMP that includes	Application Document Refs. 5.4.2.1 COCP A & 5.4.2.2 COCP B, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.13 BNG Report, Application Document Ref. 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Reconsider the robustness of LERMP and projected planting success in light of reports of recent semi-mature tree death in the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Scheme Update. There is no reference to a watering/irrigation scheme for mature specimen trees. 4. Commit to using biodegradable tree guards and ties instead of plastic the production of which is carbon heavy and their breakdown harmful to wildlife.		measures for irrigation and management to ensure successful planting. 4. The use of biodegradable tree guards is being considered.	
Save Honey Hill	Landscape	Connectivity	The installation of the CWWTP in this location would jeopardise the quality and aspirations of the Wicken Fen Vision for the people of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire	n	The project will increase biodiversity on the site within the land required for the proposed WWTP and the landscape masterplan-by a minimum of 20 per cent. It will create new wildlife habitats, which will complement local initiatives such as the Cambridge Nature Network and the Wicken Fen vision. The Applicant has engaged with partners of local initiatives since inception of the project to ensure it provides the opportunity to link in and improve the area.	Application Document Ref. 5.4.8.13 BNG Report
Ian Gilder	Landscape	Assessment	Where I differ from the assessment is that, even taking the optimistic tree growth assumptions used, there will be significant landscape effects on parts of the Eastern Fen Edge LCA at Year 15 and beyond and significant adverse visual effects from a number of viewpoints at Year 15 (in particular from Horningsea Road, south of the village; from High Ditch Road from the selected viewpoint and from several points further east along High Ditch Road as far as Lower Fen Drove Way; from Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton close to the junction with Field Lane; from the J34 A14 bridge; from Biggin Abbey and from the viewpoint south east from Low Fen Drove Way, just to the north of the site.	y	Following responses from stakeholders at Phase Three Consultation the design has been modified to take on board the comments made about the need to improve visual mitigation. The design has been reviewed with reduction in building heights, massing of buildings and increased planting. The amended designs have significantly improved the visual impact.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Ian Gilder	Landscape	Photomontages	From my own observation and planting experience, the very dry springs in recent years, coupled with annual rainfall of only around 20 inches, are increasing the challenges for tree growth. My judgement is that both the Year 15 and Year 60 photomontages are showing taller and denser tree and shrub growth than will occur in reality and that the photomontages should be redone with this in mind.	n	The Applicant has employed landscape architects, with extensive experience to design a scheme that is sustainable. This design alongside the management measures set out in the LERMP should enable sustainable planting. The photomontages in the application were revised post Phase Three Consultation following improvements to planting mitigation, taking into account stakeholder comments.	Application Document Ref. 5.4.8.14 LERMP, Application Document Ref. 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Ian Gilder	Landscape	Planting	The proposals for advance planting within the main site boundaries, shown on Figure 6 of the paper, are insufficient. Along the northern section of Lower Fen Drove Way and in the north-west corner of the site, a 12 to 15m tree and shrub belt should be planted inside the site. 7.5m is generally far too narrow and would	y	Following Phase Three Consultation there has been a review of design to further reduce visual impact, this has including modifications in planting. The Applicant believes that the improvements to the heights and massing of structures within the proposed WWTP together with the landscape	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			allow winter views through the trees probably indefinitely. Similar wider advance planting should also take place along the south-east boundary of the site paralleling the former railway County Wildlife Site; along the northern boundary of the A14 and along both the new proposed bridleway and the proposed footpath link to Lower Fen Drove Way.		masterplan mean that offsite planting in this area would not be required.	
Ian Gilder	Landscape	Planting	Generally, the tree and shrub planting mixes and specifications set out in the LERMP are appropriate for these soil conditions and reflect the mix of species that thrive locally. These planted areas will need continuing management, including planting replacement stock and weed control, not just in the first few years after planting. In my view, trees planted on raised earthworks on the site will require watering during the first ten or so years and this should be done using captured rainwater from the hard surfaced areas of the works. In order to meet the BNG commitments 'in perpetuity' and secure the long-term landscape benefits, all of the off-site planting areas should be retained and directly maintained by Anglian Water and not handed back to the existing landowners.	n	The final LERMP will set out the management of the site. Longer term maintenance would take place as part of Anglian Water's wider environmental care initiatives and may involve community management groups or environmental non-governmental organisations. Irrigation plans are set out in the LERMP as part of the DCO application. The BNG elements of the project delivering the anticipated future 20% BNG at the Proposed WWTP site will be maintained and monitored for 30 years in accordance with the statutory framework. The requirements in the LERMP will be approved by Natural England and the Local Planning Authority.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Ian Gilder	Landscape	Connectivity	There is a cost-effective opportunity to link footpaths to the north east of the A14, in a sustainable way with cycle and footpaths into the City of Cambridge. As part of the Marleigh development, paths are already being created/diverted into the northern tree belt alongside High Ditch Road, which would link to NCR 51, and to use the section of former railway from High Ditch Road to Ditton Lane to link into the established footpath and cycleway network into the City. This proposal would allow effective use of parking already available at the Newmarket Road Park and Ride site. This would only entail the Project establishing a new path along a short length of High Ditch Road, on the north side, from the north east corner of the Marleigh development to join up with the southern end of Low Fen Drove Way. This proposal is in line with similar comments made by South Cambridgeshire DC in their response. This path should be combined with a 12 to 15m tree and shrub belt, which would provide effective off-site screening for views of the works to the north of the A14, from High Ditch Road including the houses to the south.	n	The Applicant expects that the proposals within the landscape masterplan that serve to formalise connectivity for recreation to be of benefit to the local community, however the aim of the project is not to increase the provision of parking for use of the green space. The new landscape at CWWTP creates a series of—recreational connections, within the land around the proposed WWTP and linking to the wider network. The Landscape, Ecology and Recreation Management Plan (LERMP), illustrates the connectivity to the existing public rights of way network. A publicly accessible path will traverse the eastern part of the land around the proposed WWTP, set between a hedgerow with hedgerow trees, and the edge of the eastern woodland. The path surface is of a suitable width to be shared by pedestrians and recreational cyclists. Internal paths lead around the slopes of part of the earth bank and through the open ridge and furrow grassland. Where paths are in open areas these will be delineated by low level post and rail features, designed to promote the use of the paths, but not prohibit access to the open green spaces. The green space is not intended as a recreational destination in its own right.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					The landscape masterplan provides alternative access and routing for use by pedestrians and those on non-motorised transport through the area and in so doing diffuses and disperses footfall by offering more choice and creating positive experiences for recreational users of this area within the wider landscape.	
Ian Gilder	Landscape	Parking	At the northern end of the proposed bridleway along the former railway, the Project needs to look at providing a small area of parking and to improving connectivity with paths 218/4 and 149/17 into the Anglesey Abbey estate, preferably without relying on just on Station Road.	n	The project does not aim to increase the provision of parking for the use of green space but to improve connectivity to the wider network for recreational purposes.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Ian Gilder	Landscape	Connectivity	Low Fen Drove Way, as a Byway Open to All Traffic, needs to have its' future use and management addressed, particularly at the western end where it meets Horningsea Road. It will otherwise continue to attract vehicular traffic, including off-road vehicles, fly-tipping etc., with no legal power in place to prevent this. Apart possibly from occasional use by farm machinery, there appears to be no practical need for motor vehicles to use this western section of LFDW. The stopping up to vehicular traffic should be included in the DCO. This proposal is likely to have the support of the County Council (which, as highway authority, has, over many years failed to maintain this highway or resolve anti-social activities) and of the adjacent agricultural landowners and tenants.	n	The Applicant has been engaging with statutory stakeholders through the PRoW Technical Working Group, as well as speaking to Landowners in order to look at the options for changing the status of Low Fen Drove Way. There have also been discussions with other developers in the area to understand their plans for connectivity, as well as speaking to the National Trust to understand their vision for Wicken Fen. Engagement will continue in order to support the linkages and connectivity where possible.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Ian Gilder	Landscape	Connectivity	The Project should also explore the opportunity to create a footpath or bridleway from path 130/1, the Harcamlow Way, adjacent to the cemetery on Horningsea Road, around the eastern side of Horningsea to link up with path 130/6 to the north of the village, which already forms parts of the longer circular route being proposed by the Project. The first part of this path appears to have already been created informally along a tree belt planted by the landowner in around 2017. This would provide a safe alternative for walkers and equestrians avoiding the need to use Horningsea Road/Clayhithe Road through the village.	n	The Applicant, whilst acknowledging the potential opportunity, confirms that this sits outside the remit of the project.	
Cllr John Williams	Landscape and visual	Planting	I note that The following new structures are proposed as part of the development: Two digester towers at 20m high, Sludge storage 14m high , Cake storage 15m high ,Gas handling 16m high, Boiler house 12m high,	y	Post Phase Three Consultation the Applicant has amended the design to take on board the comments made by stakeholders during this consultation phase about the need to improve visual mitigation. The Applicant has reviewed	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Landscape and Visual Amenity, Application

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Boiler stack 24m high ,These heights pose significant challenges given the rising open topography of the proposed site. Given this, it is important to provide effective mitigation for the landscape impacts of the proposal. The visualisations for the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) accept that the Plant will have a negative impact unless there is significant and careful landscaping around the site with the use of mature trees. It is clear that the planted screening proposed will have little realistic effect on some of the longer distance views towards the site. The most effective screening is that which is closest to the receptor. These preliminary visualisations illustrate the potential for significant adverse harm despite. More detail should be provided as part of the DCO submission to demonstrate how far the harm identified can be further mitigated by appropriate on site and more remote planting plans. .It is not acceptable that it will take 15 years to achieve even the degree of masking of the bund shown in these visualizations and that the planting of mature trees should be possible. In my view that gradient of the outside of the bund should be more gradual so that the impression is given of a gentle more natural rise. And this could be coupled with the opening out of the woodland planting to pockets of trees, grasslands and scrapes. This will provide more diverse habitats and connectivity for wildlife than a blanket of woodland planting.		design, building heights, mass of buildings and planting. Planting design has also been modified to be more aligned with the local landscape. The amended designs have significantly improved the visual impact.	Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
Cllr John Williams	Landscape and visual	Lighting	The consultation material indicates that lighting will be required on site at a maximum height of fifteen metres to ensure a safe working environment for any emergency works. This maximum height is not acceptable particularly when it is expected under the landscaping plans that it will take 15 years for the masking of the site by trees to be accomplished. Continued examination of lighting options should take place, with a final solution, ensuring site safety, but minimising potential for intrusion/disturbance to nearby properties and the enjoyment of a night sky for those further afield, being detailed at the DCO stage.	y	Post Phase Three Consultation the Applicant has taken on board the comments made regarding the fifteen metres height of lighting and we have now reduced the height of these columns to 5m. There should be no lights visible under normal operation. Lighting outside of the rotunda will be discrete and kept to a minimum for safety reasons. Lighting will be activated on use only and not activated continuously through night time hours. A lighting assessment has been completed. Lighting plans are set out in the Project Description and a Lighting Strategy is included in the DCO Application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.15.3 Lighting Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.4 Glint & Glare, Application Document ref: 5.2.2 Project Description

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Stow Cum Quy PC	Landscape		Use as many mature trees (rather than saplings as possible to get the coverage as soon as possible. Ideally in under the 15-year projections.	y	The Applicant has reviewed planting and is increasing the size of the trees planted at the edges of the site, as well as the density of planting on the earth bank, to create a dense thicket over time. There will also be the addition of larger trees to the early planting belts.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Stow Cum Quy PC	Landscape		landscape plans are balanced appropriately between nature and connectivity	n	The Applicant notes the comment	
Stow Cum Quy PC	Photomontages		High Ditch Road in Fen Ditton – looks insufficient. Having worked out where that was taken from on google maps, I think the view would be very similar for all the houses (particularly from upstairs windows) and the offices along that stretch of High Ditch Road, most of the way to the cross roads. The trees on the bund are clearly more mature in at 15 years, but they barely screen the facility at all. There really needs to be more dense screening, or possibly screening closer to High Ditch Road, to hide the facility from this direction.	y	Following Phase Three Consultation the Applicant has reviewed the design to mitigate visual impact. This has included reviewed building heights, mass of buildings and planting. The Applicant has modified planting design to be more aligned with the local landscape. The amended designs have further minimised the visual impact.	Application Document Ref 5.2.15 ES, Chapter 15: Landscape & Visual Amenity, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.1 Photomontages
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Lighting		The consultation material indicated that lighting will be required on site at a maximum height of fifteen metres to ensure a safe working environment for any emergency works. The District Council would advise that it is typical to receive complaints when the view residents are accustomed to is dominated by the glare produced by light. This will certainly be true for residents located at Stow-Cum-Quy and Lode who at the moment will have an uninterrupted view of Cambridge City from a distance. Continued examination of lighting options should take place, with a final solution, ensuring site safety but minimising potential for intrusion/disturbance to nearby properties being detailed at the DCO stage.	y	The lighting proposals were amended following Phase Three Consultation. The heights of lighting have reduced to 5 metres. The lighting will also be directed downwards and generally used for task purposes. Lighting outside of the rotunda will be discrete and kept to a minimum for safety reasons. It will also be activated by use, not permanently lit during night time hours.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.2 Project Description
Stow Cum Quy PC	Lighting		To avoid light pollution, keep the site predominantly unlit during the hours of darkness and for essential lighting use only covers above the lights; also use yellow light (rather than white). This also applies to when the site is in operation.	y	The height of the lights inside the earth bank will be no greater than 5m. This lighting will also be directed downwards and generally only when carrying out tasks. Lighting outside of the earth bank will be discrete and kept to a minimum for safety reasons. It will also be active for use, not permanently lit during night time hours. Details of lighting considerations are included within the Project Description and a Lighting Strategy is included as part of the Application. Lighting along Horningsea Road will be agreed with the local highway authority and only installed if absolutely necessary for safety reasons.	Application Document Ref 5.4.15.3 Lighting Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.15.4 Glint & Glare Assessment, Application Document Ref: 5.2.2 Project Description

Table 1-11 Land Quality, Minerals and Waste

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cambridgeshire County Council	contaminated land and minerals	local policy consideration	Consideration of Policy 24: Sustainable use of soils of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021) (MWLP) in the Agricultural Land and Soil Management Plan is welcomed. It is also noted that local plan policy is considered in the Framework Travel Plan, but it does not reference MWLP Policy 23 Traffic, Highways and Rights of Way. Other PEI documents and Management Plan documents do not appear to make direct reference to local plan policies, although consideration is given to Mineral Safeguarding Areas in the Contaminated land and Minerals PEI. 8.2. In order to help the local planning authorities, understand the extent to which local plan policy has been considered and reflected, it is requested that the Applicant update the relevant PEI and Management Plan documents so that they include consideration of relevant local plan policy. Alternatively, a separate document could be prepared to demonstrate how local planning policy has been considered. Additional MWLP policies that are relevant include: • Policy 1: Sustainable development and climate change. • Policy 5: Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAS) • Policy 17: Design • Policy 18: Amenity Considerations • Policy 20: Biodiversity and Geodiversity • Policy 21: The Historic Environment • Policy 22: Flood and Water Management • Policy 23: Traffic, Highways and Rights of Way. The Contaminated Land and Minerals PEI considers the topic of Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs). These are areas safeguarded under Policy 5: Mineral Safeguarding Area of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2021). Reference to, and consideration of, the Plan and MSAs is welcomed. The MWPA suggests for completeness that Policy 5 should be referenced within the PEI	y	The Applicant notes the comments and has updated reference to and consideration of policies and confirms that they have been included in the Land Quality Chapter within the ES with regard to MSAs.	Application Document Ref 5.4.14.2 Contaminated land Risk Assessments
Cambridgeshire County Council	Contaminated land and minerals	Local guidance	The MWPA notes that the Sand and Gravel MSA shown on page 6 of the PEI appears to show the MSA from the old Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Core Strategy – Policies Map C (2011). The Applicant should update their map to reflect the 2021 extents. It should be noted that the sand and gravel MSA now covers a much larger area, and that the proposed development now also partially falls within the Chalk MSA. The MWPA, therefore, also requests that the Applicant updates and reassesses their assessment in light of the revised MSA areas	y	The Applicant has updated plans with current MSAs. The new, larger, impacted area has been updated in the Land Quality Chapter within the ES which will be included in the Application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.14.2 Contaminated land Risk Assessments

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cambridgeshire County Council	Contaminated land and minerals	Decommissioning of existing site	While we appreciate that the potential for contaminants to reach the identified receptors at the Proposed Development is addressed in this document it would be appreciated if the applicant could confirm what safeguards are to be introduced when decommissioning the existing site in terms of: Site Security Ongoing maintenance to ensure direct impact on soils and groundwater and increased odour from the existing site. The impact of any major lighting of the decommissioned site such as glare affecting traffic on the A14.	n	The decommissioning process is outlined in the Decommissioning Strategy that is part of the DCO submission. In summary the site will operate as normal until the proposed works is fully operational with the same level of security currently in place. The Decommissioning Strategy covers draining down, cleaning out, turning off and making safe all of the different process assets in a staged way. None of this work requires lighting over and above those that are currently part of the works or localised task lighting. The lighting will not in any way effect the A14 or nearby receptors. Odour is likely to decrease through the decommissioning as process elements are drained down and cleaned out. No further sources of contamination will be found on the existing WWTW to create a source for contamination to the ground. This will be confirmed with a level of ground sampling agreed with the Environment Agency.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan
Cambridgeshire County Council	Contaminated land and minerals	Spray of waste water	In terms of the proposed new WWTP we would welcome information relating to mitigation measures aimed at preventing spray of waste water, causing by changes in wind direction, coming on contact with walkers and cyclists, in the proposed recreation area new cycle walking routes and other PRoWs. Please also see our comment under Landscape and Ecology Management Plan below.	n	The Applicant acknowledges the comment and can confirm that the standard design measures and presence of the landscaped earthwork bank would mean there is sufficient embedded mitigation and therefore spray of waste water is not a risk.	
The Environment Agency	Contaminated land and Minerals		We expect risks to controlled waters to be managed from potential historic contamination sources for the proposed development following the tiered approach laid out in our Land contamination risk management (LCRM) guidance, as proposed on page 8. We understand (page 3 and 11) that a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA) has already been undertaken and that the likelihood of there being significant contamination is considered to be low, however, we will need to see this assessment.	n	Preliminary Risk Assessment is included as part of the application and forms an Appendix to the ES. The Water resources chapter of the ES refers to the findings of this report in completion of the environmental assessment. A copy of the PRA has been shared with the Environment Agency and comments received included in the Statement of Common Ground.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 Chapter: 20 Water resources
South Cambridgeshire District Council	contaminated land		It is noted that section 6.4 of the CoCP on 'Land Quality' makes reference to Part 2a of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA) as a means of setting out when land is to be regarded as contaminated. The Council's view is that the risks from contamination should also be assessed in terms of suitability for use in accordance with the NPPF.	y	The CoCP has been amended to signpost to the relevant section of the Land Quality Chapter where it makes reference to the NPPF, the Applicant does not think making reference to planning policies and decisions is relevant to the CoCP, therefore the reader is referred to the	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP, Application Document Ref 5.2.14 ES Chapter Land Quality

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					Land Quality chapter should they wish to understand the relevancy of the criteria.	
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Land contamination	Assessment	FDPC draw attention again to the possibility that there is an historic landfill on the northern side of Field/Filly Lane towards its western end. Anecdotal information in Cambridge Archives refers to night soil being emptied in this area around the start of the 20th Century. This could be within the red line boundary and under or close to the proposed route of the Waterbeach transfer pipelines.	n	The Land Quality and Material Resources and Waste Chapters of the ES include reference to historic land use including landfills and the implications are considered in each of these chapters.	Application Document Ref 5.2.16 ES, Chapter 16: Material Resources & Waste, Application Document Ref: 5.2.14 Chapter 14: Land Quality
Save Honey Hill	Contaminated land		AW's Contaminated Land and Minerals document states that the Proposed Development is located in a semi-rural location. This is untrue; the area is rural, predominantly arable land and soil integrity will be lost or significantly reduced during construction. AW's scoping report states that it is "likely that some mineral resources will be removed as part of the construction" without supplying the potential quantitative effects on minerals or sufficient mitigation	n	The ES Chapter on Land Quality includes an assessment on potential effects to mineral resources. The Applicant acknowledges all the comments in relation to the Agricultural Land and Soil resources. An outline Soil Management Plan (SMP) is included within the Application. A draft of this was provided as part of the PEIR at Phase Three Consultation. The CoCP requires the appointed contractor(s) to prepare a detailed SMP in line with the outline SMP. The outline SMP has been prepared in in accordance with the guidance in the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites. (2009). The CoCP (Defra 2009) provides general measures that are required to be in place to ensure that soil is appropriately managed during construction and suitable for its final use. The outline SMP provides the basis for the final SMP which will be prepared by the contractor prior to the start of construction. The final SMP will details these measures as applicable to the particular soil types of the site and should be adhered to during and after the construction phase. Although well-executed soil management will minimise damage to soil resources a period of aftercare and soil monitoring to ensure that reinstated soils are functional to the required level. For this reason, the outline SMP advises that reinstated soils are subject to a period of aftercare, as per Defra 2009 guidance. During this period, the Contractor is required to closely monitor both soil and plant health closely to swiftly identify and rectify deficiencies.	Application Document Ref. 5.2.14 ES Chapter Land Quality, Application Document Ref: 5.4.6.3 Outline Soil Mgmt. Plan

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
The Coal Authority	Materials resources and waste		No comments to make	n	Response acknowledged by the Applicant	

Table 1-12 Noise

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Historic England	Noise, light, traffic	Non-Technical summary	We note the reference to other environmental impacts of the proposed development such as levels of noise, light, traffic, and landscape assessments etc. and that these have been addressed in their own right in relevant specialist chapters. We would ask that a nontechnical summary of these impacts on the designated heritage assets is also provided in the cultural heritage chapter, with cross-referencing where there is a relevant overlap, in order to provide as full a basis for assessment as is possible. This should be aimed at helping us to interpret the technical data and assess the impact. We also recommend that all supporting technical heritage information is included as appendices.	n	The Applicant notes these comments and a non-technical summary has been prepared in support of the Environmental Statement.	Application Document Ref 5.1 Environmental Statement Non Technical Summary
Quy Fen Trust	Noise	Change to noise baseline	No information has been provided regarding the potential night time noise sources or potential noise levels anticipated.	n	The Applicant has included within the Environmental Statement the assessment of Construction and Operational Noise.	Application Document Ref 5.4.17.4 Operational Noise Sources and Application Document Ref 5.4.17.3 Construction Noise Assessment
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Noise		Please provide us with a copy of the report on baseline noise measurements; Please give an assessment of the combined effect of baseline and operational noise.	n	Further information is provided on the ES Chapter on Noise including an Appendix that provides the baseline noise survey information.	Application Document Ref 5.2.17 ES, Chapter 17: Noise & Vibration, Application Document Ref 5.4.17.2 Baseline Noise Report
Horningsea Parish Council	Noise		Noise mitigation appears to focus predominantly on construction, but the Horningsea document states that '*new low-level noise sources during operation of the proposed WWTP have the potential to result in adverse noise effects, particularly during night-time periods as existing noise levels are lowest at this time*.' The PEI Noise and Vibration document provides general information on potential areas of mitigation and that noise levels are only considered significant following an increase greater than 10dB but no specific information is provided. Further information is requested on the operational noise sources and levels involved, particularly at night.	n	The Environmental Statement provides full details on noise in the Noise Chapter. The PEI advised new low-level noise sources during operation of the proposed WWTP have the potential to result in adverse noise effects, particularly during night-time periods as existing noise levels are lowest at this time. However, distance to the southern edge of Horningsea is such that no noise effects are expected in this location.	Application Document Ref 5.2.17 ES, Chapter 17: Noise & Vibration

Table 1-13 Planning

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cam Valley Forum	Planning	Project need	Cambridge STW in Cowley Road has spare capacity. It could be better, (both in treatment and elements like carbon zero) but the site sale was in our understanding an opportunistic move to benefit from land sale there for housing development.	n	The relocation will enable South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council's long held ambition to develop a new low-carbon city district on Cambridge's last major brownfield site, in North East Cambridge. Details provided in the Planning Statement.	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement
CPPF	Planning	Green Belt	As you are aware, we object to the location of the site within the Green Belt and we did not support the site option that has been chosen, which will introduce a large industrial complex into the open undeveloped countryside, which will be extremely intrusive in the landscape. We understand the reasons for relocating the works and we agree that Cambridge North is a more sustainable location for new housing and employment rather than locating it in, or beyond, the Green Belt.	n	The Applicant notes the comment regarding the selected site in the Green Belt and agreement with the policy regarding North East Cambridge as a sustainable location for new housing.	
CPRE	Planning	Project Need	(Page 1 point 2) Relocation of the CWWTP would not be compliant with the NPPF because it has been demonstrated that a modernised CWWTP utilising latest technology could be built on the existing Anglian Water site and Anglian Water has publicly stated that the existing CWWTP has sufficient capacity to meet the needs of the Cambridge area it serves, including planned expansion, until 2050.	n	The Applicant notes the comments about the NPPF and it is it is accepted that the-land required for the proposed WWTP lies in the Cambridgeshire Green Belt as a result of the site selection process. The relocation is to enable the new, low carbon city district in North East Cambridge. The Applicant will submit a full assessment of the need of the proposed development in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Waste Water and the national planning policy for Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF), local development plan policies and the . Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) performance indicators.	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement
CPRE	Planning	Project scope	Page 3 point 13 and 14 - CPRE is concerned that, because the HIF funding of £227m is finite, it is probable that the choice of the Honey Hill site has been made on cost alone. Knowing how regular it is that major infrastructure projects significantly exceed budget, CPRE is extremely concerned to know how the project will be funded to completion if the project cost does exceed the available HIF funding. Unclear if the £227m will also fund the Waterbeach pumping station or will that be the responsibility of the developers?	n	The Applicant is confident with the cost estimates and has submitted a funding statement as part of its DCO application to show that the project can be fully funded and its commitments can be delivered. The Waterbeach work is not part of the HIF Funding.	Application Document Ref 3.2 Funding Statement
East Cambridge District Council	Planning	Decommissioning of existing site	No details have been provided with regard to the decommissioning of the existing plant at Milton?	n	An Outline Decommissioning Plan for the existing Cambridge WWTP will be included within the Application. The Applicant worked with the master developers of the	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan and

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					existing Cambridge WWTP to help them understand what assets and infrastructure will remain in place. The Applicant has submitted a Carbon Assessment as part of the Environmental Statement. The Carbon chapter of the ES includes decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP, construction of the proposed site WWTP (embedded carbon in materials), land use change (the net impact land permanently required for the Proposed Development), and operation of the proposed WWTP. Demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not included within Carbon chapter of the ES. The demolition of the existing Cambridge WWTP is not part of the scope of this proposal, that work will be completed by the future developer and considered as part of a separate planning application. It is likely to include the effects of emissions from plant used in demolition and should consider the re-use of materials including secondary aggregate, recovered steel and other equipment. The wider effects of changing the existing Cambridge WWTP are covered by a separate strategic assessment included as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.2.10 ES, Chapter 10: Carbon.
Federation of Cam Residents	Planning	Project Need	This design does not appear to be technically better than the current plant, the current site is more than adequate and could be upgraded for far less cost. The existing treatment works at Milton is effective and as spare capacity.	n	The Project Description sets out the plans for design and technical scope of the proposed WWTP. It will be operationally net zero carbon, as well as energy neutral. It is designed to adapt to changing social and environmental priorities, increasing resilience to storm flows and flooding and provide a long-term solution to how we best treat waste water for a growing Greater Cambridge population. The relocation will enable South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council's long held ambition to develop a new low-carbon city district on Cambridge's last major brownfield site, known as North East Cambridge.	Application Document Ref. 5.2.2 Project Description
Federation of Cam Residents	Planning	project need	No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for the loss of green spaces and the impact on openness and other purposes of Green Belt policy. Residents question how this complies with NPPF, South Cambs District Council Local Plan 2018 and Greater Cambridge Emerging local plan 2018 and the aspirations of Greater Cambridge share planning to protect and improve green spaces and the reference to the Wicken Fen Vision. There has been a failure to consider a full range of alternative sites.	n	The site is an important component of the First Proposals (preferred options) for the new Greater Cambridge Local Plan that were subject to public consultation late last year. The North East Cambridge Area Action Plan has also recently been agreed by the Councils in its Proposed Submission form and will be subject to public consultation prior to submission once the Development Consent Order is determined. The relocation of the existing waste water treatment facility will enable this new district to come forward and deliver 8,350 homes, 15,000 new jobs and a wide range of community, cultural and open space	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					facilities in North East Cambridge. As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process Anglian Water evidence the special circumstances for building on Green Belt.	
Marshall Group	Planning	Project need	Supportive in principle at this stage, and we welcome the necessary investment in the capacity of the sewerage system to support the growth of Cambridge and the surrounding area. Through workshops that we have had with Anglian Water and as part of this Phase Three Consultation, MGP is pleased to have access to much of the requested information and, subject to more detailed data being submitted in support of the DCO application, there are no known detrimental impacts at this stage of outstanding concern to MGP in relation to Cambridge East Recommend a further workshop/meeting ahead of submission	n	The comments regarding the management of growth and the capacity within the sewerage system for Cambridge catchment are acknowledged. The Applicant will continue to work with MGP on this issue in accordance with its' statutory duty to ensure the effective drainage of the catchment and will programme in update meetings as required.	Section 94 Water Industry Act 1991
Marshall Group	Planning	Capacity & growth	MGP is grateful for the clarity on this issue regarding project being developed in two phases to deal with increase in capacity but would question whether there is any further futureproofing factored into the proposals for growth beyond the end of the Plan period (2041). As identified within the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, a significant proportion of development identified in the First Proposals is due to be delivered beyond the Local Plan period. Therefore, further clarity is sought as to whether the capacity testing for the new facility factors in the full scale of growth at Cambridge East and what provisions are being made for increasing the capacity of the facility to accommodate growth beyond 2041	n	The design basis of the Proposed Development is in alignment with the population growth estimates provided by the Greater Cambridge Local Plan as provided from Cambridgeshire County Council in 2021. The facility is designed to be able to expand within the existing bund to accommodate further growth beyond 2041. This expansion will be delivered as required with reference to future growth projections and in accordance with future Local Plans.	
National Trust	Land interests	Recreation	The National Trust has significant land holdings in the locality of proposed CWWTPR site. Beyond its own landholdings, the Trust has an interest in the extensive area of land in the corridor between the River Cam and the B1102 stretching from the A14 in the south to Wicken village in the north. This land is recognised as the "Wicken Fen 100 Year Vision Area" and the Trust, working with partners and landowners, has a long-term ambition to see this 5,300ha area managed for nature conservation with	n	The Applicant notes the comment, the project has been developed to complement this ambition.	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			improved public access for recreation, community engagement and learning			
National Trust	Planning	NECAAP, Local Plan delay, Special Circumstances and Needs Case	It is noted that the submission version (final draft) was presented to the South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council's relevant Committees in late 2021. However, the Councils have now paused progress on the NECAAP until a decision has been made on an application for a Development Consent Order for the CWWTP relocation. There is no adopted plan which provides clear policy support for the relocation of the existing waste water treatment plant at Milton Road to an alternative site to enable development proposals to be realised.	n	In a further meeting on 18 November 2021 the parties discussed and agreed that the project site lies in the Cambridgeshire Green Belt as a result of the site selection process. It is accepted that the Applicant will need to set out in the Planning Statement compliance with planning policy and establish why harm to the Green Belt is outweighed by other considerations.	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement
Natural England	Planning	Recreation	This major infrastructure development will bring significant change to the Cambridge Green Belt and surrounding countryside, for people and wildlife. In our view the effects of this, in combination with Local Plan development, including the North East Cambridge development that this Scheme will enable, requires further consideration, particularly with regard to increased visitor pressures.	n	The Applicant acknowledges the comment and, in order to support the understanding of how the land required for the construction of the Proposed Development is used recreationally, user counts have been undertaken and completed by the Applicant. These have covered a work day, weekend and a day outside of school term time and cover different times throughout the days. These data have been assessed, together with other publicly available information on recreational facilities and usage. These surveys and the assessments have been used to inform relevant parts of the ES including the chapters on Community and Traffic and Transport. Information from these surveys will be shared separately with Natural England if required.	Application Document Ref. 5.4.19.4 Pedestrian Counts
Quy Fen Trust	Planning	Landscape design	the proposed relation is detrimental to Wicken fen vision; Cambridge Nature Network; Cambridge Local Plan Green and Open Space Initiatives; Cambridgeshire Horizons - Green Infrastructure Strategy. The landscape areas surrounding the site such as the A14 corridor and those with fewer high sensitivity receptors should be considered with the Wicken Fen Vision and Cambridge Nature Network and reclassified as high sensitivity reception areas - also noted in Con2 response.	n	The Applicant notes the comments and has taken them into consideration in the Environmental Statement Chapter for Landscape and Visual.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Quy Fen Trust	Planning	Landscape design	The proposal is unclear how Anglian Water plans to deliver the mitigation on land that will not be subject to compulsory purchase.	n	The CPO will cover all land that is required for mitigation. Thereafter all the land will be in the legal ownership of the Applicant.	
Quy Fen Trust	Planning	Project need	Quy Fen objects to the relocation as no special circumstances exist to justify relocation and the	n	The Applicant acknowledges the comments in relation to the principle of development and Green Belt impact and it	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			areas of greenbelt should be protected and preserved - also noted as part of Con2 response.		is accepted that the project site lies in the Cambridgeshire Green Belt as a result of the site selection process. As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process the Applicant evidences the special circumstances for building on Green Belt with the submission of a full assessment of the need of the proposed development in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Waste Water and the national planning policy for Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF), local development plan policies and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) performance indicators.	
Teversham Parish Council	Planning	Project need	Keen to engage with AW to assess and comment on its plans for mitigation. Our principle objections are the fact that there is no operational need for the sewage works to move, having sufficient capacity on site to be able to upgrade its facilities if needed and the fact that the proposed new site has severe limitations for potential growth being too close to the city boundary. If it has to move, an alternative site further out should be selected.	n	The relocation is to enable the creation of a new sustainable neighbourhood in Cambridge, delivering 8,350 homes, 15,000 new jobs and a wide range of community, cultural and open space facilities in North East Cambridge	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement
Teversham Parish Council	Planning	Project need	We note there is no mention of the plant in the City and District Council's local plan.	n	The Planning Statement within the Application sets out the links to relevant policies and plans. The Applicant acknowledges the comments in relation to the principle of development and Green Belt impact and it is accepted that the project site lies in the Cambridgeshire Green Belt as a result of the site selection process. As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process the Applicant evidences the special circumstances for building on Green Belt with the submission of a full assessment of the need of the proposed development in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Waste Water and the national planning policy for Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF), local development plan policies and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) performance indicators.	Application Document Ref. 7.5 Planning Statement
Waterbeach Parish Council	Planning	Capacity at WRC	Anglian Water have no operational need to relocate the Milton sewage works however WPC is aware that infrastructure to process wastewater generated by Waterbeach New Town will be required. The existing Waterbeach WRC is almost at capacity. Waterbeach Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) February 2019 page 130 - 131is referenced. WPC are seeking reassurance regarding capacity at	n	The Applicant acknowledges the comments made by WPC. The Applicant continues to work with South Cambs District Council and both developers for the Waterbeach New Town to ensure there is a waste water strategy that aligns with the build out rates of each developer. Currently the waste water generated by any new occupants of the Urban and Civic development are transferred via a connection at the Research Park pumping station and sent	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			the WRC and how the new flows from Waterbeach New Town will be managed		for treatment via the Cottesmore rising main to the existing Cowley Road site. The RLW site does not yet have final planning permission. Any houses developed on this site cannot be occupied until the new station is complete so build out rates are also contingent on this planning process. The first phase of houses from the RLW site when complete will have waste water treated at the existing Waterbeach WRC which has further capacity of 500 dwellings. It is not anticipated that 500 dwellings will be built and occupied before 2030 at the earliest by which point the CWWTPR will be operational.	
Waterbeach Parish Council	Planning	Pumping station	Details requested regarding Waterbeach Pumping Station.	n	The Applicant is currently still in discussions with South Cambridgeshire District Council and the Waterbeach New Town Developers regarding the potential final location of the new Waterbeach Pumping Stations. .	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Planning	Project need	The AAP committee reports also, however, emphasised that the DCO process is a separate statutory planning process from the GCLP plan-making process and that the project itself will be determined under different legislation and by a separate decision maker i.e., ultimately the Secretary of State. The ReWWTP is therefore not a project or proposal within the scope of the joint GCLP or the AAP and it would be inappropriate for it to be such. Both plans are therefore currently being prepared on the basis that the CWWTP will be relocated but this relocation is not a policy requirement of either plan.	n	The Applicant notes the comments on the role of the relocation project in enabling the creation of a new, sustainable urban neighbourhood. . As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process the Applicant evidences the special circumstances for building on Green Belt with the submission of a full assessment of the need of the proposed development in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Waste Water and the national planning policy for Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF), local development plan policies and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) performance indicators.	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Planning	Green belt	The District Council recognises the potential benefit of the ReCWWTP in the provision of this additional capacity to meet future development. Meeting the needs of the Waterbeach New Town through the ReCWWTP saves the need for a separate plant elsewhere that would most likely be located in the countryside, noting in particular that Waterbeach is located at the outer edge of the Green Belt.	n	The Applicant notes the comment.	
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Planning		Object to the project and project need	n	As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process the Applicant evidences the special circumstances for building on Green Belt with the submission of a full assessment of the need of the proposed development in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Waste Water and the national planning policy for Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF), local development plan policies and	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) performance indicators.	
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Planning	Capacity	Although AW have stated on 19th April 2022 that all structures for expansion to 300,000PE would take place within the proposed bund, FDPC would like to see also a commitment that there would be no expansion outside the bund within a minimum of 40 years of opening.	n	The Applicant is confident that there is space on site, within the earth bank, to accommodate future growth.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description, Application Document Ref 4.9 Design Plans - Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Planning	Green belt	The significance and impact on the purpose of Green Belt is considered to be under- represented and reported (See Appendix 1 page 22)	n	As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process the Applicant evidences the special circumstances for building on Green Belt with the submission of a full assessment of the need of the proposed development in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Waste Water and the national planning policy for Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF), local development plan policies and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) performance indicators.	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement
Horningsea Parish Council	Planning	Project need	Object to the project location and need.	n	The Applicant notes the objection to the location and the project need the response to these are set out in the application in the Site Selection Report and the Planning Statement.	Application Document Ref 7.3 Site Selection Report (NTS), Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement
Horningsea Parish Council	Planning	Green belt	The AW PEI: Landscape and Visual Amenity document (page 14), quotes extracts from the Greater Cambridge Green Belt Assessment, released in September 2021 but appears to omit the overall classification for the proposed site. HPC requests AW includes the very important statement that is made in the GCP Green Belt Study 2021; that development as an extension of the villages or within the parcel of land OA2 is assessed as causing 'Very High Harm' to the purposes of the Green Belt.	n	A Green Belt Assessment is included within the Planning Statement that is part of the Application. The Applicant acknowledges the comments in relation to the principle of development and Green Belt impact and it is accepted that the project site lies in the Cambridgeshire Green Belt as a result of the site selection process. As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process the Applicant evidences the special circumstances for building on Green Belt with the submission of a full assessment of the need of the proposed development in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Waste Water and the national planning policy for Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF), local development plan policies and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) performance indicators.	Application Document Ref: 7.5 Planning Statement
Save Honey Hill	Planning	Capacity	The scheme fails to make adequate provision for future population growth, having similar capacity to the existing site at Cowley Road. Based on population predictions capacity might be reached within 20 years requiring extension outside the earthworks or a new site; poor return for harm to the Green Belt and financial cost. It does not include	n		Application Document Ref: 5.2.2 Project Description

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			sufficient detail on the provision for Climate Change or Future Change in Environmental Standards (including capacity calculations). It gives little detail on the capacity increase needed for secondary sludge treatment for the planned increase in imported sludge			
Save Honey Hill	Land purchase	CPO	There is insufficient evidence for the Grant of Compulsory Purchase Powers (CPO), including Deliverability Funding. AW has chosen to leave a viable facility and build a new plant for no operational reason. There is insufficient information on the temporary land-use management during construction of transfer pipeline and transfer tunnel and their restitution, especially where this involves agricultural land	n	The Applicant's preference is not to rely on compulsory acquisition powers and to acquire land voluntarily through negotiation. Where there is a need to rely on compulsory acquisition powers, the DCO application will be accompanied by a Statement of Reasons and a Funding Statement explaining the reasons for seeking the powers and the sources of funding. The proposed management scheme for land required temporarily by the Applicant during construction was set out in the draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) at Phase Three Consultation. The draft plans accompanying the consultation detailed the land to which the CoCP related. Potential impacts on agricultural land were outlined in the "Agricultural Land and Soil Resources" paper provided as part of the PEI accompanying the consultation and is more fully assessed in the Environmental Statement accompanying the DCO application, this includes Agricultural Impact Assessment.	Application Document Ref 3.1 Statement of Reasons, Application Document Ref 3.2 Funding Statement, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP, Application Document Ref 5.4.6.2 Agricultural Impact Assessment
Save Honey Hill	Planning	Local plans	Determination as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP); the proposal does not meet the criteria of the Planning Act 2008. The proposed North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) has not reached the consultation stage required by the Act's Regulation 19 and therefore its proposal for housing cannot be used as justification for the proposed CWWTP relocation. While AW claims the relocation is predicated on NECAAP, Greater Cambridge Share Planning has stated that the relocation of the Cambridge WWTP is not a "requirement" of the North-East Cambridge Area Action Plan and must not be referred to as such. 13 SCDC Local Plan 2018 policy NH/3 Protecting Agricultural Land requires development which would lead to loss of agricultural land to be permitted only when land has been allocated in the Local Plan. The area known as Honey Hill was not allocated for development in the 2018 SCDC LP or in the proposed LP 2021. The National Planning Policy Framework	n	A Green Belt assessment is included with the Planning Statement to set out the case for the "very special circumstances" for the relocation in the green belt and details the relevant planning policies for the project. This will be considered as part of the application evidence process.	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			2021 gives strong protection to the Green Belt and SCDC Local Plan Policy NH/8 requires that any development proposals on the Green Belt have no adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt. The development does not meet Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) new performance indicators in its Sustainable Growth Ambitions Statement in tackling Climate Change, reducing carbon emissions and maintaining or increasing the number of publicly open green spaces.			
Save Honey Hill	Planning	Green belt	Recommend Greater and broader cumulative consideration is made of the impact the Proposed Development would have on the Green Belt within the parcel of land identified for development and the Villages and Conservation Areas adjacent to it. All of which contribute to the setting and character of Cambridge City and are protected by Local and National Planning Policy. 2 The 'Very High Harm' the Proposed Development would have on the Green Belt as identified in the GCP 2021 Green Belt Study is reported.	n	Details on planning policy and the green belt assessment are set out in the Planning Statement within the DCO Application.	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement
Save Honey Hill	Planning	Green belt	Green Belt loss - The relocation of the CWWTP to this location cannot be considered in isolation on account of other major developments underway or in plan. The relocation will have a cumulative adverse impact on the area in the context of loss of Green Belt and high-quality arable land, adverse impact on Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets and Green Infrastructure identified in Local Plans. All of which are protected from Development in Local and National Planning Policy	n	The Planning Statement includes a Green Belt Assessment as well as setting out how the project relates to planning policy.	Application Document Ref 7.5 Planning Statement
Cambridgeshire & South Cambridgeshire Green Party	Planning	Project need	There is no operational necessity to move the plant. CWWTP recently underwent a £21 million upgrade intended to future-proof it "for decades to come. The only reason to move the plant is to make its current location available for development.	n	The relocation will enable South Cambridgeshire District Council and Cambridge City Council's long held ambition to develop a new low-carbon city district on Cambridge's last major brownfield site, in North East Cambridge. As part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) process the Applicant evidences the special circumstances for building on Green Belt with the submission of a full assessment of the need of the proposed development in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Waste Water and the national planning policy for Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF), local development plan policies and	Application Document Ref 7.8 Planning Statement

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority's (CPCA) performance indicators.	
Cambridgeshire & South Cambridgeshire Green Party	Planning	Project need	We strongly oppose the proposed development of North East Cambridge. In addition to the fundamentally unsustainable nature of growth in our water-stressed region, the proposed development will not address the real need for affordable homes for local people, but rather will draw more workers into Cambridge and exert upward pressure on housing costs.	n	The Applicant notes the comments, further details are provided in the Planning Statement.	Application Document Ref 7.8 Planning Statement
Cambridgeshire & South Cambridgeshire Green Party	Planning	Green belt	The move would involve the needless destruction of Green Belt. The first consultation made a clear case that there are no suitable non-Green Belt sites for the CWWTP to move to. It is inevitable that moving the works from its current location in an industrial estate on the edge of Cambridge into a rural area would result in negative impacts on biodiversity, landscape and amenity.	n	The Applicant notes the comments, further details are provided in the Planning Statement.	Application Document Ref 7.8 Planning Statement
Dionne Herelle BT / AUTUMNWINDOW LIMITED	Land interest		The stakeholder asked if the project would impact on BT property.	n	The Applicant confirmed there will not be a direct impact on the property.	
The Charity Commission	Land interest		The stakeholder does not use or manage the land and the project team should contact the occupants directly.	n		
Dave Prinsep of Cambridge City Council Property Services	Land interest		The stakeholder intends to redevelop the area of the Cowley Road Industrial estate for their replacement works depot.	n	The Applicant is in discussion with the stakeholder about the points raised.	
Malcolm John Wheeler	Land interest		The stakeholder asked about impact of the project on his property.	n	The Applicant confirmed the Waterbeach Rising Mains would be directionally drilled from the north side of Bannold Road and so will be underground past his property in the field opposite. His property would not be directly affected but there would be greater volume of traffic in the area and construction traffic along Burgess Drove and Bannold Road. Both roads would remain open for access to his home.	

Table 1-14 Traffic and Access

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cambridgeshire County Council	CTMP - Construction Traffic Mgmt. Plan	PRoW	As noted under the PEI Traffic & Transport above, the Applicant is asked to include the temporary closure and diversion of PROW in the Traffic Management Plan. It is likely that most PROW can be managed through a controlled arrangement whilst Horningsea Public Byway No. 17/Fen Ditton Byway No. 14 may need to be formally closed through a Traffic Regulation Order. However, the detail needs to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority and documented in the Traffic Management Plan, developed through the Access Technical Working Group with the LHA.	n	Temporary closures of PROW have been discussed and agreed with the LHA in the PROW TWG on 23 June 2022, they are outlined in the CoCP Part A & B and will be confirmed in Statement of Common Ground.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A & Application Document Ref 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part B
Cambridgeshire County Council	CTMP	Construction traffic mgmt.	Additions to CTMP 5.3.3. - Details of who will be monitoring the ANPR and how measures will be enforcing should be included in the CTMP; Consideration should be given to vehicle tracking to monitor speeds of construction traffic and ensure adherence to speed limits; A plan showing the construction traffic routes should also clearly indicate prohibited routes; Measures to ensure satellite navigation on vehicles adheres to the designated routes and accurately shows the accesses; Note in paragraph 5.3.3. it states weight limits enforced by Local Highway Authority. This should be corrected to weight limits are enforced by the police as a moving traffic offence.	y	These comments have been used to update the CTMP.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Cambridgeshire County Council	CTMP	Traffic access mitigation	Section 5.9 of the Draft CTMP, 'Facilitate safe movement of users of the highway (including NMUs)', provides an outline of the mitigation measures for the construction sites across the scheme. This includes accesses for the Waterbeach Pipeline for which there are haulage routes through Waterbeach. A further haulage route through residential areas is indicated using Milton Road, Green End Road, to Fen Road. Further details of the mitigation measures need to be developed in consultation with the LHA.	n	Construction Traffic Mitigation has been discussed and developed with the LHA through the Traffic and Access Technical Working Group.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Traffic and Access	Equestrian provision	As noted under PEI Traffic & Transport, the LHA would request that the proposed NMU route alongside the B1047 is designed to be inclusive for	n	The Applicant has considered general NMU provision throughout the design of the project and incorporated additional bridleway access. Peak hour surveys do not indicate significant	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			equestrians in accordance with the County Council's ROWIP.		equestrians along Horningsea Road. As a result of discussion with technical experts within the Traffic and Access TWG and PROW TWG, and following further internal assessment, it is not agreed that the Horningsea over bridge is suitable for the inclusion of equestrians.	
Waterbeach and District Bridleway Association	Traffic and Access	Closure /diversion of PROW	Any related highways alterations/improvements along Horningsea Road, Horningsea and High Ditch Road, Fen Ditton, should include equal consideration and provision for equestrian safety	n	The Applicant notes the comments and with any highways alterations/improvements will work with the relevant highway authority to ensure the safety of all non motorised users which includes equestrians.	
Waterbeach and District Bridleway	Traffic and Access	Closure /diversion of PROW	Upgrading of A14 Jn 34 and the use of Horningsea Road as main access to the sight by all vehicles, including many HGVs, presents our members with safety concerns when riding along Horningsea Road or to/from the access road which connects with byway 85/14. Specifically, we request please: Any highways design changes provide us with safe opportunity to use (designed so that cyclists and vehicles do not pass us on our left and have ability to pass us with the Highway Code 2022 specified 2m passing distance). Any safety crossing provision to the site be of Pegasus crossing status.	n	The Applicant acknowledges the comments and in discussions with the Highway Authority have sought to ensure safe and accessible crossings for non motorised users in particular on the Horningsea Road and have designed the new access road from Junction 34 to ensure there is no conflict between motorised vehicles and non motorised vehicles. The Proposed safety crossings on the Horningsea Road will utilise Pegasus Crossing status.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.19 Traffic and Transport
Waterbeach and District Bridleway	Traffic and Access	Equestrians	Any active travel routes for pedestrians and cyclists on the proposed site should be designed and built to provide equally for equestrians also.	n	The design on the proposed site has given equal consideration to equestrians and provided connectivity for equestrians where is has been viable to do so.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.19 Traffic and Transport, Application Document Ref: 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Waterbeach Parish Council	Traffic and Access	Construction traffic	Will AW be conducting real time traffic counts on road links between Waterbeach and Horningsea? If the A10 becomes blocked and traffic is routed through Waterbeach and Horningsea as currently happens, do AW have an emergency plan to avoid construction traffic including the haul routes from causing further congestion around the access to the site and the A14 junction? Is there a safe route for cyclists and pedestrians from Waterbeach and Horningsea to access Cambridge via Horningsea Road?		The CTMP includes a commitment to maintain regular contact with the Local Highway Authority and National Highways to monitor interaction of the works with the wider traffic network. This would enable the Applicant to implement short notice changes, if required, to manage emergency situations such as A10 traffic being diverted through Waterbeach and Horningsea. Measures that could be considered in such circumstances, where possible, could include holding construction traffic onsite to avoid creating further congestion and contacting delivery companies / drivers to either reschedule the delivery for later that day or for the next day in extreme circumstances. The Applicant has worked with the Transport	Application Document Ref. 5.4.19.7, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP and Application Document Ref 5.2.19 Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					Authorities and the Cambridgeshire Greenways team to ensure safe and accessible pedestrian routes and cycle routes. The Applicant has included a pedestrian and cycle crossing point on Horningsea Road which will have tactile paving and dropped kerbs. A central pedestrian island is proposed to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross Horningsea Road in two stages, if necessary. The crossing will be a minimum of 3 metres wide and clearly demarcated.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Traffic and Access	Mitigation	If Option 1b remains the District Council will expect to see within the DCO, carefully detailed designs for the junction and details of control systems to prevent vehicles travelling to and from the site using any access routes other than the A14 during the construction and operation stages. Given the rationale presented by Anglian Water for the choice of Option 1b, the District Council's recommendation again if this remains the proposed option, it should also deliver enhanced pedestrian and cycle access, cycling facilities. Importantly, details indicating how access to the site would not compromise cycling safety along Horningsea Road, in the vicinity of the new junction/4th arm will be required as part of the DCO. In addition, the District Council considers that measures to avoid traffic queuing/congestion on Denny End Road and Bannold Road need to be incorporated into the DCO proposals as this route is prone to congestion. The District Council remains of the opinion that direct access from the A14 would be the preferred option rather than Option 1b and asks Anglian Water to reconsider.	n	The Applicant notes the community's preference for Option 3. However, a thorough assessment was carried out taking evidence led approach that included undertaking highway and traffic modelling alongside assessment across a wide range of criteria to ascertain the preferred site access option. The development of these assessments has been agreed and shared with our Traffic and Access Technical Working Group (TWG). Option 1b provides a viable option, and it performs better, not only from a policy perspective, but also with regards to highway safety, land use, green belt, visual impact, carbon, air quality and operational management. We undertook traffic surveys in early December 2021 with agreement from Cambridgeshire County Council to collect baseline traffic data at the junctions that would be used for construction and operational traffic. This has been supplemented by surveys in May 2022 to provide a check that the volumes counted in 2021 were suitable for use as a baseline. This has been shared and agreed with our Traffic and Access Stakeholder TWG. We have looked at future scenarios for 2026 as peak construction year, 2028 as the opening operational year and 2038 operational year plus 10 years. The traffic modelling methodology has been discussed and agreed with Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority. The traffic modelling has included an analysis of traffic around Denny End Road and Bannold Road and mitigations during construction are set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.1 & 5.4.19.2 Traffic Surveys (December 2021, May 2022) and Application Document Ref 5.4.19.3 Transport Assessment.

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Traffic and access	Mitigation / community benefit	The District Council considers the Anglian Water should seek an extension to the Non-Motorised User (NMU) provision along the B1047 to the school in Horningsea as a community benefit of the scheme. Currently school children must use the busy road. It is vital to provide good quality, safe off-road infrastructure to achieve meaningful modal shift to active travel options. It is critical to engage people as young as possible to encourage long term healthy life-style choices.		The project is proposing to improve a section of the existing NMU route from Horningsea village to Fen Ditton Primary School between Low Fen Drove Way and the southern 'on slip' signalised junction. The measures include: increasing the width of the existing shared use footway / cycleway to 3.0m, provide separation between the NMU route and the adjacent carriageway by providing a new 1.0m wide verge between the carriageway and NMU route, replacing the existing parapet on the A14 over bridge (with a high barrier) to provide a cycleway compliant facility, improvements to the existing signalised pedestrian crossing points on the 'on-slip' and 'off-slip' roads, a reduction in the maximum speed limit on Horningsea Road from 60mph to 40mph between the villages of Horningsea and Fen Ditton (subject to agreement from the Local Highway Authority and the Police), provision of a central pedestrian island on Horningsea Road to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross from the existing footway / cycleway on the west side of Horningsea Road to the footway / cycleway network on the CWWTW site, a footway / cycleway link on the east side of Horningsea Road to provide access from Low Fen Drove Way to the new crossing facility on Horningsea Road. These measures have been discussed and coordinated with the local Highway Authority and the GCP Horningsea Greenways team. They seek to deliver significant improvements to a key section of the Horningsea Greenway. The GCP are proposing further improvements along the Horningsea village to Fen Ditton Primary School NMU route as part of their Horningsea Greenway project.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Traffic and access	Equestrians	The District Council also supports Cambridgeshire County Council's request that the NMU route alongside the B1047 is designed to be inclusive of equestrians in accordance with the County Council's ROWIP (Rights of Way Improvement Plan). Equestrians are particularly vulnerable users on roads, and this is a key missing link in what will otherwise be an excellent circular equestrian		The Applicant has considered general NMU provision throughout the design of the project and incorporated additional bridleway access. As a result of discussion with technical experts within the Traffic and Access TWG and PROW TWG, and following the review of the recreational survey data and further internal assessment, it is considered that the Horningsea over bridge is not	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			route. The District Council understands there is a linkage with the Horningsea Greenway and requests Anglian Water liaises with the Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) in order for these schemes to align as best as possible. Generally, all routes should be made as accessible as possible - not only for pedestrian and cyclists - but with equestrians in mind too		suitable for the inclusion of equestrians. The Applicant has considered general NMU provision throughout the design of the project and incorporated additional bridleway access elsewhere.	
Fen Ditton Primary School	Traffic		Concerned about traffic both during construction and during operation. The school have a significant problem with parents dropping off children and parking. The school has 165 pupils, the school has a strong policy promoting alternative modes of travel and 40% of pupils cycle or walk during the warmer months, however the ability for parents to drop off at school using cars and the amount of traffic on the road is already a concern.	n	The Environmental Statement has assessed traffic and also sets out the impacts and mitigation planned for traffic and transport during construction and operation. The Applicant is confident that the traffic assessment has been detailed and the mitigations proposed will minimise impacts sufficiently.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.3 Transport Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.8 Operational Workers Travel Plan, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.9 Construction Workers Travel Plan
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Traffic and access	Mitigation	FDPC considers extra mitigation is required and should include: At the proposed Option 1B junction – Legally enforceable: - No Right Turn into the works from Horningsea Rd northbound, - No Left Turn into the works from Horningsea Rd southbound and - No Right Turn at the works exit onto Horningsea Rd. Together, these would prevent traffic passing through the villages along Horningsea Rd or using Low Fen Drove to access the works and also passing through Horningsea Village and Low Fen Drove on leaving the works. Commitment to model overall traffic performance with historic data as a baseline and not rely on AW surveys since these were at a time when traffic into Cambridge was below historic levels; PC representation on the Consultation panel overseeing the traffic measures; Commitment to provide all AW and vehicle drivers with a single postcode point of references for the main site or temporary worksites. This will avoid drivers making ad-hoc satnav decisions to try and find their way to satellite sites and end up on village roads such as Green End.	n	The Applicant is working with National and Local Highways Authority to design mitigation that prevents traffic from taking shortcuts. Details are in the highway design plans and CTMP. HGVs are GPS enabled and monitored, Horningsea Rd does not allow HGVs and the Applicant will be notified if they do go down a prohibited road. There will also be a geofence in the GPS system to prevent vehicles going down these areas. Traffic modelling is provided and has covered a range of years to ensure it is truly representative of traffic activity - further details in traffic information. The Applicant will provide a postcode for a point of reference for construction traffic. The Applicant will engage the community during construction, further details will be provided in the Community Liaison Plan.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 4.11 Design Plans - Highways, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.1 & 5.4.19.2 Traffic Surveys, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Traffic and access	Operation	Our questions related to Traffic are: Q1)Please provide us with a copy of the highway safety audit noted in the Nontechnical Summary 3.4 Vehicular	n	1. Details of traffic assessment and proposals are provided in application. 2. Sludge collection will come from across Cambridgeshire and adjoining	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport,

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			access and the supporting information for its Vehicular Access evaluation; Q2)Please confirm existing routes / source destinations for sludge lorries and any additional routes that will be introduced for the proposed plant; Q3)Please advise the number of and non-operational office staff and the number of visits / visitors to the current works either annually or monthly.		regions. 3. The Project Description estimates the potential vehicle movements to the site. There are 60 vehicle movements estimated (i.e., 30 journeys) per day of office staff who are involved in the operations of waste water recycling. There are 4 vehicle movements estimated (i.e. 2 journeys) per day of operational visitors.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2:Project Description
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Traffic and Access		Construction and operation traffic should be prevented from travelling through Fen Ditton, High Ditch Road and Ditton Lane (the same as being afforded to Horningsea). All of these have weight restrictions already.	n	The Environmental Statement has assessed traffic and also sets out the impacts and mitigation planned for traffic and transport during construction and operation. The Applicant is confident that the traffic assessment has been detailed and the mitigations proposed will minimise impacts sufficiently.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Traffic and Access	Assessment	HPC is not aware of any evaluation assessment material being published by AW and would like to request this information to allow HPC a full understanding of the relevant facts. We also request a copy of the determination by Highways that found it was not possible to access the site from the A14, Option 3	n	The Environmental Statement Chapter on Alternatives includes information on the access decision.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport, Application Document Ref: 5.2.3 Chapter 3 Alternatives
Horningsea Parish Council	Traffic		Option 1b A14 Junction 34/Horningsea Road must have a solution in place to prevent heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and all other site traffic travelling East or coming from the East via Ditton Lane or High Ditch Road instead of the turnaround at Milton A14 roundabout that will be required. If they continue through Ditton Lane, they will pass a primary school, and go through a busy residential area and commuter route. Weight limits are proven not to be sufficient in stopping HGVs. Please tell us how you are going to effectively enforce this for all site traffic, construction and operational?	n	Information is included in the Construction Traffic Management Plan provides details for ensuring effective management of construction vehicles and in the Operational Workers Travel Plan. Measures include commitment to safety codes, ANPR, agreeing a Reporting and Enforcement Strategy, encouraging reporting by the community, specifying transport routes in contracts.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.8 Operational Workers Travel Plan
Horningsea Parish Council	Traffic access		We request more traffic analysis here. We fear that the traffic volume has been underestimated. We would like to see this analysis including all of the access routes into the site, including A14 westbound and A14 eastbound	n	A detailed analysis has been completed on traffic; information is provided within the Application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.1 & 5.4.19.2 Traffic Surveys, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.3 Transport Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.4 Pedestrian Counts, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.5 Traffic Flow Diagram

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Horningsea Parish Council	Traffic access		HPC also supports reduced speed limits on Horningsea Road. Suggest reducing to 30mph and 20mph in the village and enforce with speed cameras and traffic calming measures. We also want confirmation that this mitigation is within the control of AW.	n	The Applicant as part of the DCO is applying to reduce the speed limit on Horningsea Road where it is 60 down to 40, between the villages of Horningsea and Fen Ditton, in the vicinity of the proposed site access. The Applicant has not proposed any further reductions in the existing speed limits, in the villages of Horningsea and Fen Ditton and the Applicant would not have the powers to do this. Construction traffic is not routing through the village and the project has committed to this with the use of appropriate enforcement and monitoring to manage site access movements.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Horningsea Parish Council	Traffic access	Traffic	It is a significant concern that we believe AW has failed to factor in the cumulative traffic impact of previous recorded congestion at junction 34, reduction in traffic flows (due to Covid) during the 2021 AW surveys, CWWTP Construction traffic, CWWTP operational traffic, the proposed additional J34 arm, Waterbeach New Town, Marleigh, development at Fulbourn, dualling of the A10, general traffic growth and the pending development of the airport site.	n	The Applicant has looked at future scenarios for peak construction year (anticipated to be 2026), the opening operational year (expected to be 2028) and the year 1 of operation plus 10 years (expected to be 2038). The traffic surveys to inform the assessment have included a verification survey in recognition of the covid pandemic and potential effects this may have had on survey data. The approach to and timing of surveys was discussed and agreed with the local highway authority. The approach to assessment has been discussed and agreed with the Local Highway Authority.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.1 & 5.4.19.2 Traffic Surveys, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.3 Transport Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.5 Traffic Flow Diagram
Horningsea Parish Council	Traffic access		We request forecast operational HGV movements. Most of the movements are liquid sludge imports and septic tank movements, why are these being trucked here from destinations such as Ely and Huntingdon? We request forecast for operational HGV movements and an alternative plan for the movement of sludge lorries to more appropriate sites.	n	The traffic and transport assessment has assessed the reassignment of the vehicle movements from the existing WWTP. The key difference is the vehicles are leaving at a different junction off the A14 and then going straight off the junction into the proposed WWTP. The satellite sites in the Cambridge catchment do not have the ability to treat sludge, the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant would be a key site for providing this vital service to water customers.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.19 ES Chapter Traffic & Transport
Horningsea Parish Council	Traffic access		Please note diagrams in the PEI: Horningsea Preliminary Traffic Modelling Data, show Horningsea Rd Southbound with a left turn arm into works plus Northbound with right turn into works. These movements can only take place if traffic has passed through villages which is extremely concerning.		The Applicant has designed the proposed 4 arm signalised junction to physically discourage the vehicle turning movements described below and proposed relevant prohibition signage together with Traffic Regulation Orders to enable enforcement.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.19 ES Chapter Traffic & Transport

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Horningsea Parish Council	CTMP		During construction and, If the DCO is granted during operation, discussion on issues with construction traffic management and operational traffic management must include representatives from Fen Ditton Parish Council, Horningsea Parish Council and commuters from North Cambridge and Abbey Ward		The Community Liaison Plan is included within the application and sets out how communication with the community will be organised to ensure they are kept informed about the project.	Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan
Save Honey Hill	Traffic and Access	Option 1B	Anglian Water has not consulted in sufficient depth on site access and appear to have chosen a permanent access from the A14 Junction 34/Horningsea Road without due consideration of views expressed by those who responded to the Phase 2 Consultation.	n	The Applicant consulted extensively on-site access prior to and during Phase Two Consultation. Engagement has been held with a wide range of technical and community representatives, with meetings focusing specifically on access explaining methodology and process for decision making. The Consultation Report sets this out in detail.	Application Document Ref 6.1 Consultation Report
Save Honey Hill	Traffic and Access	Traffic numbers	This option would be preferable to Option 1a but must have a solution in place to prevent heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) travelling East or coming from the East via Ditton Lane or High Ditch Road instead of the turnaround at Milton A14 roundabout that will be required. Weight limits are proven not to be sufficient in preventing misuse of accesses. We dispute Anglian Water's Traffic and Transport Paper claim that residents of both Horningsea and Fen Ditton would be likely to experience only a slight increase in journey times due to increase of construction vehicles. We hold that this impact would not be confined to local residents but to commuters travelling from Cambridge to access the A14 and that delays would be considerable. The bridge is too narrow to allow a dedicated right turn onto the A14 for HGVs exiting the site, which would result in queuing and delays to pedestrians and cyclist using the cycle path to access Cambridge and Fen Ditton Primary School. During construction of the proposed new permanent arm from Junction 34 slip, building a short-term temporary construction access using the existing junction of Horningsea Road and Low Fen Drove Way will cause considerable delays for vehicles and it is not clear how cyclists and pedestrians will be able to travel.	n	The Applicant has worked with the National and Local Highways Authorities on the design to mitigate traffic impacts, this includes preventing vehicles using the village roads. The Environmental Statement provides details of the traffic assessment work carried out, as well as designs for the junction and bridge. The Construction Traffic Management Plan provides details as to how construction traffic will be managed to mitigate the impact on road users.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.1 & 5.4.19.2 Traffic Surveys, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.3 Transport Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 4.11 Design Plans - Highways.
Save Honey Hill	Traffic and Access	Mitigation	If Option 1b, Horningsea Road/A14 Junction 34, is selected, construction traffic for the new junction	n	The Construction Traffic Management Plan addresses this.	Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			must be prevented from using Horningsea Road South or North. Clear signage and monitoring would be essential. During construction of the four-arm junction, provision must be made for children who use the cycle and pedestrian path from Horningsea to travel to Fen Ditton Primary School			
Save Honey Hill	Traffic and Access		1 Access to site - No Left Turn Southbound and no Right Turn Northbound to be created for traffic leaving Horningsea Road into the proposed Works at A14 J34 under Option IB. A No Right Turn should also be created at the four-way junction for traffic leaving the proposed works. 2 No use of Green End under Operational Traffic if Vent Shaft location at Shaft 4 is adopted. 3 Horningsea and Fen Ditton Parish Councils should be represented on proposed Traffic Management Consultation body (Ref P36). 4 Stringent monitoring of adherence to new speed limits. 5 Stringent monitoring to prevent construction traffic accessing Horningsea and Fen Ditton 6 Commitment to provide better paths and crossings for non-vehicle users on Horningsea Road. 7 Use excavated materially locally to prevent increased construction traffic movement and mud on roads. 8 During construction and during operation, discussion on issues with construction traffic management and operational traffic management must include representatives from Fen Ditton Parish Council, Horningsea Parish Council and commuters from North Cambridge and Abbey Ward. 9 Consider a different sludge processing site for the proposed increase in sludge		1. See Mitigation proposals to prevent HGVs going through villages. 2. Shaft 4 has been relocated to a more appropriate location 3. Community Liaison Plan sets out engagement as does the CTMP. 4. Monitoring of speed limits part of CTMP. 5. Construction Traffic will be monitored - CTMP. 6. Traffic mitigation design has included NMUs. 7. We are using excavated material from the site and the tunnel 8. Community Liaison Plan sets out engagement. 9. This is not an option, satellite sites are too small for sludge processing, the Cambridge facility provides a vital service for customers in and around Cambridge	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP
Stow Cum Quy PC	Traffic and Access		Quy PC are disappointed that option 3 (direct access to the A14 from the site) was not selected	n	The Applicant understands the preference for Access Option 3. However, a thorough assessment was taken using an evidence- led approach that included undertaking highway and traffic modelling alongside assessment across a wide range of criteria to ascertain the preferred site access option. -The Alternatives chapter of the ES sets out details in relation to the selection on options.	Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic & Transport, Application Document Ref: 5.2.3 Chapter Alternatives
Chris Moody	Traffic and Access		The stakeholder lives at the north end of Long Drove and is concerned about the impact on his property.	n	The Applicant has confirmed that access would be maintained on access roads for residents. The	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					Applicant referred the stakeholder to the project's website to see plans of the proposed scheme.	
Janice Alison Hawkes	Traffic and Access		The stakeholder wanted to have details as to how these new plans might affect her.	n	The Applicant confirmed access to property which may be affected for a limited time whilst pipeline construction is underway but access will be possible each day and the contractors will ensure this is not blocked. Bannold Road will be used for construction traffic so there will be an increase in vehicle use and this is explained on the project's website but explained the pipeline will be drilled underneath the Bannold Road.	
Christopher Bryant	Traffic and Access		The stakeholder had a query about access to his property.	n	The Applicant responded to the stakeholder to confirm Long Drove would remain open to residents to pass throughout the work, as would Bannold Road.	
Monique Hall Smith of Wireless Infrastructure Group (The Wireless Infrastructure Company)	Traffic and Access		The stakeholder asked for more details about access to its property during construction of the projects.	n	The Applicant has engaged with the stakeholder directly through the projects Land Team and provided further details and confirmed that access to the tower will be maintained during the construction period, which is likely to run from 2025 to 2028.	
Quy Fen Trust	Traffic and transport	Driver delay	No supporting information is provided that correlates traffic forecasts with meaningful traffic modelling data and current plans do not seem to fully account for Waterbeach New Town, construction traffic, operational traffic, general growth, Marleigh development, Cambridge Airport.	n	The Applicant has looked at future scenarios for 2026 peak construction year, 2028 opening operational year and 2038 operational year plus 10 years. This has been discussed and agreed with the Local Highway Authority. Could add text below to acknowledge how the construction/operation impacts have been assessed. The Cumulative Effects Chapter has considered the impacts of construction of the Waterbeach New Town and station. With general background traffic growth in the traffic models, accounting for the Marleigh site and potential development options for Cambridge Airport	Application Document Ref. 5.2.19 Traffic and Transport Application Document Ref 5.4.19.1 & 5.4.19.2 Traffic Surveys, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.3 Transport Assessment, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.4 Pedestrian Counts, Application Document Ref 5.2.21 Cumulative Effects Chapter

Table 1-15 Water Resources

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cam Valley Forum	Water resources	PEIR	We note now, in the PEIR Water Resources Paper, that Sections 1.15 and 1.16 (ostensibly addressing Water quality) on pages 6 and 7 are missing. What were they? Where are they? They are now blank. Is this a typographical error or was something redacted.	y	The Applicant confirms that this was a formatting error in the PEIR that has now been amended. Pages 6 and 7 were missing. The empty paragraphs were a formatting issue due to the return character being used, resulting in empty lines. The blank lines should have been deleted however the Applicant confirms no information was missing. This is corrected in the ES Water Chapter at application.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources
Cam Valley Forum	Water resources	Quality	We expect Anglian Water seriously to consider further investment in phosphate reduction to an aspirational 0.2 mg/l Total Phosphorus (Greater Cambridge Local Plan Consultation: Response from the Cam Valley Forum, 13 December 2021). This is essential for Chalk Stream recovery. We need to see as soon as possible, marked reductions in phosphorus discharging from STWs higher in the catchment. This is the urgency. The existing high concentrations of phosphorus in the Cam upstream of the new WRC site should not be seen as an excuse for failing to reduce the phosphorus outflow at the design stage for the new WWTP site to the lowest level possible. We are pleased to see the changes projected though for phosphorus we do not believe that your proposed limit of 0.4 mg/litre P is sufficiently low and must be addressed.	n	Water quality and phosphate is considered in the ES Chapter on Water Resources. The Applicant has worked with the Environment Agency to define permit limits for water quality including phosphorus. Over its operational lifetime, the Proposed Development's final effluent discharges will remain subject to the Environmental Permitting regime. The Environment Agency is required through the River Basin Management Planning (RBMP) process to ensure that river water quality is maintained and will periodically review the relevant water quality components in the Environmental Permit. Permit conditions are, therefore, likely to vary over time in response to changes in flow, including those arising from population growth, changes in water usage, climatic or environmental factors.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources
Cam Valley Forum	Water quality	CSOs	Any performance with respect to CSOs should be as good as present Cowley Road performance or it will not be good enough.	n	The proposed WWTP will increase flow to full treatment compared to the existing Cambridge WWTP. Preliminary storm water modelling indicates that in a ten-year simulation, increased treated flows would result in fewer storm water discharge incidents to the River Cam; no storm water discharge incidents were predicted from modelling exercises that consider a ten-year period. The impact of increased treated flows on CSO discharges has not been modelled. However, improved throughflow of storm water to storm tanks is expected to reduce CSO discharge frequency. Decreased frequency of storm water	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					discharge to the River Cam will benefit water quality. Full details in the ES Chapter on Water.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Water resources	Outfall	The Water Resources PEI includes details of how the final effluent and discharge pipelines are proposed to cross shallow ditches to reach the outfall point of the River Cam. It is understood that discharge is proposed to be to the River Cam itself, however, as opposed to utilising the prominent drainage ditch and local infrastructure. It is not clear on the extents of the site boundaries and whether third party permissions would be required to reach the outfall point.	n	The Applicant has included design plans of the Outfall in the application. The outfall is subject to separate consent, it is also recognised that there will be an opportunity for further design refinement which would be reflected within the application for consent and subject to further stakeholder discussion closer to the time that the permit is sought.	Application Document Ref 4.13 Design Plans - Outfall
Cambridgeshire County Council	Water resources		Any works to watercourses outside of the IDB district must be submitted to the LLFA for review	n	The Applicant has engaged with the LLFA and a Schedule of affected watercourses has been provided. The Applicant has shared the drainage strategy with the LLFA for comment.	Application Document Ref 5.4.20.12 Drainage Strategy
Cambridgeshire County Council	Water resources	Flooding/SUDS	It is acknowledged that the surface water drainage strategy is being designed and will be provided in a later submission. The LLFA will expect that surface water from the additional hard standing areas across the site to be managed in line with national guidance. This includes the use of SuDS to manage surface water close to the source, building a SuDS management train and ensuring that the system is designed suitably for the lifetime of the development, including allowance for climate change. In line with the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), rates should be limited to the greenfield equivalents if discharging off site. Source control is required to intercept and manage rainfall at source, such as permeable paving, rain gardens and green roofs. All surface water being discharged from the site should be at the greenfield equivalents and be suitably treated in line with the standard index approach to protect the	n	The Outline Drainage Strategy included in the Application verifies that SuDs will be used where possible and that drainage rates will align with rates prescribed within the SPD. The detailed Drainage Strategy and plans will be developed post consent and predevelopment and agreed with the LLFA.	Application Document Ref 5.4.20.12 Outline Drainage Strategy

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			receptors from potentially hazardous contaminants. The range of SuDS available means that any site can utilise and accommodate SuDS to sustainably manage and control runoff from the site.			
Cambridgeshire County Council	Water resources	Surface water discharge	As LLFA it should be noted that we would also be looking for how contaminants from construction activity will be managed on-site to protect any receptors of surface water discharge.	n	This is considered in the Code of Construction Practice.	Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 Code of Construction Practice Part A, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.2 Code of Construction Practice Part B
Cambridgeshire County Council	Water quality	Wildlife impact	Consideration should be given to how the scheme will impact water quality (river flows, deposition etc.) of the River Cam County Wildlife Sites and the 'knock on' impact on wildlife site downstream, including the Ouse Washes SSSI / Ramsar / SAC / SPA. For European sites, this will need to be adequately addressed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment.	n	Impacts to water quality are set out in the ES chapters on Water Resources and Biodiversity. Furthermore, the HRA considered designated sites such as SP/SAC/Ramsar.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8. Chapter 8: Biodiversity, Application Document Ref 5.2.20 Water Resources, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.16 HRA report
Cambridgeshire County Council	Water quality	Ecological impact	Impact to aquatic species (e.g., fish, macroinvertebrates etc.) associated with changes to water quality during construction of new outfall / bank stabilisation works	n	The water environment is fully assessed and reported in the Water Resources chapter of the ES. Impacts and associated effects aquatic species are assessed and reported in the Biodiversity chapter of the ES. This assessment refers to the findings of the Water Resources chapter. It is also noted that works to construct the outfall would be subject to an environmental permit (flood risk activities permit) and that the works to construct the outfall would be completed in accordance with the specific conditions attached to this permit.	Application Document Ref 5.2.8 ES Chapter on Biodiversity, Application Document Ref. 5.2.20 ES Chapter on Water Resources
Canal and River Trust	Water Resources		Note that Inland Waterways Association, The East Anglian Waterways Association and EA should be consulted.	n	The Applicant notes the comments and has included Inland Waterways within the consultation. The Applicant has consulted with the Cam Conservators as the navigational authority and with the Environment Agency and will continue to discuss with them both the final design and any mitigation required in relation to the outfall structure in additional to any impact on recreational users of the River Cam.	
CPRE	Water Resources	River Cam and Old West Water River Potential for Water Quality	Page 4 point 16 - CPRE are concerned that a Water Framework Directive assessment is not and will not be available for public scrutiny until Anglian Water have submitted their final	n	The approach to the WFD assessment has been developed in consultation with the Environment Agency. The WFD assessment activities consider the following water bodies, Cam (Surface water body; river); Cam and Ely Ouse Chalk (Groundwater body); and Cam and Ely Ouse Woburn	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources , Application Document Ref 5.4.20.3 WFD Assessment

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			application for a DCO to the Planning Inspectorate. The effect of the move of the CWWTP on the flow of the River Cam and the life it supports is of huge importance to the catchment area. The river is already in a poor state due to over abstraction upstream creating a low flow. It is also polluted due to Anglian Water's frequent release of raw sewage from upstream WWTPs such as Haslingfield.		Sands (Groundwater body). The WFD Assessment is included in the application.	
Federation of Cam Residents	Water Resources	Quality	AW has ignored the fact that contaminated groundwater in the chalk aquifer beneath the site could pollute other receptors and protected rights (local well users) as well as other parts of the surface water drainage network.	n	This is considered in the ES Chapter on Water Resources.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.20 ES Chapter Water resources
National Trust	Water Resources	Hydrology/Hydrogeology	The Trust has reviewed the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment Report (March 2021) relating to Site. The impact assessment investigated permeability at Site 3 using just a single borehole.(BH1), and the Wicken Vision Area. Our interests relate to: • Drainage from Site 3. Contaminant risks from chalk marl. Further review and response to specific queries raised is needed. • Temporary dewatering in the West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation at Site 3 • Treated effluent discharge. Concerns: Anglesey Abbey CWS is scoped out as it is stated that there are no hydrological or ecological pathways to the site.	n	Meeting of both parties experts held to discuss this concern on 5th July 2022. Pumping tests were performed in 2021 to determine hydrogeological properties of the West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation. Contaminant risk in the chalk is addressed in the revised Contaminant Transport model (ConSIM) which uses updated hydraulic properties provided by pumping test data. Results of the revised modelling are discussed and used in an assessment of potential for groundwater contamination in the Environmental Statement. Pumping test data also informs the dewatering strategy. Any contamination in groundwater is unlikely to migrate beyond the drains connected to Black Ditch. As the drains and Black Ditch are located down-gradient of the proposed WWTP, groundwater underlying the site would be expected to discharge within this surface water network. Although Anglesey Abbey CWS is not considered (it is more distant and not in the Black Ditch catchment), the ES does assess the potential impact on Quy Fen SSSI. It concludes that, based on the results of the ConSim modelling, the risk of an impact on groundwater resources in the Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI should be negligible. Analysis of the impact of dewatering during construction of the terminal pumping station (TPS) shaft (the deepest	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water resources 5.2.20, Application Document Ref 5.4.20.3 WFD Assessment

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					structure in the proposed WWTP) indicated that, for the maximum estimate of the dewatering rate, the impact on groundwater levels at Quy Fen SSSI would be less than 1mm (<0.001m). Based on this analysis, the magnitude of impact on groundwater levels at Quy Fen SSSI due to temporary dewatering for all other groundworks is also assessed as negligible. This assessment takes into account the intermittent nature of the dewatering for groundworks, albeit over a substantially longer time period than for the TPS shaft. Treated effluent will be discharged to the River Cam.	
Natural England	Water Resources	Hydrological effects	Natural England's primary concern is water quality and the potential for any contamination of the Black Ditch to affect the sensitive notified features of the SSSI. We note that the HIA concludes that with implementation of appropriate code of construction practice (CoCP) mitigation, including monitoring, there will be negligible impact to water-dependent designated sites including Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI. The HIA concludes that with implementation of appropriate Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) mitigation, including monitoring, there will be negligible impact to water-dependent designated sites including Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI. Mitigation measures in the CoCP will control and prevent the discharge of silt into field boundary ditches and the Black Ditch. Natural England supports this conclusion subject to CoCP mitigation and monitoring measures being agreed, with Natural England, and their implementation secured through the DCO process.	n	The Applicant will continue to consult with NE in relation to ongoing monitoring and the final mitigation measures included in the CoCP.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources, Application Document Refs 5.4.2.1. COCP A & 5.4.2.2. COCP B
Natural England	Water resources	Water Quality	Proposals in accordance with EA environmental permit are noted and subsequent water quality improvements. The PEIR emphasises that consent conditions will require reduced concentrations of contaminants	n	The Applicant acknowledges the response and Natural England will continue to be engaged in relation to the EPR permit as submitted to the Environment Agency.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			including phosphorus, ammonia and biological oxygen demand (BOD), compared to the existing Cambridge WWTP. Once the proposed WWTP becomes operational water quality in the River Cam will therefore improve. We note that further water quality improvements will arise through reduction in frequency of storm water discharges to the River Cam. Natural England welcomes this, although we note that the final effluent discharge to the river will increase over time, as the WWTP serves an increasing population, and this will remain subject to EA water quality consent conditions which may vary over the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development.			
Quy Fen Trust	Water Resources	Water Quality	Potential for ground contamination appear to have been dismissed along with those other contributors however page 35 of the AW introductory paper states one of the criteria for not sinking the tallest structure below ground is risk of ground contamination.	n	Pumping tests were performed in 2021 to determine hydrogeological properties of the West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation. Contaminant risk in the chalk is addressed in the revised Contaminant Transport model (ConSIM) which uses updated hydraulic properties provided by pumping test data. In Chapter 20 of the Environment Statement (Water Resources), it is concluded that the implementation of regular inspection and maintenance of below-ground tanks and drainage systems, and rigorous groundwater protection measures, would reduce the potential impact on groundwater quality in the aquifer in the West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation to negligible.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.20 Water Chapter, Application Document Ref: 5.4.20.3 WFD Assessment
Quy Fen Trust	Water Resources	Quality	The PEIR has done little to allay the concerns on the risk of hydrological connectivity and potential for pollution of Stow Cum Quy Fen from both ground and surface water and proposals in PEI water resources document show preliminary modelling to be limited and represent a significant risk - also noted as part of Con2 response	n	Hydraulic connectivity is considered in the water resources chapter of the ES. Significance of effect to nature conservation site is considered in Biodiversity chapter of the ES. Pumping tests were performed in 2021 to determine hydrogeological properties of the West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation. Contaminant risk in the chalk is addressed in the revised Contaminant Transport model (ConSIM) which uses updated hydraulic properties provided by pumping test data. Based on the results of the ConSim modelling, the risk of an impact on groundwater resources in the Quy Fen SSSI should be negligible.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter: 20 Water Resources

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					Inspection, maintenance and groundwater protection measures should also reduce the risk due to potential contamination of the sub-surface drainage network in the proposed WWTP. The sub-surface drainage network is connected to a drain linked to Black Ditch. The impact on Black Ditch, which flows along the boundary just within Quy Fen SSSI, is assessed as minor. Some grassland areas of Quy Fen SSSI, and water bodies within these areas, are also connected with Black Ditch. However, this connection only occurs under high water level conditions in which there is over-bank flow from the ditch. In the unlikely event that contaminants were present in Black Ditch, further substantial dilution of these contaminants would occur in any high flows discharging to Quy Fen.	
Quy Fen Trust	Water Resources	Quality	There is a particular concern about pollution of Black Ditch and Quy Fen if an extreme event or other system failure occurs with inconsistencies within the preliminary documentation regarding potential impacts to both ground and surface water. As Quy Fen is a registered a SSSI it must not be subject to the risk of pollution.	n	The potential for groundwater flooding, and the importance of avoiding groundwater flooding within the proposed WWTP, will be taken into account in the detailed drainage design for the proposed WWTP.	
Teversham Parish Council	Water Resources	Quality	We are concerned about additional contamination of the river Cam with additional discharges. The Cam is a key recreational resource and a new water plant would have been an opportunity to reduce the risks associated with this.	n	The impact on water quality is discussed in the ES Chapter on Water Resources.	Application Document: 5.2.20 ES Chapter Water Resources
The Environment Agency	Water Resources	Surface water	We have had recent pre-permit discussions regarding the proposed stormwater management measures and associated modelling, which have progressed positively.	N	The Applicant notes the response and that the Environment Agency is satisfied with the pre application engagement for the stormwater management permit proposals. The final permit application will be made before the commencement of the DCO examination.	
The Environment Agency	Water Resources	IDB Bannolds drain	Noting the comments on page 23 regarding Bannold Drain, reduced water flow could negatively impact water quality and ecology and it's important that a water level is maintained.	N	The current water management activities for Bannold Drain have been discussed with the IDB. It is understood that ceasing the flow from the existing Waterbeach WRC is likely to result in increased frequency of low water levels in this location. It is also understood that this ditch contains water vole, and that this population could be affected by changes in water level / drying of the ditch. The Waterbeach New Town development also plans works	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 Chapter 20: Water Resources, Application Document Ref 5.4.8.3 Water Vole, Application Document Ref 5.4.20.12 Drainage strategy, Application Document Ref 5.4.21.2

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					to Bannold Drain and also plans to integrate the ditch into its surface water drainage proposals. The EIA will consider Waterbeach New Town as part of the cumulative effects assessment since the decommissioning of the WRC is not within the DCO. Further discussions are planned with the IDB to discuss water level management in the context of ceasing use of Waterbeach WRC with the view of understanding approaches to water level management to maintain water levels in the ditch prior to works from the Waterbeach New Town development commencing.	Cumulative Impacts Assessment Matrix
The Environment Agency	Water Resources	Flood risk	We are generally satisfied with the preliminary information provided in the consultation. We note that preliminary fluvial models have been completed and an assessment of flood risk will be undertaken for the DCO application utilising a climate change allowance of 20%.		The Applicant notes the comment and that the Environment Agency is satisfied with the fluvial modelling undertaken to date. It is agreed that the Flood Risk Activity permit will be submitted via the EPR permit process.	Application Document Ref 5.4.20.1 Flood Risk Assessment
The Environment Agency	Water Resources	FRAP	We are generally satisfied with outline design concept for the proposed new outfall on the River Cam. However, we will require more information as designs progress for the new outfall. We would favour designs that minimise the loss of natural bank wherever possible e.g., small outfalls that minimise footprint, a semi-natural entry set back from the river bank. Design choices should be fully explained and justified. You will require consent from us for the outfall (and any works to a main river) via an Environmental Permit (Flood Risk Activity Permit) if the FRAP is not disapplied via the DCO or approval via protected provisions within the DCO. The WFD Assessment should also form the evidence base for design options and mitigation options. The creation of marginal habitat in to the design of the outfall should also be fully explored (reeds, sedgebeds) to help improve water quality and ecology.	Y	The development of the outfall design has sought to minimise disturbance to the bank and ensure that the structure is blended insofar as is possible into the surrounds. It has been designed to avoid changes to levels on the existing public right of way in this location. The refinement of the outfall has been subject to detailed modelling using a computational fluid dynamic (CFD) model and also scour modelling to inform the design of the outfall and river bank protection works either side of the outfall. The Water Resources Chapter of the ES refers to the findings of the FRA in the completion of the environmental assessment.	Application Document Ref Design Plans - Outfall 4.13 1 - 4.13 5
The Environment Agency	Water Resources	Groundwater	The development as proposed involves potential sub-water table transmission of pollutants within principal and secondary	n	Contaminant transport through Principal aquifer (West Melbury Marly Chalk Formation) is addressed by updated Contaminant transport model. No superficial deposits	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter: 20

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			aquifers. This is contrary to C5 in our Groundwater Protection. Appropriate engineering standards and effective management systems required. .		present at proposed WWTP. Impact of dewatering on groundwater flows and levels in superficial deposits during construction of open-cut pipelines and trenches is considered in the ES.	
The Environment Agency	Water Resources	Groundwater Abstractions	We note (page14) that unlicensed private groundwater abstractions have been identified in the vicinity of the scheme, based upon information provided by local councils. It is essential that all private groundwater abstractions are identified and that their construction, source aquifer(s) and abstraction rates are confirmed.	n	Water resources surveys have been undertaken to confirm active private groundwater abstractions. Information on construction, source aquifer and use, has been provided where available by homeowners. Abstraction rates will be <20m3/d as they are unlicensed.	
Waterbeach Parish Council	Water Quality/Design		WPC note there is no provision for an overflow at the New Waterbeach pumping station. This would mean that if there was a system failure at the other end of the transfer this would lead to effluent being spilled to ground at the proposed new WWTP. It is deemed that safety measures are designed in to protect residents and the risk of polluting the land at the receiving WWTP.	n	The Applicant can confirm that in relation to the provision of an overflow at the New Waterbeach pumping station, if there is a system failure at the new WWTP end, the discharge wouldn't be spilled onto the ground of WWTP. The new WWTP has storm tanks and storm storage within the transfer tunnel designed within it. In the event of excessive flow, i.e., a power failure, then the storm tanks on site will attenuate the flow. In terms of the pipeline itself, the likelihood of a burst occurring during extreme events or the event of a burst, are slight given the fact it will be a new section of rising main made from polyethylene which is very robust. The pipe sections will be heat welded-together and the welds are generally stronger than the pipe itself. In the very unlikely event of a burst Anglian Water would, as is standard practice across the network, close off the system and tanker the waste water until the burst was fixed. The final design work for the pumping station is not yet complete but will form part of the final planning permissions/reserved matters for the Waterbeach New Town Development.	
Waterbeach Parish Council	Water Resources	EIA impact	WPC seek further information regarding the potential harm to the river Cam that the project may have. It is unclear how the flow will be maintained or if there will be harm caused by tunnelling under the river. Waterbeach parish is a highly agricultural area. Farmers are reliant on water abstraction for crop watering during drought. How will AW ensure that there will be enough provision of water to maintain the viability	n	The Applicant can confirm that the construction of the Proposed Development requires crossing by the Waterbeach pipeline in two locations and by the transfer tunnel in one location. The construction will be through trenchless techniques and subject to separate environmental permits issued by the Environment Agency (EA). There is no anticipated change to flows in the River Cam during construction of these crossings, with the construction crossings sufficiently below the river bed to prevent water ingress. These will be subject to a risk	Application Document Ref 4.14 Design Plans - Waterbeach pipeline long sections, Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources, Application Document Ref 5.4.20.3 WFD Assessment Report

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			of food production? Will this be a consideration when completing the Water Framework Directive as required by the Environment Agency?		assessment and method statement (RAMS) as part of standard construction practice and the RAMS will also be provided to the EA as part of the permitting process / obligations. In relation to dewatering during the construction phase there may be a requirement for short term dewatering, in particular of deep excavations associated with features such as the shafts and deep tunnel. Waterbeach is a shallow pipeline at 2 metres and there may be the requirement for very short-term localised dewatering, including to remove rainwater ingress to excavations. Dewatering activities would be subject to regulations and in some instances (depending on the scale of the dewatering and volumes of water) permits agreed with the Environment Agency. Based on information collected as part of the ongoing design and assessment of the Proposed Development and taking into account the likely methods employed in construction, it is not anticipated that there would be significant effects to water resources including water availability to licensed abstractors, and/or private unlicensed abstractions. The Applicant acknowledges the comments regarding the Water Framework Directive, however, there is no specific or prescribed format or process to follow for WFD assessments. The approach to the WFD assessment has been developed in consultation with the Environment Agency. The WFD assessment activities consider the following water bodies : Cam (Surface water body; river); Cam and Ely Ouse Chalk (Groundwater body); and Cam and Ely Ouse Woburn Sands (Groundwater body). The full details of the WFD assessment are now included in the Environmental Statement.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Water quality		It is understood that consent requirements for the ReWWTP, advised by the Environment Agency, will require a reduced concentration in final treated effluent discharges of phosphorus, ammonia, total suspended solids and biological oxygen demand (BOD), when compared to the consented limits at the CWWTP. This represents a potential environmental benefit to water quality in	n	The Applicant has worked with the Environment Agency to define permit limits for water quality including phosphorus. The tighter limits at the proposed WWTP will mean that there should be an improvement in river water quality at the time the Proposed Development becomes operational. Over its operational lifetime, the Proposed Development's final effluent discharges will remain subject to the Environmental Permitting regime. The Environment Agency is required through the River Basin Management Planning (RBMP) process to ensure	Application Document Ref: 5.2.20 ES Water Resources Chapter

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			the River Cam when the ReWWTP starts to operate that needs to be clearly articulated in any DCO submission. The District Council welcomes these water quality requirements and benefits and considers these to be an important benefit to the local area from the project which should be part of the required elements of the proposed project		that river water quality does not deteriorate and will periodically review the relevant water quality components in the Environmental Permit. Permit conditions are, therefore, likely to vary over time in response to changes in flow, including those arising from population growth, changes in water usage, climatic or environmental factors.	
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Water quality		Water Technology Although it is noted that the water technologies to be employed as part of the ReWWTP are primarily the matter that the Environment Agency (EA) will be able to consider and provide its views upon, the District Council considers further detail should be provided. In particular, further detail on the principles and methodology behind the choice of water technology and the implications for whole-life carbon and sustainability (including from operation as well as from use of the treated solids), odour, and transport movements from the site should be provided. The District Council considers that it and local communities should be given the opportunity, at this stage in the process, to review this information so that the choices made and reasons for them can be seen as being both operationally robust and also in keeping with the principles of exemplary design on which the case for relocation was made by the applicant. The method ultimately chosen will evidently have implications upon the extent of Order land required, the scale of structures including the digester tanks, the sustainability and power generation potential of the plant and odour. The District Council therefore considers further information regarding this, and	n	There has been a series of engagement with Council Officers on water technologies and water resources, otherwise details on the water outfall have been discussed with Officers who sit on the Biodiversity TWG.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.20 Water Chapter,

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			an assessment of the best technological solution, should be provided.			
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Water resources	Groundwater levels	The Consultation material indicates there will only be a minor reduction to ground water levels during the proposed dewatering during construction. Given the considerable local interest in this element of development and its potential adverse effects, additional evidence to demonstrate how these conclusions have been drawn how robust they are and the provision of proposals for monitoring during the construction phase are required in the District Council view. These would allow the District Council (and consultees) to consider these conclusions and would form part of the District Council's Local Impact Statement at the DCO examination stage. The District Council notes that it is unclear for example how many ponds in the vicinity of the site are reliant on ground water as well as what the assumed reduction will be. The temporary loss of quality habitat will need to be mitigated and these details provided	n	This is considered in the groundwater assessment of the ES.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources
South Cambridgeshire District Council	Water resources		In reference to Bannold's Drain any implications arising from the proposed development upon that existing water infrastructure should therefore be considered and explained (along with any mitigation) through the material prepared for the DCO application and subsequent examination.	n	The Applicant has assessed this in the Water Chapter. Ceasing the use of Bannold Drain outfall would be subject to assessment as part of a separate planning application and is considered within Chapter 21: Cumulative Effects Assessment.	Application Documents Ref 5.2.20 ES Chapter Water, Application Document Ref 5.2.21 ES, Chapter 21: Cumulative Effects
Cambridge City Council	Water resources	Quality and quantity	The City Council is committed to increasing the quality and flows of water in the surrounding water courses and supports the shift to low carbon/energy utilities infrastructure as part of its commitment to securing net zero carbon in Cambridgeshire. Evidence related to the greater intensity of rainfall events	n	The-Environment Statement details the impacts to water resources and sets out the mitigation measures to minimise any adverse impacts. Discussions with GCSPS Officers on water resources have been held and these discussions continue as we work upon agreeing a Statement of Common Ground with the Council.	Application Document Ref: 5.2.20 ES Chapter Water Resources

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			and the ability of the new drainage infrastructure to help manage more effectively the environmental and amenity impacts of such events on the river environment, and upon local communities are also important aspects which will inform the City Council's position in terms of the benefits and effects from the development proposed. Anglian is therefore requested to set out more completely how the development will align with these objectives.			
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Water resources	Storm water	Overall, FDPC are deeply concerned that the stormwater provision will be inadequate (see also our response on Climate Resilience below) and would not work under conditions of system failure and may request the Environment Agency to re-examine the issue.	n	The Applicant is confident that the storm storage capacity is adequate. The Environment Agency calculate storm storage *capacity at 68 litres per person*. This means that storm capacity is calculated by population equivalent x 68 = 275000 x 60 = c19ML (Megalitres). The proposed WWTP will be treating approximately 65% more baseline flows than the current WWTP capability. This has the biggest impact on the storm resilience as it means more flows are being treated to the permitted discharge consent before having to be sent to the storm tanks for storage.	
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Water resources	Storm water	There is no in-built resilience to out of design conditions. Information of concern which must be provided includes: Data for the design inlet and outlet storm water flow at the works under the current and 1:100 +20% condition in 2040 and 2050 together with predicted changes to the frequency of CSO events. The upper design air temperature range of 40° C needs to be clarified as to if this is a daily average or peak value. Clarity as to whether the water to be supplied to the transfer tunnel, in order to alleviate low flows, will be sourced from drinking water or elsewhere. a. Provide details of how it will meet the commitment that the surface water drainage network within the proposed WWTP will be internal to the bund to avoid overland escapes to land, the Black Ditch and Quy Fen. b.	n	The Applicant has modelled network performance at 1:100 years plus 20% condition as standard, this results in the TPS being able to pump 7000 l/sec in a storm event, which is split between 2000 l/sec FFT (full flow to treatment) and 5000 l/sec storm flow to storm tank. The modelling for storm performance predicts no CSO discharges from the WWTP. Water supplied in low flow will not be sourced from drinking water it is usual to recirculate effluent within water treatment facilities. In normal operations the surface water drained from within the proposed WWTP will be contained within the earth bank. In exceptional circumstances, should there be high ground water levels and an extreme rainfall event, there is the potential to utilise the Ridge and Furrow feature within the landscape masterplan to attenuate and absorb the water as a natural solution to surface water management. The Applicant is working with the LLFA to establish how this is best applied. There will be no emergency overflow outlet from the Waterbeach pipeline, all waste water will be transferred to the proposed WWTP for treatment. The Applicant is confident that assumptions	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources, Application Document Ref 5.4.20.10 Storm Model Report

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			Providing an emergency overflow outlet from the Waterbeach system. c. The River Cam flood model should include examination of land in the defended floodplain at Waterbeach. d. The assumptions about future stormwater flows, capacity requirements and water use by residents should include a variant based on Business-As-Usual water use by customers and be clear about population projections after 2040. There is no reason at this stage to stop at 2040 since projections exist within the Water Resources East publications to 2050 and alternative growth beyond could be based on, say, 0.5 0.75 and 1% growth alternatives.		that have been used in storm water modelling provide an accurate basis for modelling future storm water flows. The application includes a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) that includes a consideration of the area in Waterbeach benefitting from defences. Fluvial modelling completed as part of the assessments for the Proposed Development included the preparation of flood outlines which account for the mitigating effects of existing flood defences.	
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Water resources	Flow	AW should provide a clear statement of their predictions covering the period from 2015 to 2050 of: populations to be served; flow to full treatment; Dry Weather Flow and treatment capacity and they should provide their assumed future values of Q95 flows at Bottisham Lock.	n	ES Chapter 2 (Project Description) sets out the approach to sizing and phasing of the Proposed Development and assumptions made in relation to the period between year 1 of operation and 2050. The Applicant has worked with the Environment Agency, as regulator, to define and agree the treatment capacity and dry weather flow as part of the discharge permit application. The river model report provides details of predicted water levels and flow rates at various locations along the river (including Bottisham Lock) for a range of flood conditions with the following return periods: 1 in 2, 1 in 10, 1 in 20, 1 in 30, 1 in 50, 1 in 75, 1 in 100, 1 in 200 and 1 in 1,000 years. The potential impacts of climate change (with 20% uplift in flow rate) has also been considered. Future benefits to river quality would be dependent on the actual impact of climate change at low flows. The report does not specifically refer to Q95 flows as the report was looking at flood conditions.	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2 Project Description , Application Document Ref. 5.2.20 Water Resources
Fen Ditton Parish Council	Water resources	Quality	FDPC considers that: a. AW should provide a copy of the draft Habitats Regulations Assessment. B. AW should include an assessment of what changes in effluent quality may be required as a result of climate change and what assumptions they have made to ensure the future expansion to	n	a. The HRA is included in the application. b. The Environment Agency continuously review the process and the applicant will adapt the operation accordingly in the future to ensure capacity with changes in climate. There is space for expansion to accommodate increases in capacity, further information is set out in Chapter 2 of the ES (project description) and design plans.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.16 HRA Report, Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description, Application Document Ref 4.9 Design Plans - Proposed Waste Water Treatment Plant,

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			300,000PE can be accommodated inside the bund. c. AW should ensure that buried piped land drains are recognised as potential flow and pollution pathways to the Black Ditch. d. AW should ensure effluent used for pipeline or pressure testing is not discharged to drains connected to the Black Ditch. e. AW should provide their surface drainage strategy. f. AW should revise their Hydrogeological Impact Assessment Report to include the Waterbeach pipeline and ensure that the desk study of groundwater users is expanded to include everyone who has or will contact AW about their borehole or well.		c. All pollution pathways will be prevented from connecting to Black Ditch, the risk is assessed in the ES Chapter Water Resources. d. Effluent used for pipeline or pressure testing will not be discharged to drains connected to the Black Ditch. e. Surface Water Drainage Strategy is included in application. f. In discussion with the Environment Agency the Applicant has identified and agreed where it is appropriate to enter into non-derogation agreements in relation to private wells. The CoCP includes a suite of measures in relation to the protection of water resources and also requires that the work complies with all legal requirements including instances when dewatering permits from the Environment Agency are required. Reference to private wells is included in the Environment Statement.	Application Document Ref 5.4.20.12 Drainage Strategy, Application Document Ref 5.4.20.9 HIA (Site Selection Stage), Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP; Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES Chapter Water Resources
Horningsea Parish Council	Water resources	Water quality	There is particular concern about pollution of Black Ditch and Quy Fen if an extreme event or other system failure occurs.	n	In normal operations the surface water drained from within the proposed WWTP drainage network will be contained within the area of land surrounded by earth bank. In exceptional circumstances, should there be when there are high ground water levels and an extreme rainfall event, there is the potential to utilise the Ridge and Furrow feature within the landscape masterplan system to attenuate and absorb the water as a natural solution to surface water management. The Applicant is working with the LLFA to establish how this is best applied.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES Chapter Water Resources; Application Document Ref 5.4.20.12 Drainage Strategy
Save Honey Hill	Surface water		Commit to the surface water drainage network within the proposed WWTP being internal to the bund to avoid overland escapes to land, the Black Ditch and Quy Fen	n	In normal operations the surface water drained from within the proposed WWTP drainage network will be contained within the area of land surrounded by earth bank. In exceptional circumstances, should there be when there are high ground water levels and an extreme rainfall event, there is the potential to utilise the Ridge and Furrow feature within the landscape masterplan system to attenuate and absorb the water as a natural solution to surface water management. The Applicant is working with the LLFA to establish how this is best applied.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources, Application Document Ref 5.4.20.12 Drainage Strategy

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Save Honey Hill	Storm overflow		Commit to providing an emergency storm overflow outlet from the Waterbeach system	n	The Applicant can confirm that in relation to the provision of an overflow at the New Waterbeach pumping station, if there is a system failure at the new WWTP end, the discharge wouldn't be spilled onto the ground of WWTP. The new WWTP has storm tanks and storm storage within the transfer tunnel . In the event of excessive flow, i.e., a power failure, then the storm tanks on site will attenuate the flow. In terms of the pipeline itself, the likelihood of a burst occurring during extreme events or the event of a burst, are slight given the fact it will be a new section of rising main made from polyethylene which is very robust. The pipe sections will be heat welded-together and the welds are generally stronger than the pipe itself. In the very unlikely event of a burst Anglian Water would, as is standard practice across the network, close off the system and tanker the waste water until the burst was fixed. The final design work for the pumping station is not yet complete but will form part of the final planning permissions/reserved matters for the Waterbeach New Town Development.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources
Save Honey Hill	Storm overflow		The assumptions about future stormwater flows, capacity requirements and water use by residents should include a variant based on Business-As-Usual water use by customers and be clear about population projections after 2040. There is no reason at this stage to stop at 2040 since projections exist within the Water Resources East publications to 2050 and alternative growth beyond could be based on, say, 0.5 0.75 and 1% growth alternatives.	n	The Applicant is confident that assumptions that have been used in storm water modelling provide an accurate basis for modelling future storm water flows.	Application Document Ref 5. 4.20.10 Storm Model Report
Save Honey Hill	Water resources	Black Ditch	With regard to the risk of sewage pollution of land and watercourses in Horningsea, the Black Ditch and Quy Fen should an extreme event or other system failure occur. incorporating some form of emergency overflow/escape at the Waterbeach pumping station could avoid this.	n	The Applicant can confirm that in relation to the provision of an overflow at the New Waterbeach pumping station, if there is a system failure at the new WWTP end, the discharge wouldn't be spilled onto the ground of WWTP. The new WWTP has storm tanks and storm storage within the transfer tunnel designed within it. In the event of excessive flow, i.e., a power failure, then the storm tanks on site will attenuate the flow. In terms of the pipeline itself, the likelihood of a burst occurring during extreme events or the event of a burst, are slight given the fact it will be a new section of rising main made from	Application Document Ref 5.2.2 ES, Chapter 2: Project Description

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					polyethylene which is very robust. The pipe sections will be heat welded-together and the welds are generally stronger than the pipe itself. In the very unlikely event of a burst Anglian Water would, as is standard practice across the network, close off the system and tanker the waste water until the burst was fixed. The final design work for the pumping station is not yet complete but will form part of the final planning permissions/reserved matters for the Waterbeach New Town Development.	
Save Honey Hill	Water resources	Flow	Recommendations 1 AW should provide a clear statement of their predictions covering the period from 2015 to 2050 of: populations to be served; flow to full treatment; Dry Weather Flow and treatment capacity. 2 AW should provide their assumed future values of Q95 flows at Bottisham Lock.	n	ES Chapter 2 (Project Description) sets out the approach to sizing and phasing of the Proposed Development and assumptions made in relation to the period between year 1 of operation and 2050. The Applicant has worked with the Environment Agency, as regulator, to define and agree the treatment capacity and dry weather flow as part of the discharge permit application. The river model report provides details of predicted water levels and flow rates at various locations along the river (including Bottisham Lock) for a range of flood conditions with the following return periods: 1 in 2, 1 in 10, 1 in 20, 1 in 30, 1 in 50, 1 in 75, 1 in 100, 1 in 200 and 1 in 1,000 years. The potential impacts of climate change (with 20% uplift in flow rate) has also been considered. Future benefits to river water quality would depend on the actual impact of climate change to low flows. The report does not specifically refer to Q95 flows as the report was looking at flood conditions.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources
Save Honey Hill	Water resources	Water quality	AW should ensure that buried piped land drains are recognised as potential flow and pollution pathways to the Black Ditch. AW should ensure effluent used for pipeline or pressure testing is not discharged to drains connected to the Black Ditch.	n	The ES Chapter 20 Water Resources assumes existing land drainage in the WWTP will be removed during excavation of the surface and therefore cannot form a pollution pathway. However, drainage of some areas not prone to contamination (low risk) will drain to Black Ditch as indicated in the drainage strategy. The Applicant can confirm that the treated effluent will not be used for testing and that test water will not be discharged to the Black Ditch. During construction the DCO will require the appointed contractor(s) to implement the CoCP. The CoCP will form part of the application and secured through a requirement of the DCO. The CoCP has specific measures in it relating to pollution prevention and control, as well as requiring the appointed contractors to obtain all relevant permits such as for dewatering and complete these activities in accordance with the conditions of the permit.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources; Application Document Ref. 5.4.20.12 Drainage Strategy

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					Furthermore, throughout the implementation of the Proposed Development there will be a dedicated Community Liaison Officer who will deal with concerns and complaints from the community.'	
Save Honey Hill	Water resources	Surface water	AW should provide their surface drainage strategy	n	The Surface Drainage Strategy is provided as part of the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.20.12 Drainage Strategy
Save Honey Hill	Water resources	Groundwater	AW should revise their Hydrogeological Impact Assessment Report to include the Waterbeach pipeline and ensure that the desk study of groundwater users is expanded to include everyone who has or will contact AW about their borehole or well.	n	In discussion with the Environment Agency the Applicant has identified and agreed where it is appropriate to enter into non-derogation agreements in relation to private wells. The CoCP includes a suite of measures in relation to the protection of water resources and also requires that the work complies with all legal requirements including instances when dewatering permits from the Environment Agency are required. The Environmental Statement references private wells.	Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP
Cllr John Williams	Water resources	Pollution	I note the relocated CWWTP will operate in accordance with water quality requirements to be agreed with the Environment Agency (EA) and that his represents a potential environmental benefit to water quality discharged into the River Cam. However, at this moment in time the EA requirements fall far short of what is necessary to protect the River Cam. I would expect Anglian Water to use the relocation of the CWWTP to go beyond current EA requirements in order to deliver the best water quality possible with the technology that will be available at the time of operation. I disagree that the water technology to be employed is a matter for the EA. The method ultimately chosen will not only affect water quality but also have implications for the size of the site, sustainability and power generation potential, odour and the scale of structures including the digester tanks. You should be seeking to construct an exemplar plant with an assessment of the best technological solution at the DCO submission stage.	n	Water quality assessment is set out in the Environment Statement Chapter on Water Resources.	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 ES, Chapter 20: Water Resources
Natural England	HIA	Hydrology/ Hydrogeology	Natural England's primary concern is water quality and the potential for any	y	The Applicant will continue to work with Natural England in the finalisation of the mitigation measures proposed	Application Document Ref 5.2.20 Chapter 20: Water

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			contamination of the Black Ditch to affect the sensitive notified features of the SSSI. We note that the HIA concludes that with implementation of appropriate code of construction practice (CoCP) mitigation, including monitoring, there will be negligible impact to water-dependent designated sites including Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI. The HIA concludes that with implementation of appropriate Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) mitigation, including monitoring, there will be negligible impact to water-dependent designated sites including Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI. Mitigation measures in the CoCP will control and prevent the discharge of silt into field boundary ditches and the Black Ditch. Natural England supports this conclusion subject to CoCP mitigation and monitoring measures being agreed, with Natural England, and their implementation secured through the DCO process.		within the CoCP and how they are secured through the DCO.	resources, Application Document Ref 5.4.20.8 Contaminant Transport Note, Application Document Ref 5.4.20.9 HIA (Site Selection Stage) and Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 & 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part A and B

Table 1-16 Other

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Cambridgeshire County Council	Draft DCO Plans	Supplementary Powers Part 4	The draft DCO document sets out the Supplementary Powers under Part 4. With regards to the Discharge of Water section 21(9) of the document states that the approving body for any consent on works to watercourses must be provided within 28 days. It is requested that this is increased to two months to align with legislation under the Land Drainage Act (1991).	n	The Applicant requires the standard 28 days to be maintained. The purpose of the DCO being to align and make permissions process more efficient. 28 days is a standard requisite for DCO's.	Application Document Ref 2.1 Draft Development Consent Order
Cambridgeshire County Council	Draft Consent Order and Work Plans	Highways/bridleways	There are a number of technical matters in relation to the proposed amendments to the road highway at Fen Ditton Road; the proposed bridleway creation; temporary works to other; and potential legal provisions affecting the status of Horningsea Byway No. 17/Fen Ditton Byway No. 14 that need to be addressed to ensure that appropriate provisions are secured within the DCO and accompanying legal agreements, which are set out in more detail below. It is noted that the draft DCO (dDCO) at present appears to be mainly a template with the detail yet to be fleshed out. The County Council understands that it is the intention of the Applicant to set up a technical working group to take these matters forward. The County Council strongly welcomes this approach, as it would be in the interests of all parties to agree the necessary detail in principle prior to submission of the DCO application. This would enable the Examination to proceed more smoothly and swiftly, saving significant resource for all parties concerned.	n	This has been reviewed in full within the PROW TWG held on 23 June 2022. This included a review and update on DCO plans and Draft DCO schedules for Prow Works and DCO provisions being applied for. Full details are set out in the LERMP. The PROW TWG will continue to meet as required to continue the engagement on this topic and best delivery methods and agreement will be set out in the Statement of Common Ground.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
Cambridgeshire county council	Draft Consent Order and Work Plans	Legal asset records	CCC set out the Legal Assets Records requirements	n	These requirements are picked up in the DCO application.	
Cambridgeshire County Council	Draft Consent Order and Work Plans	Traffic road closures	As noted under PEI Traffic & Transport, a number of temporary closures of PROW may be needed in order to deliver the scheme. These should be agreed with the LHA and documented in the Traffic Management Plan, and the dDCO should ensure that it makes reference to the requirement for a TMP to be agreed well before any construction work begins. Formal closures should be identified with the appropriate work item in Schedule 1 and	n	Temporary closures of PROW have been discussed and agreed with the LHA in the PROW TWG on 23 June 2022 and will be set out in the Statement of Common Ground	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			cross-referenced in Schedule 8 Traffic Regulation to the DCO.			
Cambridgeshire county council	Draft Consent Order and Work Plans	Schedule 2	It is anticipated that following details will need to be secured through a suitably worded requirement as part of Schedule 2: • detailed CEMP , • detailed landscape scheme, include demonstrating how BNG will be achieve, • detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and its implementation for a minimum of 30 years, It should also include a BNG audit to demonstrate that BNG target habitats have all been delivered.	n	This is included within the application.	Application Document Ref 5.4.8.14 LERMP
CPRE	Assessment		Page 4 point 15 - CPRE is concerned that a final Environmental Impact Assessment appears not to have been completed for the existing CWWTP site and that ongoing information gathering is still being progressed, which would imply that the level of contamination at the existing site is unknown. Thus, the risk to human health and environment during the decommissioning stage is unknown. It is also unclear if the land at the existing CWWTP can be remediated at acceptable cost to enable development where people will live and work.	n	An outline Decommissioning Strategy is included within the application. This Strategy has been discussed with the Environment Agency to ensure compliance with the rescission of the EPR permits. The EA will need to be satisfied that in addition within the Land Quality Chapter of the ES the Applicant has included the contaminated land risk assessments. Once the existing Cambridge WWTP has been brought forward for development these proposals would be supported by a separate planning application and associated EIA. This will include detail in relation to land quality and any remediation that may be required in respect of proposed future use of the land.	Application Document Ref 5.4.14.2 Contaminated Land Risk, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.3 Outline Decommissioning Plan
Historic England	NPPF	Terminology and classification	We note that some of the language that is used throughout the report, although similar to, differs from that which is used in the NPPF. For example, the report refers to heritage value rather than significance, and moderate, adverse, significant effect rather than harm. In our view the use of such language is likely to result in ambiguity in understanding the seriousness of any harm. For example, in its consideration of Biggin Abbey, the report makes reference to minor adverse impact, contributing to a permanent, moderate, adverse significant effect. It then concludes that the effects would be significant. We are unsure what his really	n	The Applicant accepts this comment and has used standard UK EIA language in the updated ES, which is no different to most other EIAs, and is in line with heritage EIA methodologies (such as the DMRB 2020). The language used by the Applicant is clear, indicates a level of significant effect (which can then be correlated to the level harm) and in line with the other environment topics. The Applicant has included a clear statement on the language used and how this correlate to the language used	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			means in NPPF terms. We therefore recommend that the ES full assessment aligns with the language and terms that are used in the NPPF in order to carry out a robust assessment that comes to a clear and meaningful conclusion as to the level of harm that would be caused to significance (of heritage assets).		by the NPPF in order to clarify this for the reader.	
Waterbeach Parish Council	PEIR	Mitigation	WPC is concerned that the mitigations in the AW Phase Three Consultation are more aspirational than evidence based. More evidence is required to make informed comments as to how the relocation project will impact residents and the environment.	n	The Environmental Statement in the DCO has now been finalised and sets out the environmental impact and mitigation measures. The DCO is also supported by the Location and Scheme Order Limits Plans and the Design Plans Waterbeach Long sections	Environmental Statement Technical Chapters in Volume 5.2 (Application Document References 5.2.1 - 5.2.22) , Application Document Ref 4.2 Location and Scheme Order Limits Plans, Application Document Ref 4.14 Design Plans - Waterbeach pipeline sections
Waterbeach Parish Council	Decommissioning		Require details of how services will be maintained from build of rising main to end of WRC. Continuity of service.	n	The Applicant will maintain waste water treatment at the existing Waterbeach WRC until the Waterbeach Rising main is fully commissioned and has been pressure tested. No flows that utilise the new rising main will be permitted until the process is complete. The Applicant has a statutory duty to maintain the effective treatment of waste water as set out in section 94 Water Industry Act 1991.	
Waterbeach Parish Council	Waterbeach Pipeline	Alignment with Network Rail	WPC discussed the timing of the development of the Waterbeach Zone and connecting pipelines in relation the delivery of the relocated Waterbeach railway station planning ref: S/0971/18/FL and other ongoing Waterbeach projects. Have AW considered this construction work that has the possibility to be delivered at the same time as the Waterbeach Zone?		The Applicant is in discussion with Network Rail in relation to CWWTPR Waterbeach Rising main railway crossing and the timing of the relocated Waterbeach Railway Station.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Project implementation	Finance	The current design is being done to the minimal standards and to a cost budget. This all leads to a 'race to the bottom'. Designing to minimum standards does not allow for any concerns and feedback from local communities to be taken into account. This has been evident in the response up to now. Very few design choices have been made to make the facility		The Design and Access Statement sets out how the quality standard has been ensured throughout the design process, this includes design principles and how consultation has fed into design. Details on funding are provided in the Funding	Application Document Ref: 7.6 Design and Access Statement, Application Document Ref: 3.2 Funding Statement

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
			meet the needs and requirements of locals HPC formally requests further information regarding budget status and surety regarding the funds available to be able to deliver and mitigate the project to a level that will be acceptable to local residents.		Statement, which is provided with the DCO application.	
Horningsea Parish Council	Project implementation	Rochdale Envelope	AW has made reference to the use of the 'Rochdale Envelope' within its proposals, where final design or specification has still to be concluded. However, HPC would like to place on record that the Rochdale Envelope appears over prescribed.		The Applicant notes the comment.	
Ian Gilder	DCO Work Plans		I have reviewed these, noting that they are an early-stage draft and that the Draft DCO draws on model clauses previously used in approved DCOs and TWAOs. My comments are restricted to a few specific matters which the Project Team needs to address in the next stage of drafting.	n	Final DCO Work Plans are provided in the application.	Applicant Document Ref 4.3 Works Plans
Ian Gilder	DCO Work Plans		Article 6, as drafted, contains a basic form of wording for the vertical limits of deviation. This needs to be expanded to incorporate specific upper or building height limits for certain above ground structures, which are not to be exceeded e.g., for the main works buildings (by zone), transfer tunnel vent shafts and the outfall structures. This could be done by amending Article 6 and including specific height restrictions in Schedule 1 but would be better done by including building heights on a set of long sections to be included in the Works Plans.	n	These are provided in the draft Development Consent Order.	Application Document Ref 2.1 Draft Development Consent Order
Ian Gilder	DCO Work Plans		64. Articles 12 and 14 provide the standard wording for the permanent stopping up of streets and public rights of way. The DCO needs to address the continued existence of and future traffic management on Lower Fen Drove Way, which is an integral part of the Project and its proposed recreational access provisions. Given the varying status of LFDW along different parts of its route, this may require bespoke drafting.	n	There are no proposals with the DCO to manage LFDW from a traffic management or recreational perspective outside of the temporary use as construction access for the Proposed Development while the permanent access is under construction. The sections of LFDW subject to Article 12 of the DCO (Temporary closure of Streets) can be found on the Access and TROs Plans (4.7). The Applicant has discussed Low Fen Drove Way Status in the PRoW Technical Working Group, which involves the relevant Officers at Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.	Application Document Ref 2.1 Draft Development Consent Order, Application Document Ref 4.7 Access & Traffic Regulation Order Plans

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					The EIA process has concluded that the CWWTPR project would be unlikely to lead to an increase in ASB and therefore it would be difficult to justify making the change of status to LFDW through DCO powers. These EIA conclusions have been reached following consultation with the Police and with the Highway Authority and District Council. However whilst the ability to change status is outside of the project scope the Applicant understands the community concerns about this issue and will continue the discussion with local authorities with the aim of reaching a final conclusion in the Statements of Common Ground.	
Ian Gilder	DCO Work Plans		65. I note the inclusion of Article 18 and that this gives scope to make lower speed limits on part of Horningsea Road to the north of Junction 34 of the A14 and, potentially, on Lower Fen Drove Way, if the latter is required. These should be included in the DCO.	n	Article 19 of the DCO relates to the traffic regulation order to permanently alter the speed limit along a section of Horningsea Road to 40 mph, the section of Horningsea Road to be included within this TRO is also presented on the Access and TRO plans (4.7)	Application Document Ref 2.1 Draft Development Consent Order, Application Document Ref 4.7 Access & Traffic Regulation Order Plans
Ian Gilder	DCO Work Plans		66. Article 25 should include a commitment for the replanting of trees and reinstatement of hedgerows, where these have been removed on land occupied under temporary powers. This needs to override the provisions in Article 38(5) as drafted.	n	Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgerows) and 4.8 Hedgerow regulations and tree preservation plan set out the hedgerows and TPO trees to be removed during construction, commitments to their replanting and reinstatement following construction is covered in the CoCP and Draft DCO. Compliance with the CoCP is a requirement within the draft DCO.	Application Document Ref 2.1 Draft Development Consent Order, Application Document Ref. 4.8 Access & Traffic Regulation Order Plans, Application Document Ref 5.4.2.1 CoCP Part A
Ian Gilder	DCO Work Plans		Based on experience with other Orders, Article 38(5) needs to be revised to make sure that fences are reinstated and that ground strengthening or road/street improvements made, for example, to farm access roads, which are unnecessary for their long-term use or contrary to the mitigation/restoration principles in the ES, are removed by the undertaker.	n	The Applicant believes that the response relates to Article 39 (4) of the Consultation version of the draft DCO, this is now Article 35 (5) of the draft DCO and now requires the Applicant to restore land to the satisfaction of the landowner and provides clarification on those aspects the applicant would not	Application Document Ref. 2.1 Draft Development Consent Order

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
					need to reinstate (this is subject to those items not restricting the ability to deliver the project).	
Ian Gilder	DCO Work Plans		The descriptions of Works in Schedule 1 are clearly incomplete. I am surprised to note that the Work 16 terminal pumping station is described as having a shaft 'up to 34m in diameter' but assume that will be checked in later drafting. Schedule 2 Part 2 provides for very tight timescales for the actions required by LPAs and others in the discharge of requirements. In my view, these specified time periods should be amended to allow the discharging authorities adequate time to respond to submissions effectively. This is clearly a matter principally for Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council and is for them to make appropriate representations.	n	Schedule 1 is fully completed and is in the Draft DCO. The timescales provided for the Discharge of Requirements is based on the Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 15, Annex for Drafting Development Consent Orders.	Application Document Ref. 2.1 Draft Development Consent Order
Ian Gilder	DCO Work Plans		69. It has been helpful to have sight of the draft Order Limits on the Works Plans. These will obviously need to be subject to detailed review and tightening where possible, once the land referencing is completed, to avoid unnecessary and anomalous inclusion of land not strictly necessary e.g., corners of buildings, private residential gardens where only a narrow sliver of land is required.	n	The Scheme Order Limits and Works Plans have been refined as part of the finalisation process which included checking the limits against land parcels, environmental and community constraints.	
Ian Gilder	DCO Work Plans		Generally, the Order Limits on Sheet 6 for the land required for the transfer tunnel, Waterbeach pipeline and the outfall pipeline to the west of Horningsea Road and also to the south of the A14, to the east of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton, need to be refined and reduced substantially once the necessary alignment and temporary access design work has been completed. I would, in particular, question why the alignments of the Waterbeach pipeline and the transfer tunnel to the south of the A14 should not be brought together to parallel each other, with an appropriate minimum separation to avoid conflict during construction and the inclusion of much of the large triangular area of land to the east of Horningsea Road, for which no purpose is apparent.	n	The alignment of the Waterbeach pipeline and transfer tunnel is not possible. The two construction methodologies are different and work in two different planes the transfer tunnel is underground and has no surface effect whereas the Waterbeach construction is open cut and preferably follows field boundaries. Therefore, it is not appropriate for both pipelines to follow the same corridor.	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Ian Gilder	DCO Work Plans		Where additional landscape, ecological and PRoW works are proposed, following this consultation, Order Limits will need to change to reflect these. We discussed some of these on the site visit on 28 April, where the limits will need to be extended e.g., to the east of Horningsea Road (Sheets 4, 6 and 7) to incorporate enhanced triangular planting areas and to remove part of the rectangular plot of land immediately to the north of Lower Fen Drove Way on Horningsea Road, which appears to have been included in Limits for no justifiable reason.	n	The Scheme Order Limits have been refined to encompass all works committed.	
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Information request		The stakeholder requested plans in digital SHP format.	n		
Margaret Gertrude Starkie	Changes to Order Limits and Traffic Regulations		The points raised by the stakeholder were as follows. Please call 'Mulberry House Farm' its correct name of 'Grange Farm' so that the residents at Grange Farm know what is being discussed, especially the lessees in the yard at Grange Farm. Perhaps we could use Grange Farm in brackets? Similarly, 'Riverside Farm' should be 'Northfields Farm' and 'Hatridge Lane' is 'Hartridges Lane'. 8.2 - Both she and her husband are very concerned about possible removal of the hedge and one specific tree. She is not sure that large lorries will be able to make the turn into Hartridges Lane without churning up the verge opposite her neighbour's house. 2.4 - Red House Close and 2.5 Jessie's Hens - Both situations were queried. 6.1 - is the word 'West' of the cemetery a typing error – should it be 'east' of the cemetery? Have Horningsea PC been consulted about the cemetery as they own it? 6.2 - access maybe messed up for holiday lets 7.1 - changes here explained the reduced impact upon the trees. Page 2 of the Letter referring to A14 Junctions 33 and 35 temporary overnight closure of the A14 – this is a 'big thing' if access between Junction 33 and 34 was used then we wouldn't have to do anything to that junction.	n	The Applicant confirms they are in contact with all the landowners directly affected by the scheme.	

Stakeholder	Topic Area	Sub-Theme	Stakeholder Comment	Project Change Required (Y/N)	Applicant Response	Reply references which DCO Document
Simon Gilbey of Brown & Co acting for Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Information request		The stakeholder requested details of the location and timing of the works, as has client, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited are currently progressing a Transport and Works Act Order relating to a re-signalling project potentially in the same vicinity, notably at Waterbeach.	n	The Applicant is in contact with Network Rail	
DEFRA (property section)	Information request		The stakeholder requested more information about the project.	n	The Applicant referred the stakeholder to the consultation documentation on the project's website.	
Matthew Simons of ESP Utilities Group	Information request		The stakeholder requested some of the project's plans to be provided in digital format.	n	The Applicant provided plans in a digital format.	
Sky	Information request		The stakeholder requested map and grid references for the project.	n	The Applicant provided the stakeholder with the map and grid references.	
East Cambridgeshire District Council			There is no detail with regard to emergency procedures in the event of an operational failure?	n	The operation of the Proposed Development will require an environmental permit, which is issued and regulated by the Environment Agency. The environmental permit for the Proposed Development will require the operator to have a written environmental management system (EMS), which includes a set of plans and procedures describing measures to avoid, reduce and eliminate potential environmental impacts associated with the activities covered by the permit. The EMS would include emergency response procedures.	

Get in touch

You can contact us by:


Emailing at **info@cwwtpr.com**


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

Writing to us at **Freepost: CWWTPR**


Visiting our website at [redacted]

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/