

Submission by Save Honey Hill**Errors and Omissions in Planning Statement (AW 7.5, REP1-049) and Historic Environment Impact Tables (AW 5.4.13.4, REP1-037)****2 December 2023****Planning Statement**

SHH notes the following errors and omissions in the Planning Statement as updated as REP1-049 on Deadline 1, 20 November 2023.

4.10 Historic Environment (HE)

4.10.14 It would seem appropriate here to include the HE outcome on Biggin Abbey II*(HE011). It is noted the LVA assessment on VP 24 is reported but not the HE assessment which identified permanent moderate adverse significant residual effect on Biggin Abbey II*(HE011) at AW HE AW 5.2.13 REP1-23 at para 4.2.55.

4.10.15 We would question the accuracy of this statement. It is, at least, deceptive, noting that the HLCA22 at HE AW 5.2.13; REP1-23 at para 4.2.55 and LCA LVA AW 5.2.15; AS-034 at Table 4.5 both conclude permanent moderate adverse significant residual effect based on magnitude of change to landscape.

6 Overall Assessment and Very Special Circumstances

Leaving aside that SHH RR-035 expresses the view that the adverse effects of mitigation landscaping have been underrated in assessing permanent residual effect on the HE and LVA (visual amenity), SHH makes the following observations/comments on the Applicant's Planning Statement in relation to para 6.1.7:

- Paragraph states this is a list of adverse significant effects.
- Has excluded listing HLCA22 identified at HE AW 5.2.13 REP1-23 para 4.2.56 as permanent moderate adverse significant residual effect.
- Eastern Fen Edge Chalklands LCA does not reflect the description of residual effect reported in LVA, AW 5.2.15; AS-034 Table 4.5 including, for example, the remaining exposure of industrial buildings and omits to state the permanent moderate adverse significant residual effect assessed and reported in the Table on the LCA.
- Biggin Abbey (HE011) does not reflect the adverse effect of mitigation planting as reported at HE, AW 5.2.13; REP1-23 at 4.2.45 'Although the landscape planting and earth bank will reduce the visual intrusion of the proposed WWTP, these elements will themselves truncate views eastwards from the asset'. It also ignores the limitations of the mitigation planting and landscaping that determines the assessment outcome of a permanent moderate adverse significant residual effect (see HE 4.2.53 and 4.2.56) .

Historic Environment Impact Tables (AW 5.4.13.4, REP1-037)

St Peters Church Horningsea Grade I (HE005)

Identified in Impact Assessment Tables as 'No impact'. On account of – 'there will be no intervisibility between the asset and the Proposed Development, and therefore the asset's setting will not be altered by the construction of the scheme. '

There will be views from the church tower of the CWWTP main works site and of the construction of Waterbeach pipeline. Further, the Parochial Church Council is undertaking a project to improve access to the tower with a view to opening the Church Tower for visits to the roof top for views of the local countryside, particularly towards Cambridge.