



Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project  
Anglian Water Services Limited

# Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008

Application Document Reference: 6.1.301  
PINS Project Reference: WAW010003  
APFP Regulation No. 5(2)g

Revision No. 0102  
~~April~~ September 2023

Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project

~~(love, eue, r8 drop~~

Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under

~~anglian water~~ Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008



## Document Control

**Document title** \_ Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.

**Version No.** \_ ~~01~~02

**Date Approved** \_ 30.01.23

**Date 1<sup>st</sup> Issued** \_ 30.01.23

## Version History

Version	Date	Author	Description of change
---------	------	--------	-----------------------

01	30.01.23	-	DCO Submission
----	----------	---	----------------

<u>02</u>	<u>17.07.23</u>	-	<u>Updated table numbers</u>
-----------	-----------------	---	------------------------------

-

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells




Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008

## Contents

<b>Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008. ....</b>	<b>1</b>
--	----------

## Tables

Table 1-1: Agricultural land and soils .....	1
Table 1-2: Consultation .....	3
Table 1-3: General comments / acknowledgement .....	4
Table 1-4: Health .....	6
Table 1-5: Land Use .....	7
Table 0.6: Landscape and visual amenity.....	11
Table 0.7: Noise and vibration .....	12
Table 1-8: Planning .....	12
Table 1-9: Project Description .....	14
Table 1-10: Traffic and Transport .....	15
Table 1-11: Water Resources .....	25







**1** ~~Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008~~ ~~anglian~~ ~~a~~ **Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008.**



<p><a href="#">Woodland Trust</a></p>	<p><u>Therefore, the Trust asks that an Arboricultural Impact Assessment is submitted for review as part of the Development Consent Order application, or any other consultations prior to submission, detailing the proposed impacts to the veteran trees along the route. Veteran trees are afforded protection within paragraph 4.5.13 of the National Policy Statement for Waste Water which states: “Ancient woodland is a valuable biodiversity resource both for its diversity of species and for its longevity as woodland. Once lost it cannot be recreated. The decision maker should not grant development consent for any development that would result in its loss or deterioration unless the benefits (including need) of the development, in that location, outweigh the loss of the woodland habitat. Aged or ‘veteran’ trees found outside ancient woodland are also particularly valuable for biodiversity and their loss should be avoided. Where such trees would be affected by development proposals, the applicant should set out proposals for their conservation or, where their loss is</u></p>	<p><u>The application will include a separate Arboricultural Impact Assessment report and accompanying drawings. This report identifies constraints and provides a means of understanding the application of safeguards to specific</u> <del>Constuction Practice</del> <u>trees during construction.</u></p> <p><u>The Proposed Development does not affect the veteran trees and during construction measures within the CoCP will be applied in order to put in place measures to safeguard these during construction.</u></p>	<p><u>Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1 Code of Constuction Practice</u></p>
---------------------------------------	--	---	--





unavoidable, the reasons why.” Protection is also afforded to veteran trees within paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Table 0.11-1: Agricultural land and soils**

<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>Document Reference</u>
Horningsea Parish Council	Request inventory of trees that will be removed – species, size	The application will include a separate Arboricultural Impact Assessment report and accompanying drawings. This report identifies constraints and provides a means of understanding the application of safeguards to specific trees during construction.  <u>The Applicant can confirm that Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgrows) and 4.8 Hedgrow regulations and tree preservation plan set out the hedgrows 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.</u>	Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1 Code of Constuction Practice
Horningsea Parish Council	Request inventory of hedgerows that will be removed – type (species) age, length	<u>See above</u>	
Horningsea Parish Council	Request information on restitution of the above —	<u>See above</u>	
Horningsea Parish Council	Request information on time to restitution	<u>See above</u>	

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells



**Stakeholder Comment**

**Applicant Response**

**Document Reference**

The Applicant can confirm that Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgrows) and 4.8 Hedgrow regulations and tree preservation plan set out the hedgrows 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

Horningsea Parish Request inventory of hedgerows that will be removed – type (species) age, length

DCO.  
See above

Council  
Horningsea Parish Request information on restitution of the above

See above

Horningsea Parish Request information on time to restitution

See above

Council

Council  
Woodland Trust Two veteran oak trees are listed as impacted by the Waterbeach pipeline route within the Biodiversity Chapter of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), ~~however there is no further detail on the impacts proposed.~~ The application will include a separate Arboricultural Impact Assessment \_\_\_\_\_ report and accompanying drawings. This report identifies constraints and however there is no further detail on the impacts proposed.

p  
r  
o  
v  
i  
d  
e  
s  
a

m  
e  
a  
n  
s  
o  
f  
u  
n  
d  
e  
r  
s  
t



a  
n  
d  
i  
n  
g  
t  
h  
e  
a  
p  
p  
l  
i  
c  
a  
t  
i  
o  
n  
o  
f  
s  
a  
f  
e  
g  
u  
a  
r  
d  
s  
t  
o  
s  
p  
e  
c  
i  
f  
i  
c  
t  
r

e  
e  
s  
d  
u  
r  
i  
n  
g  
c  
o  
n  
s  
t  
r  
u  
c  
t  
i  
o  
n  
.



~~Woodland Trust~~ Therefore, the Trust asks that an Arboricultural Impact Assessment is submitted for review as part of the Development Consent Order application, or any other

~~consultations prior to submission, detailing the proposed impacts to the veteran trees along the route. Veteran trees are afforded protection within paragraph 4.5.13 of the National Policy Statement for Waste Water which states: "Ancient woodland is a valuable biodiversity resource both for its diversity of species and for its longevity as woodland. Once lost it cannot be recreated. The decision maker should not grant development consent for any development that would result in its loss or deterioration unless the benefits (including need) of the development, in that location, outweigh the loss of the woodland habitat. Aged or 'veteran' trees found outside ancient woodland are also particularly valuable for biodiversity and their loss should be avoided. Where such trees would be affected by development proposals, the applicant should set out proposals for their conservation or, where their loss is unavoidable, the reasons why." Protection is also afforded to veteran trees within paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework.~~

~~Stakeholder Document~~ **The application will include a separate Arboricultural Impact Assessment report and accompanying drawings.** [Reference](#) [Application](#) [Response](#) [Comment](#)

~~This report identifies constraints and provides a means of understanding the application of safeguards to specific trees during construction.~~

~~The Proposed Development does not affect the veteran trees and during construction measures within the CoCP will be applied in order to put in place measures to safeguard these during construction.~~

~~Stakeholder Comment Applicant Response Document Reference~~

Woodland Trust The BS5837:2012 guidelines 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction' (the British Standard for ensuring development works in harmony with trees), states that trees should have a root protection area of 12 times the stem diameter (capped at 15m), although this guidance does recognise that veteran trees need particular care to ensure adequate space is allowed for their long-term retention. It is imperative that Natural England and Forestry Commission's standing advice on root protection areas for veteran trees is taken into account. This advice states: "For ancient or veteran trees (including those on the woodland boundary), the buffer zone should be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. The buffer zone should be 5 metres from the edge of the tree's canopy if that area is larger than 15 times the tree's diameter. This will create a minimum root protection area. Where assessment shows other impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, the proposal is likely to need a larger buffer zone."

The application will include a separate Arboricultural Impact Assessment report and

~~Woodland Trust We would like to lodge an objection to this proposal unless further information can be provided demonstrating that all veteran trees within the site boundary will be retained and afforded appropriate protection in line with Natural England and Forestry Commission's Standing Advice and National Planning Policy.~~

~~The application will include a separate Arboricultural Impact Assessment report and accompanying drawings. This report identifies constraints and provides a means of understanding the application of safeguards to specific trees during construction.~~

~~Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1 Code of Constuction Practice~~

~~The Proposed Development does not affect the veteran trees and during construction measures within the CoCP will be applied in order to put in place measures to safeguard these during construction.~~

accompanying drawings. This report identifies constraints and provides a means of understanding the application of safeguards to specific trees during construction.



<u>Woodland Trust</u>	<u>We would like to lodge an objection to this proposal unless further information can be provided demonstrating that all veteran trees within the site boundary will be retained and afforded appropriate protection in line with Natural England and Forestry Commission’s Standing Advice and National Planning Policy.</u> <del>Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008</del> <del>anglian</del> <del>a</del>	<u>The application will include a separate Arboricultural Impact Assessment report and accompanying drawings. This report identifies constraints and provides a means of understanding the application of safeguards to specific trees during construction.</u>  <u>The Proposed Development does not affect the veteran trees and during construction measures within the CoCP will be applied in order to put in place measures to safeguard these during construction.</u>	<u>Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1 Code of Constuction Practice</u>	Inserted Cells Inserted Cells Inserted Cells
-----------------------	--	---	---	--



**Table 0.21-2: Consultation Stakeholder**

**~~Comment~~**

~~Save Honey Hill (and land Gilder) in some instances, the justification for the changes proposed is incomplete or unclear and/or the complex nature of the changes mean that the final order limit being proposed is not clearly visible on the attached plans at the scale provided. The consultation material does not contain any revised design details that can be overlain with these order limit changes and there appear still to be areas of land included within limits that have not yet been justified.~~

**Applicant Response**

**Document Reference**

~~The Applicant notes the comments. The consultation letter for the targeted Document consultation set out the justification for the changes and invited enquiries, to the project team if any of the information was unclear. The final works Design and Statement and access statement along with the statement of reasons justifying all the land take within the affected parcels of land.~~

~~Application~~

~~Ref 4.3 Works~~

~~Application~~

~~Ref 7.6~~

~~Access~~

~~Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008~~

~~anglian~~ a

**Table 0.3: General comments / acknowledgement**

<del>Stakeholder</del>	<del>Comment</del>	<del>Applicant Response</del>	<del>Document Reference</del>
<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>Document Reference</u>
<a href="#">Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</a>	in some instances, the justification for the changes proposed is incomplete or unclear. <del>Hill (and Ian Gilder)</del> and/or the complex nature of the changes mean that the final order limit being <del>Gilder</del> proposed is not clearly visible on the attached plans at the scale provided. The consultation material does not contain any revised design details that can be overlain with these order limit changes and there appear still to be areas of land included within limits that have not yet been justified.	The Applicant notes the comments. The consultation letter for the targeted <del>Application Document</del> consultation set out the justification for the changes and invited enquiries to the project team if any of the information was unclear. The final works plans and final DCO application will contain the final design and the design and access statement along with the statement of reasons justifying all the <del>Access Statement</del> land take within the affected parcels of land.	<a href="#">Application Document Ref 4.3 Works Plans, Application Document Ref 7.6 Design and Access Statement</a>
<del>CA Telecom</del>	<del>We can confirm that Colt Technology Services do not have apparatus near the location as presented on your submitted plan, if any development or scheme</del>	<del>The Applicant notes the comment above</del>	


~~amendments fall outside the 50 metre perimeter new plans must be submitted for review.~~  
~~Huntingdonshire Thank you for consulting Huntingdonshire District Council on the proposed~~  
~~District Council amendments to the scheme. These have been passed on to our Planning Policy~~  
~~team, who have confirmed that they have no comments to raise~~

~~Moody Homes Moody homes no longer hold any interest in this development or the CWWTPR.~~ ~~The Applicant~~ [Table 1-3: General comments /](#)

~~acknowledges and notes the comment.~~

<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>Document Reference</u>
<a href="#">CA Telecom</a>	<u>We can confirm that Colt Technology Services do not have apparatus near the above location as presented on your submitted plan, if any development or scheme amendments fall outside the 50 metre perimeter new plans must be submitted for review.</u>	<u>The Applicant notes the comment.</u>	
<a href="#">Huntingdonshire District Council</a>	<u>Thank you for consulting Huntingdonshire District Council on the proposed amendments to the scheme. These have been passed on to our Planning Policy team, who have confirmed that they have no comments to raise</u>	<u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u>	
<a href="#">Moody Homes Ltd.</a>	<u>Moody homes no longer hold any interest in this development or the CWWTPR.</u>	<u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u>	
<a href="#">NATS Safeguarding Ltd.</a>	<u>NATS operates no infrastructure within 10km of the site and anticipates no impact from the proposal. Accordingly it has no comments to make on the application</u>	<u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u>	
<del>NATS</del>	<del>NATS operates no infrastructure within 10km of the site and anticipates no impact from the proposal. Accordingly it has no comments to make on the application</del> Natural England has reviewed the consultation materials, including the plans detailing the scheme order limit changes and accompanying change note, and is satisfied that none of the changes affect the comments made in our response to the Phase Three Consultation. The changes are unlikely to have any significant implications for matters within our statutory natural environment remit and we have no further comments to make.	<del>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</del>	
<a href="#">North Hertfordshire Council</a>	<u>It is noted that the proposals involve minor amendments to the relocation of the Cambridge Water Treatment Plant to which this authority raised no objections in its previous statutory consultation response dated 26th April 2022 (NHDC ref: 22/00602/NHC). Having reviewed the documents on your website I can confirm that NHDC has no further comments to make in relation to the proposal.</u>	<u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u>	
<a href="#">Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</a>	<del>Map 1</del> <u>SHH comment: No comment on these proposed changes.</u>	<u>The Applicant notes the comment.</u>	
<a href="#">Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</a>	<u>Map 5</u> <u>SHH comment: These changes are acceptable.</u>	<u>The Applicant notes the comment.</u>	
<a href="#">Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</a>	<u>Changes 8-6 to 8-9: No comments on these changes.</u>	<u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u>	



<u>Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</u>	<u>Map 9</u> <u>SHH comment: No comments on these proposed changes.</u>	<u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u>	
<del>Hertfordshire Council</del>	<del>It is noted that the proposals involve minor amendments to the relocation of the Cambridge Water Treatment Plant to which this authority raised no objections in its previous statutory consultation response dated 26th April 2022 (NHDC ref: 22/00602/NHC). Having reviewed the on documents your website I can confirm that NHDC has no further comments to make in relation to the proposal.</del>	<del>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</del>	
<del>Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</del>	<del>Map 1</del> <del>SHH comment: No comment on these proposed changes.</del>	<del>The Applicant notes the comment.</del>	
<del>Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</del>	<del>Map 5</del> <del>SHH comment: These changes are acceptable.</del>	<del>The Applicant notes the comment.</del>	
<del>Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</del>	<del>Changes 8-6 to 8-9: No comments on these changes.</del>	<del>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</del>	
<del>Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</del>	<del>Map 9</del> <del>SHH comment: No comments on these proposed changes.</del>	<del>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</del>	
<u>South Cambridgeshire District Council Urban and Civic</u>	<u>On the basis of the above, South Cambridgeshire District Council does not object to the revised order limits and traffic management details.</u> <del>As noted in previous comments made to the consultation in 2020, when compared against the other site location options, the draft proposals will have: a reduced level of conflict with future transport infrastructure, primarily due to the relationship to the A10; fewer infrastructure requirements, due to the decreased need for substantial diversions to the existing waste water treatment network; and Proximity to the River Cam, due to its much closer physical relationship to the River Cam reducing the infrastructure in terms of pipelines required.</del>	<u>The Applicant notes the comments.</u> <del>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</del>	
<del>Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008</del>  <del>a District Council</del>			
<u>Urban and Civic</u>	<u>As noted in previous comments made to the consultation in 2020, when compared against the other site location options, the draft proposals will have: a reduced level of conflict with future transport infrastructure, primarily due to the relationship to the A10; fewer infrastructure requirements, due to the decreased need for substantial diversions to the existing waste water treatment network; and Proximity to the River Cam, due to its much closer physical relationship to the River Cam reducing the infrastructure in terms of pipelines required.</u>	<u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u>	<u>Inserted Cells</u> <u>Inserted Cells</u> <u>Inserted Cells</u>
<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Applicant Response</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>
Urban and Civic	In comparison to the previous site options, the draft proposals are considered to impact upon a smaller resident population both in terms of the location of the plant but also the extent of infrastructure and pipelines required to serve it.	The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.	
Urban and Civic	U&C fully supports the principle of Anglian Water’s proposals which will be critical to supporting the delivery of the Waterbeach Barracks project. However, as set out above, U&C is seeking urgent clarification in relation to key points of detail.	The Applicant notes the comment and repeats the comments and assurances given above.	



Atkins Global	Please note that according to our records there is leased and/or third party network within your proposed works. However, because the plant is leased/third party we strongly recommend you contact all other utility providers to gather the extent of services within that area. Unfortunately, we are unable to advise who the plant is leased to or who the third party is.	The Applicant notes the comment and the apparatus and protection measures sought will be dealt with within the Protective Provisions of the DCO once agreed.
Atkins Global	Please accept this email as confirmation that Vodafone: Fixed does have apparatus within the vicinity of your proposed works detailed below.	The Applicant notes the comment and the apparatus and protection measures sought will be dealt with within the Protective Provisions of the DCO one agreed.
Cambridge Airport	The proposed minor changes will not affect our previous assessment and response letter ref EGSC-22-029, which provided full advice for the proposed development.	The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.
Central Bedfordshire Council	Central Bedfordshire Council raises no objection to the proposed development.	The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.
GTC	Processing your plans and details I have deduced that your works are not within the vicinity of any GTC assets. Please see the attached the images of the three sites you outlined in the Contextual Plan document (also attached for you reference). As this is the case, no further action is required from GTC or yourselves on behalf of GTC.	The Applicant notes the comment.

Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008



**Table 0.41-4: Health**

Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
Health and Safety Executive	<u>HSE has no comment to make as there are no licensed explosives sites in the vicinity</u>	<u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u>	
Health and Safety Executive	<u>Electrical Safety</u> <u>No comment from a planning perspective.</u> <u>During this time, please send any further communication on this project directly to the HSE's designated e-mail account for NSIP applications at nsip.applications@hse.gov.uk . We are currently unable to accept hard copies, as our offices have limited access.</u> <del>HSE has no comment to make as there are no licensed explosives sites in the vicinity</del>	The Applicant <del>acknowledges and</del> notes the comment. <u>and will amend the correspondence details to nsip.applications@hse.gov.uk</u>	

Health and



**Table 0.51-5: Land Use**

<u>anglian a</u>	<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>
<u>Document Reference</u>			
<u>Alderson and</u>	<u>Electrical Safety</u>	<u>You are destroying our quality of life, the Green Belt, our land, everything we hold</u>	The Applicant
<u>Safety</u>	<u>No comment from a planning perspective.</u>	<u>Allen details to nsip.applications@hse.gov.uk dear just so SCDC and CC can build a "low carbon" residential and retail site on a "brownfield" sewage works site that has already been upgraded at great expense to future proof it for another 50 years at our expense!</u>	
<u>Executive</u>	<u>During this time, please send any further communication on this project directly to the HSE's designated e-mail account for NSIP applications at nsip.applications@hse.gov.uk. We are currently unable to accept hard copies, as our offices have limited access.</u>		



~~Environment Fen~~ The Environment Agency are the registered owners of 1 kilometre (approx.) section of the River Cam from National Grid Reference TL50253 64490 to TL50782 65279 land and interest in land to be acquired from the Environment Agency. (north of Clayhithe with the north section east of Burgess's Drove). The Waterbeach pipeline intersects this section of the River Cam as shown on Sheet 8 of the Scheme Order Limit Changes Sheet 8. You may need to seek an Agreement/Easement with us, and I will provide further details of this via email.

~~Ditton Fen Ditton~~ Sheets 3 and 4 and 5 Reduction in land take and use of Low Fen Drove The Applicant has considered the proposed replacement of the bridleway Parish Council FDPC comment: We note that despite a reduction in land take, AW still include a to Station Road by one via Black Ditch and Allicky Farm taking into

~~section of the former railway despite our previous objection proposing an alternative that would avoid works on the former railway and the ditch leading to habitat loss on the and any operational or construction use of the adjoining section of Low Fen with the current proposals. The proposed use of the former railway line Drove north east from Low Fen Drove Way would use the existing surface for its or High Ditch Road. Avoidance is needed to avoid areas of rare and vulnerable entire length rather than requiring the construction of a new path over species. farmland. While the option proposed by FDPC would deliver a small recreational improvement by being a more direct route, this benefit~~

~~Horningsea~~ Ref 2-4

~~Ref 2-4 - Parish Council~~ Include Red House Close within scheme order limits ~~HPC Response~~ to apply development The Applicant is in discussion with the owners of all the properties in the Parish Council restrictions to land above the tunnel for protection of the tunnel infrastructure FDPC Request clarity on the ' area around Shaft 4, and will discuss the acquisition of the land and comment: the level of development restrictions' is not clear. AW should inform interest in land required by the Applicant.

~~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 owners of proposed changes and seek agreement on to their loss of Rights. The alignment of the tunnel and location of Shafts 4 and 5 have been~~

~~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. Whilst We disagree that the link path would cause "extra severance of the CWS" as it utilises an existing gap~~

~~the impact on properties in the area. welcoming the cancellation of a vent shaft as described in the hedgerow CWG and is therefore unlikely to cause significant impacts to the CWS. current proposal to take out some land near Poplar Hall land, we stand by our previous comment about the need to choose an alignment away from both properties. We are therefore intending to retain this feature for the DCO application.~~

~~made to minimise~~

[Fen Ditton  
Parish Council](#)

[Sheets 3 and 4 and 5 – Reduction in land take and use of Low Fen Drove](#)  
[FDPC comment: We note that despite a reduction in land take, AW still include a section of the former railway despite our previous objection proposing an alternative that would avoid works on the former railway and the ditch leading to habitat loss on the CWS and any operational or construction use of the adjoining section of Low Fen Drove or High Ditch Road. Avoidance is needed to avoid areas of rare and vulnerable species.](#)

[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 Drove 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 species 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.](#)

[Horningsea Ref 2-4](#) The Applicant is in discussion with the owners of all the properties along \_\_\_\_\_  
[Parish Council](#) [Include Red House Close within scheme order limits](#) the route of the transfer tunnel. In general, low rise structures will be \_\_\_\_\_  
[HPC Response](#) \_\_\_\_\_ allowed with the transfer tunnel's zone of influence.



**Stakeholder Comment**

**Applicant Response**

**Document Reference**

[Request clarity on the 'development restrictions'.](#)



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
	What restrictions are imposed on the resident – e.g. can the resident build a shed? What is the term of the restriction?		
Horningsea Parish Council	Ref 2-5 Extension to use existing Horningsea Road field access via the Jessie’s Hen Farm HPC Response This access is required for the operational life of the plant– c50 years Clarity required on likely impact on a working farm with sensitive livestock Clarity required on types of vehicles accessing by Jessie’s Hen Farm Clarity required on number and frequency of vehicles accessing by Jessie’s Hen Farm	The use of this access will be very occasional and will not impact on the __agricultural uses in the area.	
<a href="#">Horningsea Parish Council</a>	<a href="#">Ref 7-1</a> <a href="#">Revise the Order Limits coverage of Clayhithe Road, Clayhithe Road layby and the field between the layby and Waterbeach pipeline corridor for access.</a> <a href="#">HPC Response</a> <a href="#">This layby is constantly used by walkers and dog walkers on their way to the SSSI at Quy Fen and onto Anglesey Abbey; there is an extensive Public Right of Way network accessed from this layby.</a> <a href="#">Request information on likely impact on their access</a> <a href="#">Request information on traffic management here, particularly as there is a bend in the road here.</a> <a href="#">Will the new area include hard standing ?</a> <a href="#">How will you prevent construction traffic from crossing the ‘ land outside scheme order limits’ which lies between the access corridors</a> <a href="#">Request information on restitution of trees and hedgerows as per our initial comments in this response.</a>	<a href="#">Measures within the CoCP require measures to be in place that continue safe access over sections of the PRoW temporarily affected by the <del>Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP</del>, construction of the Waterbeach pipeline.</a>  <a href="#">The CTMP secures the commitments in relation to the management of construction vehicle movements. A draft of the CTMP is included in the <del>Ref 7.8 Community</del> application and will be developed into a final detailed CTMP following the <del>Liaison Plan</del> submission of the DCO application.</a>  <a href="#">The Applicant can confirm that 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.</a>  <a href="#">The final CTMP will set out the detailed management measures, procedures and best practices required for managing the impact of construction traffic on the local and strategic road networks during the construction period.</a>  <a href="#">A draft Community Liaison Framework Plan also included in the application sets out the approach to ongoing communication with residents, the community, and businesses, including communication in relation to traffic and transport matters.</a>	<a href="#">Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan</a>

- Inserted Cells
- Inserted Cells
- Inserted Cells
- Inserted Cells



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
<u>Horningsea Parish Council</u>	<p><u>Ref 7-2</u>  <u>Altering Waterbeach pipeline corridor and material storage location east of Mulberry House Farm.</u>  <u>HPC Response</u>  <u>Mulberry House Farm is now known as Grange Farm</u>  <u>Request more information on type of access, and type of material storage in order to assess</u>  <u>likely impact on a working farm with livestock</u>  <u>Request clarity on time period required for access</u>  <u>Request information on affected trees and hedgerows</u>  <u>Request information on restitution – time to be accomplished</u></p>	<p>The Applicant confirms they are in contact with all the landowners, directly affected by the scheme.</p>	

Inserted Cells

~~Horningsea — Ref 7-1~~

~~Parish Council — Revise the Order Limits coverage of Clayhithe Road, Clayhithe Road layby and the field between the layby and Waterbeach pipeline corridor for access.~~  
~~HPC Response~~  
~~This layby is constantly used by walkers and dog walkers on their way to the SSSI at Quy Fen and onto Anglesey Abbey; there is an extensive Public Right of Way network accessed from this layby.~~  
~~Request information on likely impact on their access~~  
~~Request information on traffic management here, particularly as there is a bend in the road here.~~  
~~Will the new area include hard standing?~~

H  
o  
w  
w  
i  
l  
l  
y  
o  
u  
p  
r  
e  
v  
e  
n  
t  
c  
o

n  
s  
t  
r  
u  
c  
t  
i  
o  
n  
t  
r  
a  
f  
f  
i  
c  
f  
r  
o  
m  
c  
r  
o  
s  
s  
i  
n  
g  
t  
h





Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
	e , l a n d o u t s i d e s c	s ,  which lies between the access corridors Request information on restitution of trees and hedgerows as per our initial comments in this response. Measures within the CoCP require measures to be in place that continue safe access over sections of the PRow temporarily affected by the construction of the Waterbeach pipeline.  CTMP secures the commitments in relation to the management of construction vehicle movements. A draft of the CTMP is included in the application and will be developed into a final detailed CTMP following the submission of the DCO application.	Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP, Application Document Ref 5.4.19.7 CTMP, The Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan
Horningsea Parish Council	Ref 7-2 <del>Altering Waterbeach pipeline corridor and material storage location east of Mulberry House Farm.</del> HPC Response Mulberry House Farm is now known as Grange Farm Request more information on type of access, and type of material storage in order to assess likely impact on a working farm with livestock Request clarity on time period required for access Request information on affected trees and hedgerows Request information on restitution — time to be accomplished	The Applicant confirms they are in contact with all the landowners directly affected by the scheme.	
	h e m e o r d e r l i m i t	The Applicant can confirm that 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.  The final CTMP will set out the detailed management measures, procedures and best practices required for managing the impact of construction traffic on the local and strategic road networks during the construction period.  A draft Community Liaison Framework Plan also included in the application sets out the approach to ongoing communication with residents, the community, and businesses, including communication in relation to traffic and transport matters.	



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
	<del>How will you prevent construction traffic from crossing the 'land outside scheme order limits'</del>		
<del>Horningsea Parish Council</del>	<del>Ref 8-5 Widening of Waterbeach pipeline area HPC Response Impact on hedgerows, trees etc as per initial comments in this response Why is so much land required here? Request more information on number of vehicles, frequency of visits</del>	<del>The Applicant has set out in details all traffic movements within the final Traffic and Transport chapter of the Environmental statement.</del>	<del>Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic &amp; Transport</del>
<u>Horningsea Parish Council</u>	<u>Ref 8-5 Widening of Waterbeach pipeline area HPC Response Impact on hedgerows, trees etc as per initial comments in this response Why is so much land required here? Request more information on number of vehicles, frequency of visits</u>	<u>The Applicant has set out in details all traffic movements within the final Traffic and Transport chapter of the Environmental statement.</u>	<u>Application Document Ref 5.2.19 ES, Chapter 19: Traffic &amp; Transport</u>
Health and Safety Executive	Will the proposed development fall within any of HSE's consultation distances? HSE's advice remain the same as advised in letter dated 26th October 2021	The Applicant can confirm that the amendments to the order limits as presented in the targeted consultation do not result in any of the proposed development falling within HSE's consultation distances and therefore note that the position is as set out in the HSE's letter of 26 <sup>th</sup> April 2021. The Applicant has added to the Other Consents and Permits register, document 7.1 in the documents submitted with the Application, the need to consider the need for a Hazardous Substance Consent	Application Document Ref 7.1 Other Consents and Permits Register
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	Map 2 SHH comment: We have noted that the southern and eastern boundary of the order limits has been reduced, removing land which we identified as not being required. Between Horningsea Road and Green End, there still appears to be scope to move that boundary further north by using the same corridor for both the transfer tunnel and the Waterbeach pipeline.	The Applicant notes the comment.	
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	Change 2-4 - Include Red House Close within scheme order limits to apply development restrictions to land above the tunnel for protection of the tunnel infrastructure. SHH comment: the level of development restrictions to be imposed is not clear. If this interferes with the normal enjoyment of the residents' house and garden land e.g., they would not be able to develop a garden or build small structures in keeping with the location, this could affect their quality of life. The residents need to be given appropriate assurances as to the nature of the powers being taken and that these are unavoidable.	The Applicant is in discussion with the owners of all the properties along the route of the transfer tunnel. In general, low rise structures will be allowed with the transfer tunnel's zone of influence.	
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	Map 3 SHH comment: We have noted that the order limits around the eastern edge of the	The Applicant notes the comments. The commitment to re-enforcement planting, replanting and reinstatement following construction is covered	Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
	core site in the CoCP and Draft DCO. Compliance with the CoCP is a requirement have been rationalised and slightly reduced to bring them back to coincide with within the DCO. topographic features/existing plot boundaries, which is acceptable.		
	We continue to take the view that the order limits should have been extended in the field immediately to the north of Lower Fen Drove Way and to the east of Horningsea Road, in order to accommodate more effective off site landscape screening of views from Horningsea Road.		

Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
	We comment further on this point in relation to Map ? We also note that the order limits for the proposed new PRow along the former railway, extending into Map 4, has been reduced to the bare minimum, covering only the track bed. This change would, for example, prevent reinforcement planting to the hedges on either side of the path under order powers and the order limits should be adjusted back either to the existing field boundaries or by a minimum of 3 metres on either side to allow a minimum overall width of 15 metres. This would be consistent with the changes along the permissive path proposed on Map 5.		
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	Map 4 SHH comment: The comments above in relation to the proposed PRow apply to this map. Change 4-1 to include the surface of Station Road is acceptable.	The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment. _____	
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	Changes 7-2 to 7-5 – These changes generally appear to improve the use of land and reduce impacts at what is described as Mulberry House Farm. SHH comment: These farm buildings (now partly commercial units) have been known for many years as 'Grange Farm', not 'Mulberry House Farm' and are signposted as such. Please use this label in the DCO documents and maps to avoid confusion.	The Applicant notes the comment and the DCO Plans have been amended ___ to refer to 'Grange Farm' not 'Mulberry House Farm' following a review of the property name in response to this useful feedback.	
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	Changes 7-4 and 7- 5 amend the order limits to properly reflect the boundaries on the ground to the highway access and hardstandings to Grange Farm. Given the extent of these hard areas, it seems likely that construction use of these can co-exist with the present commercial uses, provided that there is appropriate liaison. These changes are welcomed in that they protect existing tree planting and maintain screening from Horningsea Road.	The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment. _____	
South Cambridgeshire	Given that some of the revised boundaries appear to be closer to sensitive receptors such as residential housing (notably 8.2, 8.3, 8.7, and 8.8), it will be important that	The Applicant notes the comment. _____	

- Deleted Cells
- Deleted Cells
- Deleted Cells
- Deleted Cells



Stakeholder      Comment      Applicant Response      Document Reference

---

District Council	the DCO submission material makes clear how these changes affect the impact upon sensitive receptors or provide benefits to surrounding landowners or to the delivery or operation of the project.		
------------------	--	--	--

---

**Table 01.6: Landscape and visual amenity**



Stakeholder <del>Horningsea Parish</del>	Comment
Applicant Response	Document Reference
Council	
Horningsea	
Ref 8-1	The Applicant can confirm that Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgerows) and Application <del>Parish</del>
Council	
Horningsea Parish Council	
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder) <b>Comment</b> Ref 8-1	
<del>Parish</del> Widening of Waterbeach pipeline corridor for access and traffic management <del>requirements. HPC Response</del> <u>4.8 Hedgerow regulations and tree preservation plan set out the hedgerows and TPO</u> Document Ref:	
Council <del>requirements. trees to be removed during construction, commitments to their replanting and</del> <u>5.4.2.1 CoCP HPC Response</u> <del>reinstatement following construction is covered in the</del> <u>CoCP and Draft DCO.</u>	
Request information on potential damage to hedgerow and trees here	
<u>Compliance with the CoCP is a requirement within the draft DCO. Ref 8-3</u>	
<del>Reflect actual hard standing area through Riverside Farm</del>	
HPC Response	
<del>Impact on hedgerows, trees etc as per initial comments in this response</del>	
<del>Request more information on number of vehicles, frequency of visits Not clear about naming of Riverside Farm. It is not marked on Google Maps or OS, this may be barns on Hartridges Lane? Ref 8-4</del>	



<a href="#">Horningsea Parish Council</a>	<a href="#">Ref 8-3</a> <a href="#">Reflect actual hard standing area through Riverside Farm</a> <a href="#">HPC Response</a> <a href="#">Impact on hedgerows, trees etc as per initial comments in this response</a> <a href="#">Request more information on number of vehicles, frequency of visits Not clear about naming of Riverside Farm. It is not marked on Google Maps or OS, this may be barns on Hartridges Lane?</a>	<a href="#">The Applicant notes the comments and can confirm that the new Order Limits reflect <del>Application Document</del> extent of existing hard standing. The buildings shown are part of Riverside Farm <del>Ref 4.1 Location and</del> property, though the farmhouse located elsewhere.</a>	<a href="#">Application Document Ref 4.1 Location and Scheme Order Limits</a>
<a href="#">Horningsea Parish Council</a>	<a href="#">Ref 8-4</a> <a href="#">Inclusion of land within the field west of Hartridges Lane</a> <a href="#">4.8 Hedgerow regulations and tree preservation plan set out the hedgerows and TPO</a> <a href="#">HPC Response</a> <a href="#">Impact on hedgerows, trees etc as per initial comments in this response?</a> <a href="#">Time to restitution?</a>	<a href="#">The Applicant can confirm that Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgerows) and 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.</a>	<a href="#">Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP</a>
<p><del>Change 8-4 involves a widening of order limits on the north west side of Hatridge's Lane, beyond the farm buildings. This part of the Lane is characterised by a line of 'standard' trees, mainly sycamore, about 30 years old, close to the carriageway. See photos 4 and 5. Change 8-5 seems to involve a substantial rectangular extension to land in order limits. The justification given for this expansion in limits is very general and it is not obvious why it is needed at this location. Can we please have a clear assurance that the mature trees within limits for Changes 8-4 and 8-5 will not be removed? In written response at Con Three, we were also assured<sup>1</sup> that the HDD drive site for the River Cam crossing would be from the west/north, Waterbeach, side of the river. The reason for seeking this assurance was to confirm that the largest machinery needed for the HDD would not have to be brought across Clayhithe Bridge or need to use Hatridge's Lane for access. The extended limits now being proposed in Change 8-5 now suggest that this assurance may no longer be valid. Can this earlier assurance please be repeated?</del></p>			



**Applicant Response** ————— **Document Reference**

<p><a href="#">Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</a></p>	<p>Change 8-4 involves a widening of order limits on the north west side of Hatridge's Lane, beyond the farm buildings. This part of the Lane is characterised by a line of 'standard' trees, mainly sycamore, about 30 years old, close to the carriageway. See photos 4 and 5. Change 8-5 seems to involve a substantial rectangular extension to land in order limits. The justification given for this expansion in limits is very general and it is not obvious why it is needed at this location. Can we please have a clear assurance that the mature trees within limits for Changes 8-4 and 8-5 will not be removed?  <u>In written response at Con Three, we were also assured1 that the HDD drive site for the River Cam crossing would be from the west/north, Waterbeach, side of the river. The reason for seeking this assurance was to confirm that the largest machinery needed for the HDD would not have to be brought across Clayhithe Bridge or need to use Hatridge's Lane for access. The extended limits now being proposed in Change 8-5 now suggest that this assurance may no longer be valid. Can this earlier assurance please be repeated?</u></p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that 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. mature trees within limits for Changes 8-4 and 8-5 will not be removed. The wider corridor is to facilitate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Creating a temporary construction access through the field parallel to Hatridge's Lane, but beyond the trees so as to avoid damage to the surface of Hatridge's Lane and the trees.</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Compliance with the CoCP is a requirement within the draft DCO. This section of Hatridge's Lane is privately owned (not an adopted public highway) so is also within the Order Limits for acquiring rights for future user for operational inspection and maintenance access.</a></li> </ul>	<p>Application Document                  Ref: <a href="#">4.1 Location and Scheme Order Limits</a>  <a href="#">5.4.2.1 CoCP</a></p>
---	--	---	--

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells

~~The Applicant notes the comments and can confirm that the new Order Limits reflect Application Document extent of existing hard standing. The buildings shown are part of Riverside Farm Location and property, though the farmhouse located elsewhere. Scheme Order Limits\_ Ref 4.1~~

**Table 1.7: Noise and vibration**

<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>Document Reference</u>
--------------------	----------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells





[South Cambridgeshire District Council](#)

SCDC requests that the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) that is submitted with the DCO considers potential additional impacts on noise, vibration, and air quality to these sensitive receptors. It is also expected that odour monitoring within these locations will be detailed within the CEMP.

~~The Applicant can confirm that 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.~~ Monitoring of odour is covered in the CoCP and Draft DCO. Odour Management Plan.

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 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. Compliance with the CoCP is a requirement within the draft DCO. Under the environmental permit, the operator will continually monitor treatment performance, prevent and respond to any on-site issues at the earliest opportunity.

Application  
 Document Ref:  
 5.4.2.18.4  
[CoCP Preliminary Odour Management Plan](#)

**Table 1-8: Planning**

**Stakeholder Comment**

**Applicant Response**

**Document Reference**

~~The mature trees within limits for Changes 8-4 and 8-5 will not be removed. The Application Document wider corridor is to facilitate: — Ref 4.1 Location and~~

~~Scheme Order Limits~~

~~Creating a temporary construction access through the field parallel to Hatridge's Lane, but beyond the trees so as to avoid damage to the surface of Hatridge's Lane and the trees.~~

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells





Table U&C 0-7: Noise and vibration

<p>Urban and Civic</p>	<p><del>Ensuring Adequate Security of Foul Water Connections - The Relationship to the Proposals for Waterbeach New Town East</del>  <del>It is considered that the current proposals do not provide adequate security for foul water connections to either Waterbeach Village or the Barracks. 3. The construction of a TPS at the existing Waterbeach STW in isolation will not provide the necessary capacity within the wider network to accommodate existing and forecast flows. is located within the boundary of the</del>  <del>The existing gravity network connecting Waterbeach Barracks, and Waterbeach Village must be included in the CWWTP proposals and this infrastructure must be delivered by Anglian Water as the statutory undertaker.</del>  <del>U&amp;C seeks a written response from Anglian Water to confirmation how it proposes to provide the necessary infrastructure to ensure that the Waterbeach Barracks development and the existing Waterbeach Village will be connected to the proposed TPS and piped pumping main connection to the new CWWTP Waterbeach New Town East site. The draft proposals for the CWWTP scheme, to provide a TPS at this location to replace the STW, appear to be designed in the context for the proposals for the Waterbeach New Town East site being brought forwards as currently proposed. Whilst it is acknowledged that at its meeting on 29 January 2021 South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning Committee resolved to grant outline consent for the development subject to agreement on conditions and completion of a Section 106 Agreement, the Waterbeach New Town East site does not yet benefit from planning consent. It</del></p>	<p>The Applicant is required to make the necessary connections in accordance with its duties under the Water Industry Act 1991, sections 94, sections 98 and sections 30 in particular. This obligation is not removed through the DCO process. The DCO includes a new pipeline from Waterbeach New Town to the existing Cambridge WWTP with a future connection to the proposed WWTP, assuming approval is granted. This pipeline will also accommodate the existing flows from Waterbeach village. The Applicant will continue to monitor the status of the planning application for Waterbeach New Town East along with the build out rates for the New Town as a whole and work with Urban and Civic, RLW and South Cambridgeshire District Council to identify points of connections as part of the drainage solution to ensure this can be delivered by the New Town developers, thereby allowing the continued build out of the development.</p>
------------------------	--	---



seeks a written response from Anglian Water to confirmation how it proposes to provide the necessary infrastructure to ensure that the Waterbeach Barracks development and the existing Waterbeach Village will be connected to the proposed TPS and piped pumping main connection to the new CWWTP.

~~Urban and~~ ~~The Relationship to the Proposals for Waterbeach New Town East~~—The Applicant is required to make the necessary connections in accordance with its ~~Civic~~ ~~3. The existing Waterbeach STW is located within the boundary of the~~ duties under the Water Industry Act 1991, sections 94, sections 98 and sections 30 ~~Waterbeach New Town East site. The draft proposals for the CWWTP scheme,~~ in particular. This obligation is not removed through the DCO process. The DCO ~~to provide a TPS at this location to replace the STW, appear to be designed in~~ includes a new pipeline from Waterbeach New Town to the existing Cambridge ~~the context for the proposals for the Waterbeach New Town East site being~~ WWTP with a future connection to the proposed WWTP, assuming approval is ~~brought forwards as currently proposed. Whilst it is acknowledged that at its~~ granted. This pipeline will also accommodate the existing flows from Waterbeach ~~meeting on 29 January 2021 South Cambridgeshire District Council's Planning~~ village. The Applicant will continue to monitor the status of the planning application ~~Committee resolved to grant outline consent for the development subject to~~ for Waterbeach New Town East along with the build out rates for the New Town as ~~agreement on conditions and completion of a Section 106 Agreement, the~~ a whole and work with Urban and Civic, RLW and South Cambridgeshire District ~~Waterbeach New Town East site does not yet benefit from planning consent. It~~ Council to identify points of connections as part of the drainage solution to ensure ~~is not clear from the consultation proposals if Anglian Water has considered~~ this can be delivered by the New Town developers, thereby allowing the continued ~~requirement for contingency options if there is further delay to the delivery of~~ build out of the development.

£  
#  
@  
W  
#  
#  
@  
#  
@  
@  
#  
#

€  
#  
#  
@  
W  
#  
#  
€  
#  
@  
@  
@  
#  
#  
#  
@  
#  
#  
#  
@  
@  
@  
@  
@  
#  
@  
#  
@  
#  
#



is not clear from the consultation proposals if Anglian Water has considered requirement for contingency options if there is further delay to the delivery of the Waterbeach New Town East site, if the development proposals for the site evolve prior to outline consent being granted or if planning consent is not forthcoming.  
U&C seeks further discussions with Anglian Water to consider the potential contingency options to account for the above scenarios.

this can be delivered by the New Town developers, thereby allowing the continued build out of the development.

~~U&C seeks further discussions with Anglian Water to consider the potential contingency options to account for the above scenarios.~~



**Table 0.91-9: Project Description**

Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	<del>SHH comment on naming: Hatridge's Lane is labelled as such on the OS base Hill (and Ian mapping, so Gilder) should be taken as correct spelling. The group of farm buildings labelled as Riverside Farm on the AW mapping are not and never have been known locally by this name and this name is not used by OS. There is a risk of confusion with Riverside House (which was formerly Clayhithe Farm), which is on Clayhithe Road.</del>	<del>The Applicant thanks the respondent for clarification on the naming and will use the correct label of Hatridge's Lane.</del>	<del>R</del>
Urban and Civic	<del>Waterbeach Barracks is a key strategic location for growth in Cambridgeshire. As set out below, U&amp;C is pursuing a rapid programme for the delivery of the project. It is critical that this is matched by the provision of new strategic infrastructure including the new CWWTP. It is also necessary that the details Anglian Waters proposals are fully coordinated with the infrastructure demands of the Waterbeach Barracks project and its specific technical requirements.</del>	<del>The Applicant notes the comments and both Anglian water and the project team are engaged with Urban and Civic in the Waterbeach New Town drainage delivery strategy to ensure this alignment.</del>	
Urban and Civic	<del>U&amp;C fully supports the principle of the proposed CWWTP and U&amp;C supports the selection of the land south of Horningsea site (known as 'Option 3') as the preferred approach for the CWWTP facility.</del>	<del>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</del>	
Urban and Civic	<del>The Provision of a Suitable Piped Connection between Waterbeach Barracks and the CWWTP                      1. The consultation proposals indicate that a piped pumping main connection will be made between the existing Waterbeach Sewage Treatment Works (STW) and the new CWWTP. This would cater for the intention for the Waterbeach STW to become a transfer pumping station (TPS).                      However, U&amp;C is concerned that it's not clear from the current proposals that the necessary infrastructure will be included as part of the project to provide a gravity connection between the existing STW (which will become the TPS) and the existing onsite Waterbeach Barracks foul</del>	<del>The Applicant is required to make necessary connections in accordance with its duties under the Water Industry Act 1991. The exact points of connection will form part of the Waterbeach New Town Drainage Delivery Strategy submitted and agreed with South Cambridgeshire District Council.</del>	

**Table 0.10: Traffic and Transport**

Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	<del>SHH comment on naming: Hatridge's Lane is labelled as such on the OS base Hill (and Ian mapping, so Gilder) should be taken as correct spelling. The group of farm buildings labelled as Riverside Farm on the AW mapping are not and never have been known locally by this name and this name is not used by OS. There is a risk of confusion with Riverside House (which was formerly Clayhithe Farm), which is on Clayhithe Road.</del>	<del>The Applicant thanks the respondent for clarification on the naming and will use the correct label of Hatridge's Lane.</del>	

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells



[Alderson Urban and Allen Civic](#)

~~Regarding your additional Scheme changes following the Phase 3 consultation, I am very concerned that your amendments of traffic flows will further increase the flow of traffic on Horningsea Road through Fen Ditton and cause more delays resulting in much traffic congestion, an increase of air and noise pollution both by day and night that will severely disrupt our lives. Furthermore, there is no indication of just how long the traffic management will last but as the construction phase is projected at four years, I am fearful that it could be even longer. You state that these are to "further minimise adverse impacts on environmental and community receptors" yet for us they will be much worsened and directly affect our quality of life and value of our land! [Waterbeach Barracks is a key strategic location for growth in Cambridgeshire. As set out below, U&C is pursuing a rapid programme for the delivery of the project. It is critical that this is matched by the provision of new strategic infrastructure including the new CWWTP. It is also necessary that the details Anglian Waters proposals are fully coordinated with the infrastructure demands of the Waterbeach Barracks project and its specific technical requirements.](#)~~

~~The effects to traffic and transport will be reported in the ES. Applicant notes the comments and both Anglian water and the project team. This chapter will be underpinned by a Transport Assessment (TA) which has been completed to align with the TA guidance published Cambridge County Council (CCC) highway authority. The assessment includes modelling of construction vehicle movements including those using Horningsea Road. The approach to the TA has been discussed with CCC including how to account for future changes to traffic volumes with the modelling. The control of vehicle movements is a requirement within the DCO which obligates the Applicant to enforce a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and a Construction Code of Practice (CoCP). The CTMP includes a restriction on vehicle movements within the villages of Horningsea and Fen Ditton. The CTMP secures the commitments in relation to the management of construction vehicle movements. A draft of the CTMP is included in the application and will be developed into a final detailed CTMP following the submission of the DCO application. It includes a section on 'Adherence to Designated Routes' which includes a requirement for a strategy for reporting noncompliance as well as encouraging local residents to report HGV movements within villages. Furthermore the CTMP includes a section, 'Monitoring Strategy' which requires the Principal Contractor(s) to implement a system for monitoring the movement of vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Development, which includes ANPR cameras along Horningsea Road. The final CTMP will set out the detailed management measures, procedures and best practices required for managing the impact of construction traffic on the local and strategic road networks during the construction period.~~

~~A draft Community Liaison Framework Plan also included in the application sets out the approach to ongoing communication with residents, the community, and businesses, including communication in relation to traffic and transport matters. [U&C are engaged with Urban and Civic in the Waterbeach New Town drainage delivery strategy to ensure this alignment.](#)~~

~~Application Document Ref: 5.2.19 Traffic and Transport, Application Document Ref: 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan~~

Deleted Cells

[Alderson Urban and Allen Civic](#)

~~We are facing the prospect of seeing this site spoiling the view of countryside. U&C fully supports the principle of the proposed CWWTP and U&C supports the~~  
~~acknowledges and notes the comment. The Applicant has, within the Environmental Statement, sought to determine all the potential environmental, social, and~~  
~~drilling and dust from~~  
~~Application and Allen — from our house and garden, noise pollution, vibration from~~  
~~Document Ref 5 selection of the land south of Horningsea site (known as 'Option 3') as the preferred approach for the CWWTP facility.~~

~~The Applicant~~





~~the construction traffic that will adversely affect our peaceful wildlife garden that health effects of the construction period and operation of the new facility. In addition, within each of the Environmental Statement chapters are set out the Statement away from this huge construction site And after all that we will have to endure mitigation proposals to minimise any such effects. the views and toxic air that you claim will not happen!~~

Cambridge City Council

~~The Applicant notes the comments. The justification that has been put forward for the changes to the order limits and traffic management has been noted. Given that some of the revised boundaries appear to be closer to sensitive receptors such as residential housing (notably 8.2, 8.3, 8.7, and 8.8), it will be important that the DCO submission material makes clear how these changes affect the impact upon sensitive receptors or provide benefits to surrounding landowners or to the delivery or operation of the project.~~

~~The effects of the Proposed Development, such as risk of air, dust, noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors, are assessed in the Environmental Statement that accompanies the DCO application. Where any risk of significant effects on receptors are identified the Environmental Statement identifies measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate these effects. For land that will be restored post construction, such as 8.2, 8.3, 8.7 and 8.8, those work to restore the land and any local benefits would be agreed between the Applicant and affected landowners.~~

Application Document Ref 5 Environmental Statement

Urban and Civic

The Provision of a Suitable Piped Connection between Waterbeach Barracks and the Civic CWWTP  
 1. The consultation proposals indicate that a piped pumping main connection will be made between the existing Waterbeach Sewage Treatment Works (STW) and the new CWWTP. This would cater for the intention for the Waterbeach STW to become a transfer pumping station (TPS).  
 However, U&C is concerned that it's not clear from the current proposals that the necessary infrastructure will be included as part of the project to provide a gravity connection between the existing STW (which will become the TPS) and the existing onsite Waterbeach Barracks foul water network. Similarly, it is not clear how feeds from the existing Waterbeach Village will be connected to the new TPS.  
 U&C seeks urgent written clarification that the CWWTP project will include the provision of this infrastructure.

The Applicant is required to make necessary connections in accordance with its duties under the Water Industry Act 1991. The exact points of connection will form part of the Waterbeach New Town Drainage Delivery Strategy submitted and agreed with South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Cambridge

CCC requests that the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) be included in the DCO application. The Applicant notes the comments. The ES chapters for air quality, odour and noise are set out in the Environmental Statement. The Applicant notes the comments. The ES chapters for air quality, odour and noise are set out in the Environmental Statement.

Cambridge City Council

The Applicant notes the comments. The justification that has been put forward for the changes to the order limits and traffic management has been noted. Given that some of the revised boundaries appear to be closer to sensitive receptors such as residential housing (notably 8.2, 8.3, 8.7, and 8.8), it will be important that the DCO submission material makes clear how these changes affect the impact upon sensitive receptors or provide benefits to surrounding landowners or to the delivery or operation of the project.

The effects of the Proposed Development, such as risk of air, dust, noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors, are assessed in the Environmental Statement that accompanies the DCO application. Where any risk of significant effects on receptors are identified the Environmental Statement identifies measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate these effects. For land that will be restored post construction, such as 8.2, 8.3, 8.7 and 8.8, those work to restore the land and any local benefits would be agreed between the Applicant and affected landowners.

Application Document Ref 5 Environmental Statement



<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Application</u>
<u>Cambridge City Council</u>	<u>requests that the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) that is submitted with the DCO considers potential additional impacts on noise, effects for these disciplines. This</u>	<u>The Applicant notes the comments. The ES chapters for air quality, odour and noise and vibration provide the assessment of effects for these disciplines. This</u>
<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>City Council</u>	<u>Document Ref 5</u>



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
-------------	---------	--------------------	--------------------

[Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project](#)  
[Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008](#)



~~vibration, and air quality to these sensitive receptors. It is also expected that assessment takes into account mitigation in the form of design features as part of the design of the Proposed Development and the requirement (within Statement, Schedule 2 of the DCO) for the implementation of the Code of Construction Application Practice (CoCP). The CoCP will be provided with the Application. This document Document Ref sets out a range of topic specific measures to avoid and minimise potential 5.2.18 ES, Chapter impacts including noise and air emissions. 18: Odour~~

~~Until the permit for the existing Cambridge WWTP has been surrendered it will continue to operate in accordance with the environment permit, including the odour management measures. Once the proposed WWTP is operational it will also be subject to an environmental permit including a detailed odour management. The project description as part of the ES, and the ES Chapter for Management Plan, Odour set out the design features within the proposed WWTP that have been included in relation to odour control. An Outline Odour Management Plan will be provided within the Application which sets out the approach to the future 5.4.2.1 CoCP management of odour within the proposed WWTP.~~

[Reference](#)



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
<a href="#">Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project</a> <a href="#">Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008</a>			
<a href="#">Alderson and Allen</a>	<p><u>Regarding your additional Scheme changes following the Phase 3 consultation, I am very concerned that your amendments of traffic flows will further increase the flow of traffic on Horningsea Road through Fen Ditton and cause more delays resulting in much traffic congestion, an increase of air and noise pollution both by day and night that will severely disrupt our lives. Furthermore, there is no indication of just how long the traffic management will last but as the construction phase is projected at four years, I am fearful that it could be even longer. You state that these are to "further minimise adverse impacts on environmental and community receptors" yet for us they will be much worsened and directly affect our quality of life and value of our land!</u></p>	<p><u>The effects to traffic and transport will be reported in the ES. This chapter will be underpinned by a Transport Assessment (TA) which has been completed to align with the TA guidance published Cambridge County Council (CCC) highway authority. The assessment includes modelling of construction vehicle movements including those using Horningsea Road. The approach to the TA has been discussed with CCC including how to account for future changes to traffic volumes with the modelling. The control of vehicle movements is a requirement within the DCO which obligates the Applicant to enforce a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and a Construction Code of Practice (CoCP). The CTMP includes a restriction on vehicle movements within the villages of Horningsea and Fen Ditton.</u></p> <p><u>The CTMP secures the commitments in relation to the management of construction vehicle movements. A draft of the CTMP is included in the application and will be developed into a final detailed CTMP following the submission of the DCO application. It includes a section on 'Adherence to Designated Routes' which includes a requirement for a strategy for reporting noncompliance as well as encouraging local residents to report HGV movements within villages. Furthermore the CTMP includes a section, 'Monitoring Strategy' which requires the Principal Contractor(s) to implement a system for monitoring the movement of vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Development, which includes ANPR cameras along Horningsea Road. The final CTMP will set out the detailed management measures, procedures and best practices required for managing the impact of construction traffic on the local and strategic road networks during the construction period.</u></p> <p><u>A draft Community Liaison Framework Plan also included in the application sets out the approach to ongoing communication with residents, the community, and businesses, including communication in relation to traffic and transport matters.</u></p>	<p><u>Application Document Ref: 5.2.19 Traffic and Transport, Application Document Ref: 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan</u></p>
<a href="#">Alderson and Allen</a>	<p><u>We are facing the prospect of seeing this site spoiling the view of countryside from our house and garden, noise pollution, vibration from drilling and dust from the construction traffic that will adversely affect our peaceful wildlife garden that we have spent many years in creating and now it will be no more than half a mile away from this huge construction site And after all that we will have to endure the views and toxic air that you claim will not happen!</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant notes the comment. The Applicant has, within the Environmental Statement, sought to determine all the potential environmental, social, and health effects of the construction period and operation of the new facility. In addition, within each of the Environmental Statement chapters are set out the mitigation proposals to minimise any such effects.</u></p>	<p><u>Application Document Ref 5 Environmental Statement</u></p>





Stakeholder Comment

Applicant Response

Document Reference

vibration, and air quality to these sensitive receptors. It is also expected that odour monitoring within these locations will be detailed within the CEMP

assessment takes into account mitigation in the form of design features as part of the design of the Proposed Development and the requirement (within ~~Statement~~, Schedule 2 of the DCO) for the implementation of the Code of Construction ~~Application~~ Practice (CoCP). The CoCP will be provided with the Application. This document ~~Document Ref~~ sets out a range of topic specific measures to avoid and minimise potential ~~5.2.18 ES, Chapter~~ impacts including noise and air emissions.

Environmental Statement, Application Document Ref 5.2.18 ES, Chapter 18: Odour Application Document Ref 5.4.18.4 Preliminary Odour Management Plan, Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP

Until the permit for the existing Cambridge WWTP has been surrendered it will ~~Application~~ continue to operate in accordance with the environment permit, including the ~~Document Ref~~ odour management measures. Once the proposed WWTP is operational it will ~~5.4.18.4~~ also be subject to an environmental permit including a detailed odour ~~Preliminary Odour Management Plan~~, Odour set out the design features within the proposed WWTP that have been ~~Application~~ included in relation to odour control. An Outline Odour Management Plan will be ~~Document Ref~~ provided within the Application which sets out the approach to the future ~~5.4.2.1 CoCP~~ management of odour within the proposed WWTP.

Cambridge City Council On the basis of the above, Cambridge City Council does not object to the revised order limits and traffic management details.  
~~Fen Ditton Parish Council Ref 2-5 extension to use existing Horningsea Road field access via the Jessie's~~

The Applicant notes the comment. The Applicant notes the comment and can confirm that Jessie's Hens access is for access to Waterbeach only.

~~Horningsea Parish implementation of TTRO speed limits before and after the Clayhithe Bridge. The Council number of vehicles requiring access off the Clayhithe Road to the pipe line corridor is approximately 8 HGVs per day for a period 6 months.~~  
~~Hen Farm for inspection and maintenance access during operational life of the project.~~  
~~FDPC comment: AW should clarify if this refers to the proposed Waterbeach pipeline~~  
~~of~~

~~The applicant will be working closely with the Local Highway Authority on the number of vehicles requiring access off the Clayhithe Road to the pipe line corridor is approximately 8 HGVs per day for a period 6 months.~~

Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
Fen Ditton Parish Council	<p>connection tunnel and to a vent shaft or another type of asset. We object to the unrestricted use of Horningsea Road within the village for operational traffic.</p> <p><del>More details are needed on the frequency of visits and the vehicles and equipment involved.</del></p> <p>Ref 2-5 - extension to use existing Horningsea Road field access via the Jessie's Hen Farm for inspection and maintenance access during operational life of the project. FDPC comment: AW should clarify if this refers to the proposed Waterbeach pipeline or connection tunnel and to a vent shaft or another type of asset. We object to the unrestricted use of Horningsea Road within the village for operational traffic. More details are needed on the frequency of visits and the vehicles and equipment involved.</p> <p><u>Note also that any such use was objected to previously. We are pleased to see some reduction in the excessive land take referred to in our previous objection.</u> <a href="#">Historic England</a></p>	<p>The Applicant <del>acknowledges and</del> notes the comment <u>and can confirm that Jessie's Hens access is for Parish- access to Waterbeach only.</u></p>	
England	<p><del>NoteHistoric also that any such use was objected to previously. We are pleased to see some reduction in the excessive land take referred to in our previous objection.</del></p> <p>proposed minor amendments pursuant to the above referenced NSIP. The details have been noted and we have no comments to make.</p> <p><del>Concern about the impact of construction traffic on Clayhithe bridge. This bridge is narrow and the road bends sharply on either side of the bridge with limited view for drivers, bikes and pedestrians.</del></p>	<p><u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u> Thank you for your letter of 13 July and the accompanying plans which indicate the <u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u></p>	
Horningsea Parish Council	<p><del>Concern about the impact of construction traffic on Clayhithe bridge. This bridge is narrow and the road bends sharply on either side of the bridge with limited view for drivers, bikes and pedestrians.</del></p> <p><u>How will speed restrictions be enforced here?</u></p>	<p><del>The Applicant notes the comments.</del> will be working closely with the Local Highway Authority on the implementation of TTRO speed limits before and after the Clayhithe Bridge. The number of vehicles requiring access off the Clayhithe Road to the pipeline corridor is approximately 8 HGVs per day for a period 6 months. <del>The ES chapters for Biodiversity and Water Resources provide the assessment of effects for these disciplines. This assessment takes into account mitigation in respect of any impact to groundwater. The CEMP identifies the protection zone</del></p>	
Horningsea Parish Council	<p><del>HowHorningsea will speed restrictions be enforced here?</del></p> <p>Ref 5-1</p> <p>Altered work area so drainage ditch lies along northern edge, while 15m wide work area <u>effects for these disciplines. This assessment takes into account mitigation in</u> <u>The CEMP identifies the protection zone</u> Chapter 8:</p>	<p><u>The Applicant notes the comments.</u></p> <p><u>The ES chapters for Biodiversity and Water Resources provide the assessment of</u> <u>respect of any impact to groundwater.</u></p> <p>Reference 5.2.8 provided south of the ditch.</p>	Application Document

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
	<p>HPC Response            We have concern about the impact on the CWS if these works go ahead in the vicinity of ditch            5.1 and 5.2 The CWS contains rare and vulnerable species and this disturbance could lead to the damage of their habitat and species loss.</p>	<p><del>for the CWS to address this concern. In addition the Drainage Strategy sets out the</del>  <del>vicinity surface water management proposals for the project.</del></p>	<p>Biodiversity, Application Document Reference 5.2.8 Chapter 8: Biodiversity, Document Ref 5.4.2.2 CoCP Part B LERMP and CEMP.</p>
<p>Horningsea Parish</p>	<p>Ref 5-2 – Include adjacent public highway along Low Fen Drove Way.            HPC Response            Biodiversity, Document Ref: Council</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the comments. The access proposals are as set out within the Traffic and Transport chapters of the Environmental Statement. The effects <del>for the CWS to address this concern. In addition the Drainage Strategy sets out</del></p>	<p>Application</p>
	<p><del>We have concern about the impact on the CWS, if these works go ahead in the</del>  <del>Concern about noise and disturbance on the sensitive environment here.</del>  <del>The increased land take appears to be blocking Low Fen Drove with parking for</del>  <del>construction authority. The assessment includes modelling of construction vehicle movements</del>            Access should be from the A14, as strongly requested by the local community</p>	<p><del>to traffic and transport will be reported in the ES. This chapter will be</del>  <del>underpinned by a Transport Assessment (TA) which has been completed to align</del>  <del>with the TA guidance published Cambridge County Council (CCC) highway</del>  <del>authority. The assessment includes modelling of construction vehicle movements</del>  <del>to the TA has been</del>  <del>discussed with CCC including how to account for future changes to traffic</del>  <del>the modelling. The control of vehicle movements is a requirement</del>  <del>which obligates the Applicant to enforce a Construction Traffic</del>  <del>(CTMP) and a Construction Code of Practice (CoCP). The CTMP</del>  <del>on vehicle movements within the villages of Horningsea and</del>            Fen Ditton.</p>	<p>5.2.19 Traffic and Transport, Application Document Ref: vehicles. including those using Horningsea Road. The approach to the TA has been 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application volumes with Document Ref: within the DCO 5.4.2.1 CoCP, Management Plan Application includes a restriction Document Ref 7.8</p>
	<p>The CTMP secures the commitments in relation to the management of            will be developed into a final detailed CTMP following the 5.2.3 Alternatives submission of the DCO application. It includes a section on 'Adherence to Designated Routes' which includes a requirement for a strategy for reporting noncompliance as well as encouraging local residents to report HGV movements within villages. Furthermore the CTMP includes a section, 'Monitoring Strategy' which requires the Principal Contractor(s) to implement a system for monitoring the movement of vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Development, which includes ANPR cameras along Horningsea Road.</p>	<p>The final CTMP will set out the detailed management measures, procedures and best practices required for managing the impact of construction traffic on the local and strategic road networks during the construction period.</p> <p>A draft Community Liaison Framework Plan also included in the application sets out the approach to ongoing communication with residents, the community, and businesses, including communication in relation to traffic and transport matters.</p> <p>The Alternatives Chapter of the ES sets out the reasons for the decision in relation to the selected access option.</p>	<p>Community Liaison Plan,</p>



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
Horningssea Parish Council	<p>Ref 6-1</p> <p><del>Extend northwards between Horningssea Road and Waterbeach pipeline corridor, west of the cemetery. HPC Response</del></p> <p><del>This is very close to Horningssea Village and we need more information on the use of this area and the impact it will have on the road and the residents.</del></p> <p><del>Request details of the traffic management measures for Horningssea Road Does 'temporary construction working space' include hard standing for construction vehicles?</del></p> <p><del>How long is 'temporary'?</del></p> <p><del>What restitution measures are in place and time limit for restitution?</del></p> <p><del>How long will it take to restore the landscape?</del></p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgrows) and 4.8 Hedgrew regulations and tree preservation plan set out the hedgrows and TPO trees to be removed during construction, commitments to their replanting and reinstatement following construction is covered in the CoCP and Draft DCO and sets out approximate time scales. Compliance with the CoCP is a requirement within the draft DCO.</p>	<p>Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP</p>
Horningssea Parish Council	<p>Ref 6-2</p> <p><del>Provide corridors from Clayhithe Road via Gayton Farm to fields east of the farm, plus reflect 5.4.6.2). Assessment need to access north and south / west and east of two large field drains (application HPC Response</del></p> <p><del>This will have a long term impact on a busy working farm with sensitive livestock, reference: and a 5.4.6.3). This sets out measures for the safeguarding of soil resources and specific and monitoring requirements. This plan takes into account</del></p> <p><del>Request more information on frequency of access guidance from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), application Request more information on types of vehicle specifically Land use planning: Good practice guide for handling soils 2000 and document</del></p> <p><del>Request more information on noise levels and type of disturbance so livestock can be protected Code of Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on reference: 5.4.6.3 be protected Construction Sites 2009. Soil Management</del></p> <p><del>Request guarantee that churning up of tracks etc with be restored urgently and Plan compensation The Applicant has checked the Defra database on Countryside Stewardship the surface water management proposals for the project, provided speedily NB residents are still waiting for compensation for the mess Agreements and the wildflower strip is outside of the project boundary where</del></p>	<p>Impacts to agricultural land and farm businesses are assessed and reported in the ES in the Agricultural Impact Assessment (application document reference: 5.4.6.2). Assessment need to access north and south / west and east of two large field drains (application document reference: 5.4.6.2). The DCO will require the implementation of a Soil Management Plan. An outline plan is provided within the DCO application (see application document reference: 5.4.6.3). This sets out measures for the safeguarding of soil resources and specific camping and caravanning business. reinstatement</p> <p>Request more information on types of vehicle application Request more information on types of vehicle specifically Land use planning: Good practice guide for handling soils 2000 and document</p> <p>Request more information on noise levels and type of disturbance so livestock can be protected Code of Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on reference: 5.4.6.3 be protected Construction Sites 2009. Soil Management</p> <p>Plan compensation The Applicant has checked the Defra database on Countryside Stewardship Agreements and the wildflower strip is outside of the project boundary where</p>	<p>Agricultural Impact</p>
Application made on their behalf during Con 5.1 land	<p>Application made on their behalf during Con 5.1 land</p> <p>5.1 land during Con 5.2 The CWS contains rare and vulnerable species and this disturbance damage of their habitat and species loss.</p>	<p>5.4.2.1 CoCP Reference 5.2.8 could lead to the Chapter 8: Where possible land drains will be avoided. Measures within the CoCP biodiversity, business which will (Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP) require reinstatement of land drains. In</p>	<p>Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP</p>



Stakeholder Comment

Applicant Response

Document Reference

~~the Core Site standard design. In localised areas where there may be more disruption to land which will be in full view. drainage, it may become necessary to install a pre and post works land drainage system in consultation with landowners. under a Countryside Stewardship Agreement with DEFRA Land drains running east /west across the fields, could be impacted by the activities. These are not shown on the map. If these land drains are blocked, the land could flood. They also have a connection with Black Ditch and therefore, connection to the SSSI.~~

already be badly impacted by the construction of the pipeline and the activities on instances with where this is not possible then land drains will be repaired to a [Part B LERP](#) and [CEMP](#).



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
Horningsea Parish Council	<p>Ref 7-3            New land included due east from Mulberry House Farm to Waterbeach pipeline corridor</p> <p>HPC Response            Request more information on type of access, in order to assess likely impact on a working farm with livestock            Request clarity on time period required for access</p> <p>Request information on restitution – time to be accomplished            How will you prevent construction traffic from crossing the ‘land outside scheme order limits’</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out in detail all traffic movements within the final Traffic and Transport statement of the Environmental statement (application document reference: 5.2.19). Access for HGVs will not be as intense as the proposed WWTP location with approximately 8 HGV's per day during the time frame outlined in the COCP (application document reference 5.4.2.1)</p>	<p>Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP</p>
Horningsea Parish Council	<p>Ref 7-4            New land included to reflect actual hard standing area through Mulberry House Farm</p> <p>HPC Response:            3            Request more information on number of vehicles, frequency, likely noise, intended use of hard standing which will impact the resident, the farm and livestock, and the commercial unit tenants at this busy farm            Request more information on time period access required.            Request information on restitution            Request information on affected trees and hedgerows</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out in details all traffic movements within the final Traffic and Transport statement of the Environmental statement (application document reference: 5.2.19).</p>	<p>Application Document reference: 5.2.19            Traffic and Transport</p>



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference Application
Horningsea Parish Council	<p>Ref 5-2 - Include adjacent public highway along Low Fen Drove Way.            HPC Response            Concern about impact on CWS.            Concern about noise and disturbance on the sensitive environment here. The increased land take appears to be blocking Low Fen Drove with parking for construction vehicles.            Access should be from the A14, as strongly requested by the local community</p>	<p><del>Include the adjacent section of Clayhithe Road and land either side of Mulberry House Farm entrance HPC Response</del>  <del>Request more information on number of vehicles, frequency of visits</del>            The Applicant notes the comments. The access proposals are as set out within the Traffic and Transport chapters of the Environmental Statement. The effects to traffic and transport will be reported in the ES. This chapter will be underpinned by a Transport Assessment (TA) which has been completed to align with the TA guidance published Cambridge County Council (CCC) highway <del>Application construction</del> authority. The assessment includes modelling of construction vehicle movements <del>Document Ref: vehicles</del> including those using Horningsea Road. The approach to the TA has been discussed with CCC including how to account for future changes to traffic <del>Application</del> volumes with the modelling. The control of vehicle movements is a requirement <del>Document Ref:</del> within the DCO which obligates the Applicant to enforce a Construction Traffic <del>5.4.2.1 CoCP, Management Plan (CTMP) and a Construction Code of Practice (CoCP).</del> The CTMP <del>Application</del> includes a restriction on vehicle movements within the villages of Horningsea and Fen Ditton.</p> <p>The CTMP secures the commitments in relation to the management of construction vehicle movements. A draft of the CTMP is included in the application and will be developed into a final detailed CTMP following the <del>5.2.3 Alternatives</del> submission of the DCO application. It includes a section on 'Adherence to Designated Routes' which includes a requirement for a strategy for reporting noncompliance as well as encouraging local residents to report HGV movements within villages. Furthermore the CTMP includes a section, 'Monitoring Strategy' which requires the Principal Contractor(s) to implement a system for monitoring the movement of vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Development, which includes ANPR cameras along Horningsea Road. <del>This will have an impact on the tenants with commercial units at Grange Farm. There is a bend in the road here, what traffic</del> The final CTMP will set out the detailed management measures <del>will be put in place and for how long will this access be necessary?</del>, procedures and best practices required for managing the impact of construction traffic on the local and strategic road networks during the construction period.</p> <p>A draft Community Liaison Framework Plan also included in the application sets out the approach to ongoing communication with residents, the community, and businesses, including communication in relation to traffic and transport matters.</p>	<p>Application            Document Ref:            5.2.19 Traffic and Transport,            Application            Document Ref:            5.4.19.7 CTMP,            Application            Document Ref:            5.4.2.1 CoCP,            Application            Document Ref 7.8            Community Liaison Plan,            Application            Document Ref:            5.2.3 Alternatives</p>

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells



Stakeholder Comment

Applicant Response

Document Reference

The Alternatives Chapter of the ES sets out the reasons for the decision in relation to the selected access option.

Stakeholder Comment

Applicant Response

Document Reference  
Application

Horningsea Ref 6-1

Parish Extend northwards between Horningsea Road and Waterbeach pipeline  
Council corridor, west of the cemetery. HPC Response

This is very close to Horningsea Village and we need more information on the use of this area and the impact it will have on the road and the residents.  
Request details of the traffic management measures for Horningsea Road  
Does 'temporary construction working space' include hard standing for construction vehicles?  
How long is 'temporary'  
What restitution measures are in place and time limit for restitution?  
How long will it take to restore the landscape ?

The Applicant can confirm that Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgrows) and 4.8 Hedgrow regulations and tree preservation plan set out the hedgrows and TPO trees to be removed during construction, commitments to their replanting and reinstatement following construction is covered in the CoCP and Draft DCO and sets out approximate time scales. Compliance with the CoCP is a requirement within the draft DCO.

Application  
Document Ref:  
5.4.2.1 CoCP



<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>Document Reference</u>
<u>Horningsea Parish Council</u>	<p>Ref 6-2</p> <p>Provide corridors from Clayhithe Road via Gayton Farm to fields east of the farm, plus reflect need to access north and south / west and east of two large field drains</p> <p>HPC Response</p> <p>This will have a long-term impact on a busy working farm with sensitive livestock, and a camping and caravanning business.</p> <p>Request more information on frequency of access</p> <p>Request more information on types of vehicle</p> <p>Request more information on noise levels and type of disturbance so livestock can be protected</p> <p>Request guarantee that churning up of tracks etc with be restored urgently and compensation provided speedily NB residents are still waiting for compensation for the mess made on their land during Con 3</p> <p>The inspection route would be very close to the camping and caravanning business which will already be badly impacted by the construction of the pipeline and the activities on the Core Site which will be in full view.</p> <p>The route would have an impact on a large wildflower strip which has been set up under a Countryside Stewardship Agreement with DEFRA</p> <p>Land drains running east /west across the fields, could be impacted by the activities. These are not shown on the map. If these land drains are blocked, the land could flood. They also have a connection with Black Ditch and therefore, connection to the SSSI.</p>	<p>Impacts to agricultural land and farm businesses are assessed and reported in the ES in the Agricultural Impact Assessment (application document reference: 5.4.6.2).</p> <p>The DCO will require the implementation of a Soil Management Plan. An outline plan is provided within the DCO application (see application document reference: 5.4.6.3). This sets out measures for the safeguarding of soil resources and specific reinstatement and monitoring requirements. This plan takes into account guidance from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), specifically Land use planning: Good practice guide for handling soils 2000 and Code of Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites 2009.</p> <p>The Applicant has checked the Defra database on Countryside Stewardship Agreements and the wildflower strip is outside of the project boundary where construction activities will take place.</p> <p>Where possible land drains will be avoided. Measures within the CoCP (Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1 CoCP) require reinstatement of land drains. In instances with where this is not possible then land drains will be repaired to a standard design. In localised areas where there may be more disruption to land drainage, it may become necessary to install a pre and post works land drainage system in consultation with landowners.</p>	<p>Agricultural Impact Assessment (application document reference: 5.4.6.2).</p> <p>application document reference: 5.4.6.3</p> <p>Soil Management Plan</p> <p>Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1 CoCP</p>
<u>Horningsea Parish Council</u>	<p>Ref 7-3</p> <p>New land included due east from Mulberry House Farm to Waterbeach pipeline corridor</p> <p>HPC Response</p> <p>Request more information on type of access, in order to assess likely impact on a working farm with livestock</p> <p>Request clarity on time period required for access</p> <p>Request information on affected trees and hedgerows</p> <p>Request information on restitution – time to be accomplished</p> <p>How will you prevent construction traffic from crossing the ‘ land outside scheme order limits’</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out in detail all traffic movements within the final Traffic and Transport statement of the Environmental statement (application document reference: 5.2.19). Access for HGVs will not be as intense as the proposed WWTP location with approximately 8 HGV's per day during the time frame outlined in the COCP (application document reference 5.4.2.1)</p>	<p>Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1 CoCP</p>



<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>Document Reference</u> Application
<u>Horningsea Parish Council</u>	<p>Ref 7-4</p> <p><u>New land included to reflect actual hard standing area through Mulberry House Farm</u></p> <p><u>HPC Response:</u></p> <p><u>3</u></p> <p><u>Request more information on number of vehicles, frequency, likely noise, intended use of hard standing which will impact the resident, the farm and livestock, and the commercial unit tenants at this busy farm</u></p> <p><u>Request more information on time period access required.</u></p> <p><u>Request information on restitution</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant has set out in details all traffic movements within the final Traffic and Transport statement of the Environmental statement (application document reference: 5.2.19).</u></p>	<p><u>Application Document reference: 5.2.19</u></p> <p><u>Traffic and Transport</u></p>
<u>Horningsea Parish Council</u>	<p>Ref 7-5</p> <p><u>Include the adjacent section of Clayhithe Road and land either side of Mulberry House Farm entrance</u></p> <p><u>HPC Response</u></p> <p><u>Request more information on number of vehicles, frequency of visits</u></p> <p><u>This will have an impact on the tenants with commercial units at Grange Farm</u></p> <p><u>There is a bend in the road here, what traffic management measures will be put in place and for how long will this access be necessary?</u></p> <p><u>Impact on hedgerows, trees etc as per initial comments in this response</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant has set out in details all traffic movements within the final Traffic and Transport statement of the Environmental statement (application document <del>reference: 5.2.19).</del> <del>reference: 5.2.19</del></u></p> <p><u><del>Traffic and Transport</del> The Applicant can confirm that Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgerows) <del>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</del> <del>Document Ref.</del> (application document reference 5.4.2.1) and Draft DCO. Compliance with the <del>5.4.2.1 CoCP</del> <u>CoCP is a requirement within the draft DCO.</u></u></p>	<p><u>Application Document reference: 5.2.19</u></p> <p><u>Traffic and Transport</u></p> <p><u>Application Document Ref. 5.4.2.1 CoCP</u></p>
<u>Horningsea Parish Council</u>	<p>Ref 8-2 <del>Parish Council</del></p> <p><u>Include area of land south of Hartridges Lane, plus section of Clayhithe Road</u></p> <p><u>HPC Response</u></p> <p><u>Request further information on damage to hedgerows and trees in this area</u></p> <p><u>How long will access be necessary?</u></p> <p><u>What traffic management measures will be put in place at this sharp bend on Clayhithe Road?</u></p> <p><u>Not clear about naming of Riverside Farm. It is not marked on Google Maps or OS, this may be barns on Hartridges Lane?</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant will be working closely with the Local Highway Authority on the implementation of TTRO speed limits before and after the Clayhithe Bridge. The number of vehicles requiring access off the Clayhithe Road to the pipe line corridor is approximately 8 HGVs per day for a period 6 months.</u></p>	
<u>Pegasus Group</u>	<p><del>Argiva</del> <u>Argiva operate an equipment room at the bottom of Fen Road, just to the south <del>Group</del> of the A14 (52.23197100, .16865500). Argiva has rights to access this site and has a service obligation that the site continues to operate. Whilst Argiva has no objection to the principle of the relocation project, means of access to this equipment room should be preserved at all times as should the means of providing power and fibre connectivity to the site.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant notes the comment and any retention of access can and will be covered, if necessary, by Protective Provisions.</u></p>	



**Stakeholder Comment**

**Applicant Response**

**Document Reference**

<p>Peter Brierly</p>	<p>1. How will you ensure compliance with the traffic management plan in regard to restriction on HGVs using Car Dyke Road/A10 junction.</p>	<p>All traffic management commitments will be agreed through the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (application document reference: 5.4.19.7) and CoCP (application document reference 5.4.2.1) and monitored through the 5.2.19 Traffic and Community Liaison Group in line with the Community Liaison Plan. We are Transport, working with the Local Highways Authority to arrange access to the pipeline corridor, this is allowed for within the Traffic Regulation Order currently in place on Car Dyke Road. 5.4.19.7 CTMP,</p>	<p>Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.19 Traffic and Transport, Application Document Ref: 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP, Application Document Ref 7.8 Community Liaison Plan</p>
----------------------	--	---	---

and Transport statement of the Environmental statement (application document reference: 5.2.19). Document reference: 5.2.19

Traffic and The Applicant can confirm that Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgerows) Transport 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 Document Ref. (application document reference 5.4.2.1) and Draft DCO. Compliance with the 5.4.2.1 CoCP CoCP is a requirement within the draft DCO.

The Applicant will be working closely with the Local Highway Authority on the implementation of TTRO speed limits before and after the Clayhithe Bridge. The number of vehicles requiring access off the Clayhithe Road to the pipe line corridor is approximately 8 HGVs per day for a period 6 months.

**Horningsea**

Ref 8-2

Parish Council Include area of land south of Hartridges Lane, plus section of Clayhithe Road HPC Response

Request further information on damage to hedgerows and trees in this area How long will access be necessary?

What traffic management measures will be put in place at this sharp bend on Clayhithe Road?

Not clear about naming of Riverside Farm. It is not marked on Google Maps or OS, this may be barns on Hartridges Lane?

Pegasus Group of the A14 (52.23197100, -16865500). Arqiva has rights to access this site and has a service obligation that the site continues to operate. Whilst Arqiva has no objection to the principle of the relocation project, means of access to this equipment room should be preserved at all times as should the means of providing power and fibre connectivity to the site. Peter

1. How will you ensure compliance with the traffic management plan in regard to Brierly restriction on HGVs using Car Dyke Road/A10 junction.





Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference Application
Peter	2. Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) is being used around Horningsea <del>The Applicant notes the comments. The areas in Waterbeach do not have the</del>	<del>Liaison Plan. The Applicant notes the comments. The areas in Waterbeach do not have the</del> conservation status as the areas utilizing ANPR in Horningsea and Fen	
Brierly	and Fen Ditton. What is your reasoning for not using this around Waterbeach <del>village?</del>	<del>village?</del> Ditton given the development proposals for Waterbeach New Town. In	
Peter	3. Why does the traffic management plan permit vehicles less than 7.5t to use the	addition,	
Brierly	<del>Car dyke road/A10 junction when there is an alternative to use the haul road and join the road network at A14? The current position will increase traffic in the village and risk to school children, which is contrary to the Waterbeach Local plan.</del>		
Peter	4. What consideration has been made to the introduction of a 20mph limit in Brierly <del>Waterbeach village?</del>		
Peter	5. What specifically is meant by the car parking restrictions in Waterbeach?		
Brierly			
Peter	6. What is meant by the statement two way HGV movement during the		
Brierly	<del>construction of the Waterbeach pipeline. Will this be through the village?</del>		
	The Applicant notes the comment and any retention of access can and will be covered, if necessary, by Protective Provisions.		
	<del>All traffic management commitments will be agreed through the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (application document reference: 5.4.19.7) and Document Ref: CoCP (application document reference 5.4.2.1) and monitored through the 5.2.19 Traffic and Community Liaison Group in line with the Community Liaison Plan. We are Transport, working with the Local Highways Authority to arrange access to the pipeline Application corridor, this is allowed for within the Traffic Regulation Order currently in place Document Ref: on Car Dyke Road, 5.4.19.7 CTMP,</del>		
		Application	
		Document	
		Ref:	
		5.4.2.1	
		CoCP,	
		Application	
		Document	
		Ref 7.8	
		Community	

t  
h  
e  
W  
a  
t  
e  
r  
b  
e  
a  
c  
h  
p  
i  
p  
e  
l  
i  
n  
e  
s  
t  
a  
r  
t  
s  
t  
o  
t  
h  
e  
E  
a  
s  
t  
o



Stakeholder Comment

Applicant Response

Document Reference

f  
W  
a  
t  
e  
r  
b  
e  
a  
c  
h  
w  
h  
i  
c  
h  
m  
a  
k  
e  
s  
c  
o  
n  
s  
t  
r  
u  
c  
t  
i  
o  
n  
o  
f  
t  
h  
e  
p  
i  
p  
e

l  
i  
n  
e  
i  
m  
p  
r  
a  
c  
t  
i  
c  
a  
b  
l  
e  
w  
i  
t  
h  
o  
u  
t  
a  
c  
c  
e  
s  
s  
t  
h  
r  
o  
u  
g  
h  
W  
a  
t  
e  
r



Stakeholder Comment

Applicant Response

Document Reference

Application

b  
e  
a  
c  
h  
.  
I  
t  
s  
h  
o  
u  
l  
d  
a  
l  
s  
o  
b  
e  
n  
o  
t  
e  
d  
t  
h  
a  
t  
t  
h  
e  
c  
o  
n  
s  
t  
r  
u  
c  
t

i  
o  
n  
i  
n  
W  
a  
t  
e  
r  
b  
e  
a  
c  
h  
i  
s  
f  
o  
r  
a  
m  
u  
c  
h  
s  
h  
o  
r  
t  
e  
r  
p  
e  
r  
i  
o  
d  
o  
f  
t



<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>Document Reference</u>
		i m , w i t h s m a l l e r , t e m p o r a r y i m p a c t s a s c o n s t r u c	t i o n w o r k m o v e s a l o n g t h e p i p e l i n e l e n g t h a s i t i s c



**Stakeholder Comment**

**Applicant Response**

**Document Reference**

Application

Stakeholder Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
	<p><a href="#">Peter Brierly</a> <a href="#">5. What specifically is meant by the car parking restrictions in Waterbeach?</a></p>	<p><a href="#">Parking restrictions refer to roads that the applicant need to keep clear for construction access only.</a></p>
	<p><a href="#">Peter Brierly</a> <a href="#">6. What is meant by the statement two-way HGV movement during the construction of the Waterbeach pipeline. Will this be through the village?</a></p>	<p><a href="#">All traffic routes and expected traffic numbers are identified in the ES (application) — <a href="#">Application</a> COCP, traffic assessment and traffic and transport chapter of the ES (application) — <a href="#">Document Ref:</a> document reference 5.2.19.</a></p>
	<p><del>The Applicant notes the comment. The proposals have been discussed and agreed with the Highway Authorities. Car Dyke Road provides the most practicable route to the pipeline corridor, vehicles numbers are not significantly high and construction vehicle safety is an important factor in decision making. The CTMP requires that HGV's comply to CLOCS and FORS safety standards. The Applicant notes the comment. The proposals have been discussed and agreed with the Highway Authorities. Car Dyke Road provides the most practicable route to the pipeline corridor, vehicles numbers are not significantly high and construction vehicle safety is an important factor in decision making. The CTMP requires that HGV's comply to CLOCS and FORS safety standards.</del></p>	<p><del>Application agreed with the Highway Authorities. Car Dyke Road provides the most practicable route to the pipeline corridor, vehicles numbers are not significantly high and construction vehicle safety is an important factor in decision making. The CTMP requires that HGV's comply to CLOCS and FORS safety standards. The Applicant notes the comment. The proposals have been discussed and agreed with the Highway Authorities. Car Dyke Road provides the most practicable route to the pipeline corridor, vehicles numbers are not significantly high and construction vehicle safety is an important factor in decision making. The CTMP requires that HGV's comply to CLOCS and FORS safety standards.</del></p>
<p><a href="#">Peter Brierly</a> <a href="#">3. Why does the traffic management plan permit vehicles less than 7.5t to use the Car dyke road/A10 junction when there is an alternative to use the haul road and join the road network at A14? The current position will increase traffic in the village and risk to school children, which is contrary to the Waterbeach Local plan.</a></p>	<p><del>The Applicant notes the comment. The proposals have been discussed and agreed with the Highway Authorities. Car Dyke Road provides the most practicable route to the pipeline corridor, vehicles numbers are not significantly high and construction vehicle safety is an important factor in decision making. The CTMP requires that HGV's comply to CLOCS and FORS safety standards.</del></p>	<p><del>Application Document Ref: 5.4.19.7 CTMP</del></p>
<p><a href="#">Peter Brierly</a> <a href="#">4. What consideration has been made to the introduction of a 20mph limit in Waterbeach village?</a></p>	<p><del>The effects of the Proposed Development on existing traffic and transport and by proposed construction traffic (e.g. dust, noise impacts on nearby receptors) are assessed in the Environmental Statement that accompanies the DCO application. All traffic routes and expected traffic numbers are identified within the CTMP, where any risk of significant effects on receptors are identified the Environmental Statement identifies measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate these effects, including reduced speed limits.</del></p>	<p><del>Application Document Ref: 5.2.19 Traffic and Transport,</del></p>
		<p><a href="#">Application Document Ref: 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP</a></p>
<p><a href="#">Royal Mail</a> <a href="#">Royal Mail has three operational properties within 10 miles of the proposed relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTPR): Cambridge Parcelforce Depot (CB1 3EZ) – circa. 5km; Cambridge Delivery Office (CB1 7QQ) – circa. 8km; and Cambridge Vehicle Park (CB1 7DY) – circa. 9km. Royal Mail supports Anglian Water Services Limited's proposed relocation of the CWWTPR. However, Royal Mail is concerned about the scheme's potential construction phase and operation phase impacts on its road based operations, particularly in view of the potential for cumulative impacts from other proposed</a></p>	<p><a href="#">The Applicant notes the comments and will continue to work with Royal Mail to ensure there is no impact to their services as a result of construction traffic. This can be incorporated into Protective Provisions within the DCO once agreed if necessary.</a></p>	

<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>Document Reference</u>
	<u>major developments in the area, including North East Cambridge and Waterbeach New Town.</u>		
<u>Royal Mail</u>	<u>Any periods of road disruption / closure, night or day, on or to the roads immediately connected to these developments or the surrounding highway network will have the potential to impact operations and may consequently disrupt Royal Mail's ability to meet its Universal Obligation service delivery <del>necessary</del> targets. The A14 and the A10 are both of high strategic importance to Royal Mail operational vehicle movements and its distribution network, meaning that road works and Traffic Management affecting these routes have significant potential to disrupt Royal Mail operations.</u>	<u>The Applicant notes the comments and will continue to work with Royal Mail to ensure there is no impact to their services as a result of construction traffic. This can be incorporated into Protective Provisions within the DCO once agreed and if necessary.</u>	
<u>Royal Mail</u>	<u>It is also requested that Royal Mail is invited to join any Traffic Management Group for the scheme that is set up for this scheme and any other major development proposals in the vicinity.</u>	<u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment and will include Royal Mail in any Traffic Management Group.</u>	
<del>Royal Mail</del>	<del>Royal Mail has three operational properties within 10 miles of the proposed relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTPR):        - Cambridge Parcelforce Depot (CB1 3EZ) - circa. 5km;        - Cambridge Delivery Office (CB1 7QQ) - circa. 8km; and        - Cambridge Vehicle Park (CB1 7DY) - circa. 9km.        Royal Mail supports Anglian Water Services Limited's proposed relocation of the CWWTPR. However, Royal Mail is concerned about the scheme's potential construction phase and operation phase impacts on its road-based operations, particularly in view of the potential for cumulative impacts from other proposed major developments in the area, including North East Cambridge and Waterbeach New Town. Royal Mail <del>Any periods of road disruption / closure, night or day, on or to the roads</del> immediately connected to these developments or the surrounding highway network will have the potential to impact operations and may consequently <del>disrupt Royal Mail's ability to meet its Universal Obligation service delivery</del> <del>necessary</del> targets. The A14 and the A10 are both of high strategic importance to Royal Mail operational vehicle movements and its distribution network, meaning that road works and Traffic Management affecting these routes have significant potential to disrupt Royal Mail operations.</del>	<del>The Applicant notes the comments and will continue to work with Royal Mail to ensure there is no impact to their services as a result of construction traffic. This can be incorporated into Protective Provisions within the DCO once agreed if necessary.</del>	

<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>Document Reference</u> Application
<del>Royal Mail</del>	<del>It is also requested that Royal Mail is invited to join any Traffic Management the scheme that is set up for this scheme and any other major</del>	<del>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment and will include Royal Mail Group for in any Traffic Management Group.</del>	
<del>Royal Mail</del>	<del>As the information outlined in the consultation documents does not specify the CTMP (application Application intended works to the local highways network and there is no CTMP available, application. Document there remains insufficient detail in relation to the scheme for Royal Mail to assess 5.4.19.7 CTMP position to submit a consultation response/s at a later stage in the consenting process and give evidence at any future Public Examination, if required.</del>	<del>The Applicant notes the comment and can confirm that the document reference: 5.4.19.7) will be submitted with the DCO reference: any potential impact to its assets. Therefore, Royal Mail</del>	
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	Change 2-5 - extension to use existing access track to Horningsea Road from Jessie's Hen Farm for inspection and maintenance access during operational life of the project. SHH comment: this would appear to only require the first 30 or so metres of the existing access track, which is away from the hen pens. This, for occasional access by light vehicles, is probably acceptable.	The Applicant notes the comment and the access is only intended for access by light vehicles.	
<del>Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</del>	<del>Change 2-5 extension to use existing access track to Horningsea Road from Jessie's Hen Farm for inspection and maintenance access during operational life of the project. SHH comment: this would appear to only require the first 30 or so metres of the existing access track, which is away from the hen pens. This, for occasional access by light vehicles, is probably acceptable.</del>	<del>The Applicant notes the comment and the access is only intended for access by light vehicles.</del>	
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	Map 6 SHH comment: We note that the order limit has been pulled back to coincide with the highway	The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.	
	boundary on the west side of Horningsea Road (avoiding land take from the cemetery, for example) and that the land take on the eastern side of Horningsea Road has been widened. These are both desirable changes, particularly if this will allow additional planting to reinforce the line of occasional trees along the eastern side of the road, helping to screen views of the new works by pedestrians from the road/footways and footpaths. We are not aware that any substantial construction works to Horningsea Road are proposed in this location, so the general description as 'temporary construction working space' is a little misleading. Any construction		

<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>	<u>Document Reference</u>
	<p>vehicle/materials access to the Waterbeach pipeline corridor itself should be taken via the main/core site access, not from this stretch of Horningsea Road between Lower Fen Drove Way and the village.</p> <p>SHH's previous representations, in response to Con Three, argued that additional land within the field north of Lower Fen Drove Way, shown as 'land not to be taken' on the revised plans, should have been included in the order limit, to allow more effective landscape screening of views from the north west from Horningsea Road. We are disappointed that this well thought out suggestion has apparently been rejected.</p>		
<p><del>Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)</del></p>	<p><del>Change 6-2 This is noted as to 'provide corridors from Clayhithe Road via Gayton Farm to fields east of the farm, plus reflect need to access north and south / west and east of two large field it was found before the development began therefore not being there in the drains for inspection and maintenance access during operational life of the operational phase project.'</del></p> <p><del>SHH comment: This is a substantial additional land take, not included at Con 3, which appears to use narrow existing dog-legged tracks/hard standings through Gayton Farm. It is difficult to believe that an entirely new access is needed just for field drain maintenance here (or that the access as proposed will be adequate for large machines). If access is required to these drains, it could be better achieved from the construction/maintenance access already being proposed at the layby north of the village, now shown in revised form as Change 7-1.</del></p>	<p><del>The Applicant can confirm that the permanent access is to follow the field edge similar to how the farm machinery access the field to reduce crop damage if access is needed. The temporary easement will be returned back to the standard</del></p>	



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
-------------	---------	--------------------	--------------------

Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project  
 Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008

Save Honey — Map 7

Stakeholder

Comment

Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	<p>Change <del>7-12</del> <u>revises the order limits coverage of Clayhithe Road, – This is noted as to ‘provide corridors from Clayhithe Road layby and the via Gayton Farm to fields east of the farm, plus reflect need to access north and south / west and east of two large field between the layby and Waterbeach pipeline corridor for access for temporary construction access and traffic management requirements. drains for inspection and maintenance access during operational life of the project.’</u></p> <p>SHH comment: <del>The</del> <u>This is a substantial</u> additional <del>trapezoidal</del> land take, <del>proposed at the south end of the lay by</del> <u>not included at Con 3, which appears</u></p> <p><del>appears to offer a far more practicable construction (and long term maintenance) access, separated from the continuing public use of most of the layby, which is an important parking</del></p> <p><u>to use narrow existing dog-legged tracks/hard standings through Gayton Farm. It is difficult to believe that an entirely new access is needed just for field drain maintenance here (or that the access as proposed will be adequate for large machines). If access is required to these drains, it area/entry point onto the public footpath network. We note that parts of the existing lay by and footpath are being kept inside the order limit. This is acceptable if needed for traffic management or temporary footpath closures or diversions, but this land should not generally be used by construction machinery accessing the pipeline corridor could be better achieved from the construction/maintenance access already being proposed at the layby north of the village, now shown in revised form as Change 7-1.</u></p>	<p>Document Ref: <del>5.2.19 Traffic and Application Docu 5.4.19.7 CTMP, A</del></p> <p>The Applicant can field edge Hill (an farm machinery needed. The term it was found before in the operationa</p>
----------------------------------	---	---

#  
#







<a href="#">Stakeholder</a>	<a href="#">Comment</a>	<a href="#">Applicant Response</a>	<a href="#">Document Reference</a>
-----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

~~Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project~~  
~~Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008~~

†  
e  
e  
†  
#  
#  
#  
e  
e  
#  
#  
#  
†  
e  
†  
e  
e  
e  
e  
e  
#  
e  
#  
#  
#  
#  
#  
#  
#  
#  
#  
#  
†



<a href="#">Stakeholder</a>	<a href="#">Comment</a>	<a href="#">Applicant Response</a>	<a href="#">Document Reference</a>
-----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

~~Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project~~  
~~Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008~~

#  
#  
+  
+  
#  
#  
#  
#  
#  
+  
#  
#  
#  
#  
#  
#  
+  
#  
#  
#  
+  
+  
#  
#  
#  
#  
#  
+  
#  
+  
#  
#  
#  
#  
+  
#  
#  
#





<a href="#">Stakeholder</a>	<a href="#">Comment</a>	<a href="#">Applicant Response</a>	<a href="#">Document Reference</a>
-----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------

~~Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project~~  
~~Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008~~

~~means of understanding the application of safeguards to specific trees during construction.~~

~~The Applicant can confirm that Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgrows) and 4.8 Hedgrow regulations and tree preservation plan set out the hedgrows 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.~~

~~The Applicant notes the comments but does not propose to alter the access to~~



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	<p><del>Changes 7-2 and 7-3 create a new direct construction access eastward from the hardstanding effectively replacing the dog-leg route shown at Con 3. The alignment of the pipeline corridor is</del></p> <p><u>Map 7</u></p> <p>Change 7-1 revises the order limits coverage of Clayhithe Road, Clayhithe Road layby and the field between the layby and Waterbeach pipeline corridor for access for temporary construction access and traffic management requirements. Inspection and maintenance access during operational life of the project. SHH comment: The additional trapezoidal land take proposed at the south end of the lay-by appears to offer a far more practicable construction (and long term maintenance) access, separated from the continuing public use of most of the layby, which is an important parking area/entry point onto the public footpath network. We note that parts of the existing lay-by and footpath are being kept inside the order limit. This is acceptable if needed for traffic management or temporary footpath closures or diversions, but this land should not generally be used by construction machinery accessing the pipeline corridor.</p>	<p>The Applicant can confirm that this access is for access for construction access and deliveries. The total number per day is identified in the CTMP, Traffic Assessment and traffic and transport chapter of the ES. We do not believe this operation will cause significant impact on the current use of the layby.</p>	<p><u>Application Document Ref: 5.2.19 Traffic and Transport, Application Document Ref: 5.4.19.7 CTMP, Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP</u></p>
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	<p><u>Changes 7-2 and 7-3 create a new direct construction access eastward from the hardstanding effectively replacing the dog-leg route shown at Con 3. The alignment of the pipeline corridor is also adjusted slightly. We note that the original route is being kept in the order limit as a narrow corridor, presumably for light vehicle maintenance access. These changes appear sensible and are welcomed.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant acknowledges and notes the comment.</u></p>	
Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder)	<p>SHH comment: Change 8-1 is very minor and acceptable. Changes 8-2 and 8-3 involve creating a much wider access corridor than at Con 3, using the field to the south of the existing Hatridge's Lane and also use of some existing hardstanding adjacent to the farm buildings. These changes are generally welcome if this allows segregation of existing users and construction traffic. However, our concern here has always been to avoid the removal of any existing mature trees (and hedges) at this location just for temporary construction activities. The photos included in Annex A (Photos 1 to 3) show that there is a mature ash and an oak within the new limits on the field boundary/ in the field to the south and several ash and other trees in the hedgeline on the northern boundary. Can we please have a clear assurance that these particular mature trees will not be removed and that the established hedgerows will be retained, wherever possible?</p>	<p><u>The application will include a separate Arboricultural Impact Assessment report and accompanying drawings. This report identifies constraints and provides a means of understanding the application of safeguards to specific trees during construction.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant can confirm that Schedule 15 of the DCO (Removal of hedgrows) and 4.8 Hedgrows regulations and tree preservation plan set out the hedgrows 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.</u></p>	<p>Application Document Ref: 5.4.2.1 CoCP</p>

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
<p><del>Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project            Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008</del></p>	<p><del>Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder) • SHH comment on changes to the traffic management outside order Hill (and Ian Gilder) limits (as described in page 2 of the consultation letter to property owners):</del></p> <p><del>also adjusted slightly. We note that the original route is being kept in the order limit as a narrow corridor, presumably for light vehicle maintenance access. These changes appear sensible and are welcomed.</del></p> <p><del>Save Honey Hill (and Ian Gilder) SHH comment on changes to the traffic management outside order limits (as described in page 2 of the consultation letter to property owners):</del></p>	<p><del>The Applicant notes the comments but does not propose to alter the access to the site to be via the layby between junctions 34 and 35. This has been discussed and assessed with the relevant traffic authorities and is not considered suitable.</del></p> <p><del>the site to be via the layby between junctions 34 and 35. This has been discussed and assessed with the relevant traffic authorities and is not considered suitable.</del></p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>□ Temporary overnight full closure of the A14 between Junction 33 and 35 for bridge works would not be necessary if the access to the site were to be via the layby between junctions 34 and 35. This has been a strong recommendation by Parish Council, District Council, Save Honey Hill and Lucy Frazer, MP. These closures will impact commercial traffic travelling to Felixstowe.</del></li> <li><del>□ Temporary speed limit restrictions on Clayhithe Road. We welcome these restrictions but reiterate from the Con Three consultation that Clayhithe bridge is narrow, with a steep approach ramp and not intended for heavy construction traffic, so may require further temporary works.</del></li> <li><del>□ Waterbeach traffic management – these are likely to impact residents and commercial units on Convent Drive.</del></li> </ul>		

Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells  
 Inserted Cells



Document  
Reference  
Application



**Stakeholder Comment**

**Applicant Response**

[Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project](#)  
[Applicant Regard to Targeted Statutory Consultation Responses under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008](#)

- [Temporary overnight full closure of the A14 between Junction 33 and 35 for bridge](#)  
~~35~~ works would not be necessary if the access to the site were to be via [the layby between junctions 34 and 35](#). This has been a strong recommendation by [Parish Council, District Council, Save Honey Hill and Lucy Frazer, MP](#).  
These closures will impact commercial traffic travelling to Felixstowe. ☐
- [Temporary speed limit restrictions on Clayhithe Road](#). We welcome these restrictions but reiterate from the Con Three consultation that [Clayhithe bridge is narrow, with a steep approach ramp and not intended for heavy construction traffic, so may require further temporary works](#). ☐
- [Waterbeach traffic management - these are likely to impact residents and commercial units on Convent Drive](#).



**Table 0.111-11: Water Resources Stakeholder Comment**

<u>Stakeholder</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>
Canal and River Trust	Thank you for your consultation on the amendments to the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project. The proposed works are not within close proximity to the Trust's network, and we therefore have no comments to make.	<a href="#">The Applicant notes the comment.</a>
Canal and River Trust	<del>We would however advise that the Inland Waterways Association, The East River Trust Anglian Waterways Association and EA should be included in any consultation.</del>	<del>The Applicant notes the comment and can confirm it is in contact with the Environment Agency and Waterways Association.</del>
<del>Environment Agency</del>	<del>Having reviewed the proposals, we have no objections to the changes. You will need to gain the appropriate Environmental Permits where works are near the River Cam.</del>	
<del>Fen Ditton Parish Council</del>	<del>Sheets 8 and 9 Waterbeach Area        FDPC comment: We have objected previously to the absence of emergency washout at the lower end of the Waterbeach pipeline. We consider you should ensure there is sufficient opportunity within the proposed land to add such an asset. The absence of land should not be used in future as a reason to reject this propose asset.</del>	

Doc

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

Inserted Cells

**Applicant Response** **Document Reference**

~~The Applicant notes the comment.~~



Stakeholder	Comment	Applicant Response	Document Reference
	<u>Having reviewed the proposals, we have no objections to the changes. You will</u>	The Applicant is in discussion with the Environment Agency regarding the need	
<u>Environment Agency and Waterways Association</u>	<u>Having reviewed the proposals, we have no objections to the changes. You will</u>	The Applicant is in discussion with the Environment Agency regarding the need	
<u>Agency</u>	<u>need to gain the appropriate Environmental Permits where works are near the River Cam.</u>	to apply for a Flood Risk Activity Permit to allow the works required at the site of the new outfall into the River Cam.	
<u>Fen Ditton Parish Council</u>	<u>Sheets 8 and 9 – Waterbeach Area</u> <u>Parish—FDPC comment: We have objected previously to the absence of emergency Council—washout at the lower end of the Waterbeach pipeline. We consider you should ensure there is sufficient opportunity within the proposed land to add such an asset. The absence of land should not be used in future as a reason to reject this propose asset.</u>	<u>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 weldedtogether 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.</u>	

~~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.~~

## Get in touch

### You can contact us by:



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



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



Writing to us at **Freepost: CWWTPR**



Visiting our website at [www.cwwtpr.com](http://www.cwwtpr.com)

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/>