

CWWTPR DCO Examination 6 December 2023

Submission by Save Honey Hill Group

SHH 30 - Comments on Cambridgeshire County Council 's response to ExA ExQ1 REP1-134

Save Honey Hill Group's responses follows the structure of the Applicant's document REP1-134. SHH comments on responses by Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils are not reiterated here.

REP1-134 Section References	SHH Response	References to SHH or Other Submissions
2.8	Appears to be in breach of Policy 16 in that the development will prejudice the existing and future use of the area, i.e. the area is agricultural land in the Green Belt	CPMWLP Policy 16
2.13 b) to e)	<p>b) SHH disagrees that that it would be 'inappropriate for the proposed WWTP to be within the scope' of the GCLP or NECAAP insofar as the relocation is intrinsically part of the housing and other proposals made in those plans and the relocation will have adverse environmental effects. The CPMWLP, which was not adopted until 2021, should have been used as the formal vehicle for bringing forward the proposed relocation, as the MWLP was in the process of doing in 2006.</p> <p>c) and d) Agree</p> <p>e) The answer given is unhelpful and is not a matter addressed in the answer given to 2.9. Given that the HIF grant was awarded in early 2019, the relocation should have been addressed in the emerging CPMWLP alongside the emerging draft NECAAP and GCLP.</p>	
2.25	<p>This response does not answer the question, which is directed at the potential grant or otherwise of planning permission for a Waterbeach pumping station by the County Council. SHH accepts that it is not for the County Council to judge what weight in the planning balance the ExA should give to the 'benefits of connection...to the new WWTP'.</p> <p>It is of course to be noted that it is entirely practicable to connect Waterbeach to the existing WWTP via a route to the west of Milton (and also that Phase 1 of housing at</p>	

	Waterbeach new Town is already being connected via an existing pumping main from the 'Dickersons' industrial area on the A10 direct to the existing Cambridge works.	
2.27	This is not really a matter for the County Council. In the light of the County Council's comments about Green Belt location, based on the 2006 proposals, the Applicant needs to explain why non-green Belt sites were examined during site selection, given that the amount and basis on which the HIF grant was calculated was already known at this time.	SHH WR REP1-171 Section 11
2.29	SHH refers the ExA to evidence of other large WWTP sites with smaller or no zones where residential development is excluded.	REP1-171 SHH WR Sections 4.5 to 4.7
4.5	SHH agrees with the Council's views on minimising impact on Air Quality and improving the Air quality Management Plan.	
Biodiversity 5.13 to 5.41	SHH notes that these are same responses as given by the other Councils and has responded to these in Comments on the SCDC ExQ1 Responses and in other SHH submissions.	SHH 19; SHH 29; SHH 30 REP1-171 SHH WR Section 10.2.2
7.23	SHH supports all of the responses given by the County Council on these matters. SHH remains disappointed that the County Council is unwilling to consider or address with the Applicant the problems of unfettered vehicular access to Low Fen Drove Way. SHH has made submissions on many of these matters in the RR and WR and in responding to the County Council's LIR	REP1-171 WR Sections 10.4.2; 10.3.4 (ii) SHH 19
12.4	SHH agrees with the Council's concerns and refers the ExA to its Written Representation.	REP1-171 WR Sections 10.3.4
20.19	This question appears to be directed to the generality of abnormal loads to be delivered to the main works site. There will also be abnormal loads to be delivered to the Waterbeach pipeline route, notably large HDD rigs which will need to cross both the railway at Waterbeach station and Clayhithe Bridge, which has both a weight limit and a very difficult vertical profile. The Applicant and the County Council need to agree that this access route is feasible.	