

WEBVTT – This file was automatically generated by event.video

0

00:00:04.615 --> 00:00:06.385

Okay, it's 20 past 11,

1

00:00:06.605 --> 00:00:09.625

and the issue specific hearing three is resumed.

2

00:00:21.345 --> 00:00:25.745

I understand that, um, the applicant's ecologist was here

3

00:00:25.745 --> 00:00:27.385

to answer, uh,

4

00:00:28.125 --> 00:00:30.625

the impacts on protected species isn't available

5

00:00:31.585 --> 00:00:34.545

'cause she's, well, as we've said so, um, I,

6

00:00:34.625 --> 00:00:36.625

I won't ask the applicant questions on that if,

7

00:00:36.625 --> 00:00:38.265

if they're happy with that approach.

8

00:00:39.365 --> 00:00:41.185

Uh, yes. Thank you, mum Paul, male for the applicant.

9

00:00:41.185 --> 00:00:42.185

That's, that's absolutely fine.

10

00:00:55.215 --> 00:00:58.315

On reflection there, there is a, um, a note

11

00:00:58.315 --> 00:00:59.675

of discrepancy perhaps that,

12

00:00:59.675 --> 00:01:01.235

that you could take away with you.

13

00:01:03.435 --> 00:01:04.435

Is that all right?

14

00:01:05.625 --> 00:01:08.325

Uh, yes ma'am. I'm sorry, I was just distracted by myself.

15

00:01:08.325 --> 00:01:09.565

I was trying to gain entry to the room,

16

00:01:09.625 --> 00:01:10.845

ah, through the door that was locked.

17

00:01:10.875 --> 00:01:12.525

Okay. So, um,

18

00:01:13.185 --> 00:01:16.885

Uh, ES chapter eight, biodiversity rep 2 0 0 7 states

19

00:01:16.915 --> 00:01:19.225

that the maximum height

20

00:01:19.325 --> 00:01:21.705

of the lighting columns within the proposed wastewater

21

00:01:21.705 --> 00:01:23.745

treatment plan would be five meters under

22

00:01:23.745 --> 00:01:24.945

table five dash two.

23

00:01:25.805 --> 00:01:29.185

The lighting design strategy rep three 30 says

24

00:01:29.185 --> 00:01:31.545

that there would be a, there would be lighting positioned

25

00:01:31.545 --> 00:01:32.545

eight to 10 meters

26

00:01:32.545 --> 00:01:34.025

above the ground level within the

27

00:01:34.025 --> 00:01:35.065
wastewater treatment plant.

28

00:01:36.095 --> 00:01:38.905
Example areas six, 10, and 14 states.

29

00:01:38.935 --> 00:01:41.745
This, this perhaps this you need

30

00:01:41.745 --> 00:01:43.025
to take away and have a look at.

31

00:01:43.405 --> 00:01:46.785
Um, if not, the applicant can offer a response on this,

32

00:01:48.245 --> 00:01:49.465
Uh, Paul mouth, the applicant.

33

00:01:49.465 --> 00:01:50.665
Uh, yes ma'am. We'll take that away.

34

00:01:50.665 --> 00:01:52.505
We'll see if there's any inconsistencies and,

35

00:01:52.565 --> 00:01:54.825
and either rectify or explain.

36

00:01:55.155 --> 00:01:59.625
Thank you. Uh, so regarding bats,

37

00:02:00.185 --> 00:02:01.465
a question for the councils.

38

00:02:02.205 --> 00:02:04.465
Can they confirm whether they consider the BAT surveys,

39

00:02:04.555 --> 00:02:07.225
which were undertaken by the applicant were carried out in

40

00:02:07.345 --> 00:02:09.345

accordance with best practice methods at the time,

41

00:02:09.345 --> 00:02:11.265

which were agreed with the technical working group?

42

00:02:14.255 --> 00:02:16.925

Madam, let me just first turn to the district Council

43

00:02:22.065 --> 00:02:22.545

checking Madam.

44

00:02:22.605 --> 00:02:24.705

Um, uh, I will

45

00:02:27.515 --> 00:02:28.855

see whether we can get, um,

46

00:02:29.615 --> 00:02:31.175

somebody from the county to address this.

47

00:02:32.935 --> 00:02:35.955

Ms. Ahmad, I might just call on Ms.

48

00:02:36.005 --> 00:02:38.515

Ahmad at least to, to say if she's not, not the one.

49

00:02:42.075 --> 00:02:43.925

Deborah Ahmad C County Council.

50

00:02:44.465 --> 00:02:47.605

Um, I will defer the question on BS over to, um,

51

00:02:47.825 --> 00:02:50.525

Dan Weaver from, um, south Cambridgeshire.

52

00:02:51.455 --> 00:02:52.455

Sorry.

53

00:02:52.865 --> 00:02:54.925

That's fine. Tha Thank you Madam Ms.

54

00:02:54.925 --> 00:02:56.645

Mr. Weaver can actually answer this matter.

55

00:02:57.465 --> 00:02:58.725

Uh, yeah. Daniel Weaver, uh,

56

00:02:58.725 --> 00:03:00.040

greater Cambridge Shared Planning?

57

00:03:00.225 --> 00:03:01.525

Um, I think in terms of the level

58

00:03:01.525 --> 00:03:03.565

of surveys we are, we are happy.

59

00:03:04.105 --> 00:03:07.765

Um, I think there was a, a degree of the, of the assessment

60

00:03:07.785 --> 00:03:10.725

of impact that I think we, we, we disagreed on.

61

00:03:10.745 --> 00:03:15.005

Uh, I think this was specifically around the, um, um,

62

00:03:15.245 --> 00:03:16.725

hor sea roads area.

63

00:03:16.785 --> 00:03:19.285

So this would be the new junction on Hornsey roads

64

00:03:19.285 --> 00:03:22.205

for the entrance into the, into the site, uh,

65

00:03:22.205 --> 00:03:23.885

where lighting from the junction

66

00:03:24.155 --> 00:03:27.325

with the A 14 would be extended down along the road.

67

00:03:27.865 --> 00:03:30.245

Um, so we were, I think we, we, we disagree a little bit on,

68

00:03:30.245 --> 00:03:31.925

on how that impact had been measured

69

00:03:31.925 --> 00:03:34.245

or what the, the impact would be.

70

00:03:34.625 --> 00:03:36.005

The, the, the,

71

00:03:36.045 --> 00:03:38.325

the ongoing impact would be of the additional lighting.

72

00:03:45.855 --> 00:03:49.645

Thank you. Um,

73

00:03:51.215 --> 00:03:54.005

could the county council provide an update on matters

74

00:03:54.005 --> 00:03:55.565

regarding reptile mitigation?

75

00:03:55.805 --> 00:03:58.165

I understand that the county council still considers this

76

00:03:58.165 --> 00:03:59.925

to be an outstanding concern,

77

00:04:05.995 --> 00:04:08.085

Deborah Ahmed County Council?

78

00:04:08.825 --> 00:04:11.485

Yes, it's really to do with the concern that both us

79

00:04:11.705 --> 00:04:15.165

and the other councils have had regarding the movement of,

80

00:04:15.345 --> 00:04:19.165

um, reptile, uh, during translocation schemes

81

00:04:19.185 --> 00:04:20.725

for both this development

82

00:04:21.065 --> 00:04:23.045

and other developments in the nearby area,

83

00:04:23.505 --> 00:04:26.205

and the concern over double handling of reptiles

84

00:04:26.505 --> 00:04:28.565

and the impact that could have on the animals welfare

85

00:04:28.745 --> 00:04:30.285

and also the local population.

86

00:04:30.705 --> 00:04:35.645

So we would ask that the applicant could add to their, um,

87

00:04:36.035 --> 00:04:38.605

reptile mitigation, uh, strategy,

88

00:04:39.095 --> 00:04:41.005

which is outlined in the code

89

00:04:41.005 --> 00:04:43.205

of construction practice Part A.

90

00:04:43.945 --> 00:04:47.765

So that's rep, uh, three dash um,

91

00:04:48.555 --> 00:04:50.205

0 2 6.

92

00:04:50.665 --> 00:04:52.285

If they can review the reptile section

93

00:04:52.585 --> 00:04:54.725

and add to the relevant paragraph of reference

94

00:04:54.725 --> 00:04:56.325
to double handling

95

00:04:56.345 --> 00:04:57.445
and making sure they're going

96

00:04:57.605 --> 00:05:01.445
to coordinate any reptile mitigation strategies

97

00:05:01.755 --> 00:05:04.885
with the other, uh, developers within that area

98

00:05:04.945 --> 00:05:09.605
of the water beach, um, housing Newtown schemes.

99

00:05:10.575 --> 00:05:12.045
Thank you. I think that's quite a

100

00:05:12.045 --> 00:05:13.165
clear request for the applicant.

101

00:05:13.305 --> 00:05:15.245
Um, not expecting necessarily an answer.

102

00:05:15.265 --> 00:05:17.245
Now, um, if you can, then great,

103

00:05:17.385 --> 00:05:19.405
but if that can be considered

104

00:05:19.425 --> 00:05:21.805
and if that's not possible a response given,

105

00:05:22.785 --> 00:05:25.205
Uh, we'll, we'll do as you suggest, Madam,

106

00:05:37.285 --> 00:05:38.825
I'm going to leave the other questions, I think

107

00:05:38.885 --> 00:05:41.345

for the action points, um, based on, um,

108

00:05:41.345 --> 00:05:43.745

what I've been informed of today regarding the ecologist.

109

00:05:44.325 --> 00:05:48.945

So before we move on, um, I've noted that there's been, um,

110

00:05:49.065 --> 00:05:51.465

a number of ips who have, have raised their hands

111

00:05:51.465 --> 00:05:52.945

during the, the process.

112

00:05:53.605 --> 00:05:55.505

Um, uh, Mr. Aslin,

113

00:06:01.415 --> 00:06:02.415

Thank you, madam.

114

00:06:02.465 --> 00:06:04.445

Yes. Uh, our comments relate

115

00:06:04.505 --> 00:06:07.805

to the recreational impacts on Stoke Qua Finn,

116

00:06:08.225 --> 00:06:11.285

if I could just, uh, take, take us back, back to that item.

117

00:06:11.865 --> 00:06:14.845

Uh, firstly, we, um, obviously welcome the news.

118

00:06:15.065 --> 00:06:18.325

The, um, invites extended to National Trust, uh,

119

00:06:18.325 --> 00:06:21.085

natural England and Wildlife Trust will also be extended

120

00:06:21.105 --> 00:06:23.245

to, uh, trustees.

121

00:06:23.265 --> 00:06:27.765

So that's, that's welcomed, uh, in, in terms of, um,

122

00:06:28.145 --> 00:06:29.645

the baseline requirement.

123

00:06:29.825 --> 00:06:32.325

We, we support the views of the county council

124

00:06:32.625 --> 00:06:36.445

and, uh, natural England in terms of needing baseline.

125

00:06:37.265 --> 00:06:42.245

Um, in terms of the potential impact,

126

00:06:42.715 --> 00:06:46.045

they don't necessarily subscribe to the applicant's views

127

00:06:46.315 --> 00:06:49.405

that the, that the development will have a de

128

00:06:49.405 --> 00:06:50.645

minimis impact.

129

00:06:51.305 --> 00:06:53.725

Uh, I'm, I'm sure everybody's familiar with the, the plan,

130

00:06:53.745 --> 00:06:58.325

but we're talking about opening the old railway line from Hy

131

00:06:58.325 --> 00:07:02.205

Ditch Road right across the station road, inquire, uh,

132

00:07:02.255 --> 00:07:05.725

which, you know, if the development was just a peripheral

133

00:07:05.725 --> 00:07:09.445

footpath around the works, uh, that that may be fine,

134

00:07:09.465 --> 00:07:11.845

but actually we're opening up a major route, uh,

135

00:07:11.845 --> 00:07:15.845

which would, um, has the potential to bring

136

00:07:16.395 --> 00:07:19.565

increased activity to Quien.

137

00:07:20.665 --> 00:07:24.565

So, um, we're, we're struggling a little bit to see how

138

00:07:25.265 --> 00:07:28.005

the de minimis effect can be proven without,

139

00:07:28.035 --> 00:07:29.565

without the baseline.

140

00:07:30.185 --> 00:07:32.605

So I guess that's, that's one aspect.

141

00:07:33.545 --> 00:07:37.405

Uh, secondly, we've, we've read, uh,

142

00:07:37.795 --> 00:07:41.605

with interest the proposed benefits, uh, of the

143

00:07:42.175 --> 00:07:44.805

additional, um, footpaths.

144

00:07:45.385 --> 00:07:49.205

Um, and that that seems to set out in, in quite, uh,

145

00:07:49.535 --> 00:07:53.845

quite substantively the promotion of the benefits to users,

146

00:07:54.625 --> 00:07:56.045

um, and are

147

00:07:56.045 --> 00:07:58.965

therefore struggling to then, um, balance

148

00:07:58.995 --> 00:08:00.965

that off against this view

149

00:08:00.965 --> 00:08:04.365

that there'll be a di minimis impact as, as a result.

150

00:08:05.185 --> 00:08:08.605

So that's a, a general, uh, a general view.

151

00:08:10.425 --> 00:08:12.565

Um, so, uh, I, I think that

152

00:08:12.675 --> 00:08:14.765

that summarizes our points on the impact.

153

00:08:14.785 --> 00:08:17.765

The, the second point we had was re regarding funding,

154

00:08:18.435 --> 00:08:22.845

obviously trust in its submission, uh,

155

00:08:23.485 --> 00:08:28.325

REP one dash 1 66, um, set out the, the view

156

00:08:28.355 --> 00:08:32.405

that whatever measures were put in place, uh, to

157

00:08:32.955 --> 00:08:36.885

address, um, to address the, the recreational impacts,

158

00:08:37.275 --> 00:08:39.845

it's really important that those had a sound

159

00:08:39.845 --> 00:08:41.245

basis in terms of funding.

160

00:08:41.785 --> 00:08:45.045

So we welcome the, the, the feedback, whether it's

161

00:08:45.045 --> 00:08:47.765

through section 1 0 6 or through the learn.

162

00:08:48.265 --> 00:08:50.605

Um, we're, we're welcome the feedback

163

00:08:50.605 --> 00:08:53.525

that there will be a formal process to capture that,

164

00:08:54.185 --> 00:08:57.645

not just reliant on, uh, corporate,

165

00:08:58.145 --> 00:08:59.245

um, best efforts.

166

00:09:00.825 --> 00:09:03.205

So I think there, there are, uh, they're the,

167

00:09:03.225 --> 00:09:06.965

the comments from, um, trust. Thank you.

168

00:09:07.805 --> 00:09:10.595

Thank you. Mr. Aslin. Did the applicant have any comments

169

00:09:10.735 --> 00:09:12.155

on any of the comments made there?

170

00:09:13.895 --> 00:09:17.555

Um, Andrew pr, applicant, Adam, um, not at this point.

171

00:09:17.555 --> 00:09:19.275

We've, we've made full submissions on that.

172

00:09:19.375 --> 00:09:22.475

Um, we hope that at the meeting the next couple of weeks

173

00:09:22.505 --> 00:09:24.355

with, which will include the trustees.

174

00:09:24.365 --> 00:09:25.995

We'll, we'll have further

175

00:09:25.995 --> 00:09:27.595
information for you at that after that.

176

00:09:28.565 --> 00:09:30.515
Thank you. Mr. Smith.

177

00:09:31.755 --> 00:09:33.455
Uh, thank you very much. Uh, I'm Chris Smith,

178

00:09:33.495 --> 00:09:34.735
a local Cambridge resident.

179

00:09:35.115 --> 00:09:38.855
Um, I would like to talk about

180

00:09:39.395 --> 00:09:41.295
the bat focus and back surveys.

181

00:09:41.475 --> 00:09:46.415
Um, I submitted something yesterday that sets out the,

182

00:09:46.795 --> 00:09:50.015
um, compliance of the BAT surveys

183

00:09:50.015 --> 00:09:51.135
with best practice guidance.

184

00:09:54.015 --> 00:09:57.755
Um, I can submit it as a formal, um, uh, what got formal,

185

00:09:57.855 --> 00:10:01.275
um, submission, um, later on in the process? Um, yeah,

186

00:10:01.545 --> 00:10:02.995
Just, just on, sorry, just on that matter.

187

00:10:03.275 --> 00:10:06.715
'cause we only, I think we only, we only submitted it sort

188

00:10:06.715 --> 00:10:08.995

of late yesterday and that's fine.

189

00:10:09.095 --> 00:10:10.475

We haven't had a chance to look at it.

190

00:10:10.515 --> 00:10:12.435

I don't, the applicant wouldn't have had a chance

191

00:10:12.435 --> 00:10:15.275

to look at it either if we'd have accepted and published it.

192

00:10:15.415 --> 00:10:19.955

So I think we're thinking if you would like to submit that

193

00:10:19.955 --> 00:10:22.755

as a formal deadline for submission,

194

00:10:22.855 --> 00:10:24.275

we can deal with it then.

195

00:10:24.295 --> 00:10:26.835

And the applicant can comment on that appropriately,

196

00:10:26.835 --> 00:10:29.395

appropriately and have the time to comment on that as well.

197

00:10:29.555 --> 00:10:31.915

Yeah. But obviously if you want to discuss anything,

198

00:10:32.265 --> 00:10:33.875

Yeah, I think the, I basically, I've looked through,

199

00:10:33.935 --> 00:10:34.935

That's fine. I've, I,

200

00:10:34.935 --> 00:10:36.635

I, I did make a request, um,

201

00:10:36.635 --> 00:10:38.595

during my previous submissions to actually ask

202

00:10:38.595 --> 00:10:41.315

for additional information on the batch surveys when they're

203

00:10:41.315 --> 00:10:43.395

carried out, the timings, et cetera, et cetera.

204

00:10:43.815 --> 00:10:46.185

Um, but that hasn't been forthcoming.

205

00:10:46.245 --> 00:10:47.705

So what I've done is gone through the report

206

00:10:47.705 --> 00:10:52.145

and based on the available information, analyzed the works

207

00:10:52.145 --> 00:10:53.345

that were carried out, the survey works

208

00:10:53.345 --> 00:10:56.265

that were carried out for compliance with the BCT 20,

209

00:10:56.265 --> 00:10:58.425

the back Conservation Trust 2016 guidelines.

210

00:10:59.045 --> 00:11:01.785

The guidelines were updated last year in November to 2020.

211

00:11:01.885 --> 00:11:03.225

The 2023 guidelines.

212

00:11:03.965 --> 00:11:06.225

Um, they have changed in terms of survey effort,

213

00:11:06.685 --> 00:11:08.145

but what I've done is just look at

214

00:11:08.145 --> 00:11:10.625

how the actual surveys carried out, complied

215

00:11:10.655 --> 00:11:15.105

with the agreed, um, survey effort agreed

216

00:11:15.105 --> 00:11:16.825
between the councils and the applicant.

217

00:11:17.365 --> 00:11:20.265
Uh, within that, there's, there's 18, uh, sorry, there's,

218

00:11:20.265 --> 00:11:21.785
there's, there's six transects carried out.

219

00:11:21.785 --> 00:11:23.785
There's activity surveys carried out for bats.

220

00:11:24.175 --> 00:11:28.625
There's six transects, um, that the applicant's carried out,

221

00:11:29.245 --> 00:11:33.505
uh, three in the north in 2020, uh, 2023

222

00:11:34.325 --> 00:11:36.105
and three in the south in 2022.

223

00:11:36.605 --> 00:11:40.725
Um, the northern ones, um, none of 'em are compliant

224

00:11:40.725 --> 00:11:42.045
with the actual BCT guidelines.

225

00:11:43.145 --> 00:11:47.435
The basis

226

00:11:47.495 --> 00:11:50.555
of the basic guidelines is that the, the,

227

00:11:50.575 --> 00:11:52.395
the actual Chex are walked in.

228

00:11:53.145 --> 00:11:56.405
The, the sort of lowest level is spring, summer, and autumn.

229

00:11:57.305 --> 00:11:59.765

All the northern ones walked just in the summer months.

230

00:12:00.425 --> 00:12:02.885

So they're all, um, June, July, August.

231

00:12:03.505 --> 00:12:04.845

So they're not compliant based on

232

00:12:04.845 --> 00:12:05.925

the spread of, of the data.

233

00:12:06.745 --> 00:12:09.445

Um, none of the northern transects had any static

234

00:12:09.515 --> 00:12:11.005

data associated with 'em.

235

00:12:11.005 --> 00:12:14.685

There's no static, um, um, uh, detectors deployed at all.

236

00:12:15.265 --> 00:12:17.405

So none of the northern ones are, are compliant with,

237

00:12:17.405 --> 00:12:19.965

with the BCT guide guidelines of 2016 guidelines

238

00:12:20.545 --> 00:12:23.525

on the Southern one, uh, it's a more mixed picture.

239

00:12:23.585 --> 00:12:25.765

The issue with the Southern one is that some of the, um,

240

00:12:26.635 --> 00:12:28.685

transects don't comply with the minimum duration

241

00:12:28.685 --> 00:12:29.845

of one hour and 30 minutes.

242

00:12:31.835 --> 00:12:32.975

So it needs to be, it needs

243

00:12:32.975 --> 00:12:33.975
to be a certain minimum duration,

244

00:12:33.975 --> 00:12:35.575
otherwise it just be you, you know,

245

00:12:35.575 --> 00:12:37.175
to capture the back activity, um,

246

00:12:37.305 --> 00:12:38.535
while you're walking around the site.

247

00:12:39.515 --> 00:12:40.975
Um, I've sat out in my spreadsheet

248

00:12:41.365 --> 00:12:43.655
what I believe the calculate lengths are.

249

00:12:43.675 --> 00:12:46.095
I'm happy that, um, angling water might wanna come back

250

00:12:46.115 --> 00:12:49.055
and add, add to that detail, correct those details.

251

00:12:49.115 --> 00:12:51.255
Is there any wrong there? There might be some obvious tar,

252

00:12:51.435 --> 00:12:54.615
uh, one of his potential typo within the spreadsheet in

253

00:12:54.615 --> 00:12:56.615
which the BAT service is three hours 39 minutes

254

00:12:56.645 --> 00:12:58.135
long, which seems unlikely.

255

00:12:58.235 --> 00:13:01.575
But within that, there are three, I think it's three, um,

256

00:13:02.475 --> 00:13:04.735

um, transects walks that are not compliant

257

00:13:13.945 --> 00:13:15.765

within the constraints section of the BCT.

258

00:13:15.765 --> 00:13:17.645

It's noted, uh, within the constraints section

259

00:13:17.645 --> 00:13:19.765

of the report, it's noted that another three static

260

00:13:19.765 --> 00:13:21.045

deployments aren't compliant.

261

00:13:22.105 --> 00:13:25.525

It says they're basically the static deployment failed. Yep.

262

00:13:26.625 --> 00:13:27.805

The, the synopsis of this,

263

00:13:27.805 --> 00:13:30.005

and I, I make a submission as the, as kind

264

00:13:30.005 --> 00:13:34.925

of form next stage is that by strictly reading the BCT,

265

00:13:35.035 --> 00:13:37.965

none of the transects carried out were compliant

266

00:13:37.965 --> 00:13:39.085

with the BCT guidelines.

267

00:13:43.605 --> 00:13:45.305

I'm happy to, I might have misread the text.

268

00:13:45.385 --> 00:13:47.265

I haven't got the full details of all the surveys.

269

00:13:47.625 --> 00:13:50.225

I misread it. So I'm not trying to catch the applicant out.

270

00:13:50.645 --> 00:13:52.185

Uh, I make the application, uh,

271

00:13:52.265 --> 00:13:53.985

I make the additional submissions

272

00:13:53.985 --> 00:13:55.865

and hopefully we get clarity on that.

273

00:13:56.245 --> 00:13:58.785

The implications of this are, are clearly that the actual

274

00:13:59.335 --> 00:14:02.465

data is relied upon to underpin the EIA.

275

00:14:09.865 --> 00:14:12.125

Yep. So the activity is based on the EI.

276

00:14:12.305 --> 00:14:13.885

But the second thing is I can't find

277

00:14:14.765 --> 00:14:17.645

anywhere within the actual documents details of,

278

00:14:17.705 --> 00:14:19.005

of surveys of structures.

279

00:14:20.945 --> 00:14:22.645

The tree surveys are very well set out.

280

00:14:22.645 --> 00:14:25.085

There's no details given of structures within the document.

281

00:14:26.185 --> 00:14:29.365

Now, although there's no not

282

00:14:30.195 --> 00:14:33.045

many apparent structures within the actual pipeline, um,

283

00:14:33.085 --> 00:14:35.565
sections, there is obviously a number

284

00:14:35.565 --> 00:14:38.445
of structures within the actual existing sewage treatment

285

00:14:38.445 --> 00:14:42.195
works, which may have potential for bats.

286

00:14:43.465 --> 00:14:45.245
Now, it may be the details have just been submitted

287

00:14:45.245 --> 00:14:47.325
to the inquiry, to the inquiry, uh,

288

00:14:47.345 --> 00:14:48.565
but it may be they don't exist.

289

00:14:49.465 --> 00:14:52.125
Yep. The additional structure structure within the pipeline

290

00:14:52.125 --> 00:14:57.115
alignment is the bridge, the A 14, um, cam bridge,

291

00:14:57.215 --> 00:14:59.435
the, the bridge, the bridge over the cam on the A 14.

292

00:15:02.275 --> 00:15:04.375
Now, whilst it might seem unlikely

293

00:15:04.375 --> 00:15:06.255
that bats roost in bridges,

294

00:15:06.255 --> 00:15:07.695
it's quite a well-known phenomenon.

295

00:15:07.695 --> 00:15:10.215
They're go into the expansion joints in the abutments.

296

00:15:11.675 --> 00:15:14.575

Um, I think Liz, I won't drag Liz in,

297

00:15:14.575 --> 00:15:15.935

but Liz is a local resident.

298

00:15:16.225 --> 00:15:18.295

There is a lot of activity down there on the bridge.

299

00:15:18.795 --> 00:15:21.855

And also the activity that has been shown with this thing

300

00:15:21.965 --> 00:15:24.495

with existing survey baseline indicates there is a lot

301

00:15:24.495 --> 00:15:25.775

of activity under those bridges.

302

00:15:27.005 --> 00:15:29.825

So just to recap, we've run through the actual,

303

00:15:30.725 --> 00:15:32.305

um, activity surveys.

304

00:15:32.305 --> 00:15:34.465

Don't be compliant. We're lacking the structured data.

305

00:15:35.725 --> 00:15:37.305

Now, within the, within the data

306

00:15:37.305 --> 00:15:38.305

that has been actually presented,

307

00:15:38.305 --> 00:15:39.665

there's a lot of barber cell activity.

308

00:15:39.975 --> 00:15:42.025

It's been largely said, it's commuting activity,

309

00:15:42.695 --> 00:15:43.745

bats just moving through the area.

310

00:15:45.005 --> 00:15:46.585

But even on the basis of what's been given,

311

00:15:47.595 --> 00:15:49.425

where are the bats commuting to and from?

312

00:15:50.445 --> 00:15:52.235

There are bats on the inside of the A 14.

313

00:15:52.235 --> 00:15:53.915

There are bats on the outside of the A 14.

314

00:15:59.975 --> 00:16:03.675

Now the presumption is the bats are moving from Angle Abbey,

315

00:16:03.775 --> 00:16:05.795

or, I dunno, it's not clear where they,

316

00:16:05.795 --> 00:16:06.795

where they're actual roos are from.

317

00:16:06.795 --> 00:16:08.195

It's not clear if they're actually the, the, um,

318

00:16:09.265 --> 00:16:11.395

wind pole connected to the wind wipo sac.

319

00:16:11.485 --> 00:16:14.155

Maybe there's an, an additional maternity column nearby.

320

00:16:14.155 --> 00:16:15.875

We dunno. That's all hypothesis without the data.

321

00:16:16.475 --> 00:16:18.755

I think the point I would make is actually that, um,

322

00:16:19.535 --> 00:16:21.235

if the bats are on one side of the A 14,

323

00:16:21.235 --> 00:16:22.715

the bats on the other side of the A 14,

324

00:16:23.935 --> 00:16:25.555

if they're commuting, they're commuting entirely

325

00:16:25.555 --> 00:16:27.235

through the, um, that they have

326

00:16:27.235 --> 00:16:29.515

to get across the A 14 from one side to the other,

327

00:16:30.535 --> 00:16:32.555

and two of the likely, uh, places

328

00:16:32.695 --> 00:16:35.515

to come across are under the river by the cam

329

00:16:37.065 --> 00:16:38.325

and also across the, uh,

330

00:16:39.165 --> 00:16:41.165

junction 34 if they're following the bridge.

331

00:16:41.265 --> 00:16:42.485

So if you assume they're not gonna try

332

00:16:42.485 --> 00:16:44.565

and if they're not gonna race directly across the A 14.

333

00:16:44.825 --> 00:16:46.565

So we've got two potential commuting issues

334

00:16:47.345 --> 00:16:49.165

of actually two potential points

335

00:16:49.165 --> 00:16:50.845

where barber styles potentially crossing the A 14

336

00:16:50.845 --> 00:16:52.645

that are quite important features.

337

00:16:53.465 --> 00:16:58.085

Um, but it's also, I think it's also the issue is the level

338

00:16:58.085 --> 00:17:00.885

of activity from the statics is relatively,

339

00:17:01.245 --> 00:17:02.405

although it's dismissed as commuting.

340

00:17:03.035 --> 00:17:04.285

From my experience, I,

341

00:17:04.525 --> 00:17:06.965

'cause I'm a professional ecologist, I've got, uh,

342

00:17:06.965 --> 00:17:08.045

30 years experience.

343

00:17:08.045 --> 00:17:10.325

I do a lot of that surveys with statics.

344

00:17:10.665 --> 00:17:13.205

The level activity is not minimal.

345

00:17:13.405 --> 00:17:16.925

I think normally you might get a pass every night,

346

00:17:16.925 --> 00:17:18.285

might pass night if there's, if there's a lot

347

00:17:18.285 --> 00:17:19.925

of barber cells locally, some

348

00:17:19.925 --> 00:17:22.245

of the statics are getting, you know, 20 or 30.

349

00:17:22.915 --> 00:17:25.325

There's instances within dating which are 20,

350

00:17:25.445 --> 00:17:28.805

I think it's a maximum of 20 or 30 in a deployment.

351

00:17:28.805 --> 00:17:30.485

So there's a lot of activities unexplained.

352

00:17:31.115 --> 00:17:33.845

It'd be helpful, um, to the inquire if actually

353

00:17:34.415 --> 00:17:36.045

where those barber cells are coming from,

354

00:17:36.715 --> 00:17:40.205

what level activities they're making of the land within the,

355

00:17:40.865 --> 00:17:42.845

um, or would, um,

356

00:17:43.145 --> 00:17:45.645

and whether there's, I don't know whether would be roofs

357

00:17:45.645 --> 00:17:49.485

present locally, but certainly to eliminate that issue, um,

358

00:17:49.755 --> 00:17:51.445

from, from, from consideration.

359

00:17:51.825 --> 00:17:53.845

And the only way to do that essentially is

360

00:17:53.845 --> 00:17:57.765

to carry out additional surveys during 2024

361

00:17:58.025 --> 00:18:01.085

to cover those gaps within the data so

362

00:18:01.085 --> 00:18:03.205

that the inquiry can have confidence

363

00:18:04.225 --> 00:18:07.195

that the dataset prevented presented is robust.

364

00:18:08.165 --> 00:18:09.165

Thank you very much.

365

00:18:12.215 --> 00:18:14.485

Thank you. Does the applicant have

366

00:18:14.485 --> 00:18:15.565

any response to that, please?

367

00:18:15.945 --> 00:18:17.365

Um, not today, madam.

368

00:18:17.365 --> 00:18:20.005

As you know, we don't have our bet expert here,

369

00:18:20.345 --> 00:18:23.285

but what would be really helpful if Mr. Smith is prepared

370

00:18:23.285 --> 00:18:26.805

to do this would be, um, for him informally

371

00:18:26.865 --> 00:18:29.845

to let us have his paper, um, today.

372

00:18:32.145 --> 00:18:35.605

And then we know it'll be formally submitted on the 22nd,

373

00:18:35.985 --> 00:18:39.765

but the sooner we can have it, the sooner we can, um,

374

00:18:40.065 --> 00:18:41.285

be looking at these points.

375

00:18:42.895 --> 00:18:44.235

Yes, that would be helpful.

376

00:18:44.515 --> 00:18:46.315

I mean, you may not have access to that today,

377

00:18:46.315 --> 00:18:48.595

but certainly if you can liaise the applicant to provide it

378

00:18:48.595 --> 00:18:50.795

to them as soon as possible, of course they can then provide

379

00:18:50.835 --> 00:18:52.715

a response to that potentially by deadline

380

00:18:52.735 --> 00:18:54.555

for which you would then have access to as well.

381

00:18:56.955 --> 00:18:58.225

Sorry, what are you requesting?

382

00:18:58.225 --> 00:18:59.465

The actual, the spreadsheet?

383

00:18:59.525 --> 00:19:00.865

The spreadsheet I sent through? I

384

00:19:00.865 --> 00:19:01.865

Think so, yeah. Okay.

385

00:19:02.065 --> 00:19:05.105

I can Peter the document that Mr. Smith says he sent

386

00:19:05.105 --> 00:19:06.945

through to somewhere the spreadsheet.

387

00:19:06.975 --> 00:19:08.785

Yeah, I'm happy to pass that on.

388

00:19:08.785 --> 00:19:11.065

If you wish to pass that on to the all parties,

389

00:19:11.205 --> 00:19:13.145

You would need to pass that on the applicant please.

390

00:19:13.475 --> 00:19:14.785

Right. Okay. Thank you.

391
00:19:14.855 --> 00:19:16.145
Okay, I'll try to do that. Thank you

392
00:19:29.455 --> 00:19:30.455
Mr. Gilda.

393
00:19:30.455 --> 00:19:30.845

394
00:19:31.495 --> 00:19:31.715
Mr

395
00:19:40.605 --> 00:19:41.785
Uh, thank you ma'am.

396
00:19:41.805 --> 00:19:44.185
Um, Ian Gilda for Save Honey Hill.

397
00:19:44.605 --> 00:19:47.305
Um, obviously we've been through a lot

398
00:19:47.305 --> 00:19:50.465
of matters this morning, a tremendously long list as I,

399
00:19:50.765 --> 00:19:51.985
as my notes tell me.

400
00:19:52.245 --> 00:19:55.585
Um, and perhaps you'll, uh, accept that I'll, I'll need

401
00:19:55.725 --> 00:19:58.065
to go to two or three separate points

402
00:19:58.205 --> 00:20:00.185
before we, we get to the end of this.

403
00:20:00.845 --> 00:20:05.135
Um, Clearly

404
00:20:06.145 --> 00:20:09.855

madam, there is a difference of view between, um, myself

405

00:20:09.875 --> 00:20:12.015

or the Save Honey Hill group and,

406

00:20:12.595 --> 00:20:14.255

and the applicant about the extent

407

00:20:14.255 --> 00:20:19.055

to which this new recreational provision of land around the,

408

00:20:19.875 --> 00:20:23.455

around the works and the new public rights of way will

409

00:20:24.575 --> 00:20:27.935

specifically channel and encourage additional recreational

410

00:20:28.335 --> 00:20:30.655

activity outside the LM area.

411

00:20:31.235 --> 00:20:33.935

Um, now clearly we take the view

412

00:20:33.935 --> 00:20:37.615

that it's an almost natural consequence of, um,

413

00:20:38.755 --> 00:20:41.695

the creation of this recreational focus.

414

00:20:42.275 --> 00:20:45.455

Um, but there will be increased use of that site

415

00:20:45.475 --> 00:20:47.930

and it will spread out along the public rights away.

416

00:20:47.930 --> 00:20:51.845

And indeed your question madam went to part of that point,

417

00:20:51.895 --> 00:20:55.685

which is that if the applicants are providing you public

418

00:20:55.685 --> 00:20:58.525
rights away, um, they're going to be used

419

00:20:58.665 --> 00:21:00.245
and they're not paths

420

00:21:00.245 --> 00:21:01.725
that can be used at the moment legally.

421

00:21:02.105 --> 00:21:04.125
Um, we accept there's probably some, um,

422

00:21:04.995 --> 00:21:06.405
illegal use of them.

423

00:21:08.065 --> 00:21:11.865
Um, the logical follow up to that is

424

00:21:11.865 --> 00:21:13.345
that there is a risk

425

00:21:13.815 --> 00:21:17.185
that there will be some recreational impacts, um,

426

00:21:18.325 --> 00:21:19.865
on, for example.

427

00:21:20.605 --> 00:21:24.105
Um, and in those circumstances we are in the curious

428

00:21:24.505 --> 00:21:29.465
position that the applicant appears to be happy obviously

429

00:21:29.525 --> 00:21:33.305
to, um, participate in these advisory groups.

430

00:21:33.885 --> 00:21:36.345
And, and Mr. Pryor tells us that, um,

431

00:21:37.215 --> 00:21:40.265

they might in due course make some sort of contributions to

432

00:21:43.135 --> 00:21:46.865

remediating, um, those recreational impacts.

433

00:21:47.525 --> 00:21:50.595

Um, if that's the case,

434

00:21:51.735 --> 00:21:54.035

are we not in a very similar position to

435

00:21:54.035 --> 00:21:56.235

that which the applicant is taking in relation

436

00:21:56.235 --> 00:21:58.115

to antisocial behavior, for example,

437

00:21:58.125 --> 00:22:01.155

where they have offered a section 106 agreement,

438

00:22:02.485 --> 00:22:05.475

which is effectively a contingent section 106 agreement

439

00:22:05.625 --> 00:22:07.075

that they will, um,

440

00:22:08.475 --> 00:22:10.875

resource any remediation measures if necessary.

441

00:22:11.655 --> 00:22:15.155

Um, and I find it difficult madam to understand why

442

00:22:15.815 --> 00:22:17.395

the applicant is so reluctant

443

00:22:17.495 --> 00:22:20.595

to enter into a contingent section 106 agreement

444

00:22:21.135 --> 00:22:23.595

in relation to potential recreational impacts

445

00:22:24.255 --> 00:22:26.235
or other offsite impacts possibly

446

00:22:26.265 --> 00:22:27.515
that could be covered by that.

447

00:22:27.535 --> 00:22:30.075
But in this particular issue,

448

00:22:30.235 --> 00:22:31.995
I think we are very much focused on,

449

00:22:32.495 --> 00:22:34.355
on quite fairness in SSSI.

450

00:22:34.775 --> 00:22:38.635
Um, and there are differences,

451

00:22:38.875 --> 00:22:42.975
I think matter between that request and,

452

00:22:42.995 --> 00:22:45.375
and the one that was being discussed later in relation

453

00:22:45.375 --> 00:22:46.375
to requirement 25.

454

00:22:47.755 --> 00:22:49.375
In relation to requirement 25,

455

00:22:49.565 --> 00:22:51.895
there's a clear requirement on the face of it, as Mr.

456

00:22:51.985 --> 00:22:55.695
Pryor says, to deliver a plan

457

00:22:56.485 --> 00:22:57.975
that gets approved in term

458

00:22:58.075 --> 00:23:00.375

or deliver a BNG report that gets approved.

459

00:23:00.875 --> 00:23:05.175

Um, and they could take appropriate measures if they needed

460

00:23:05.195 --> 00:23:09.935

to in the future to, to, to fund activity

461

00:23:10.645 --> 00:23:13.855

related to ecological, um, management and monitoring.

462

00:23:14.395 --> 00:23:16.815

The recreational impacts are not covered by

463

00:23:17.415 --> 00:23:20.895

a requirement in the same way, um, in the DC0.

464

00:23:20.955 --> 00:23:22.455

So there's, that route is

465

00:23:22.975 --> 00:23:24.975

apparently closed off to us at the moment.

466

00:23:25.635 --> 00:23:29.735

Um, and the sensible approach in my

467

00:23:30.445 --> 00:23:32.175

view, madam is, is that they would,

468

00:23:33.515 --> 00:23:34.935

the applicant should be prepared

469

00:23:34.975 --> 00:23:37.895

to enter into a contingent section 106 agreement

470

00:23:38.035 --> 00:23:42.495

to support appropriate remediation measures,

471

00:23:42.525 --> 00:23:46.085

accepting that those would only arise, um,

472

00:23:46.395 --> 00:23:48.445

when you can identify what those impacts are

473

00:23:48.445 --> 00:23:50.285

and what those remediations might be.

474

00:23:50.745 --> 00:23:55.605

Um, so that's, that, that, that's a, a key point in,

475

00:23:55.665 --> 00:23:57.005

in relation to that, madam.

476

00:23:57.545 --> 00:23:57.765

Um,

477

00:24:03.915 --> 00:24:06.735

We have, I think in, in, in our submissions

478

00:24:07.435 --> 00:24:11.455

and in conversations with the applicant around, um, hedge

479

00:24:11.635 --> 00:24:15.375

and tree reinstatement had continued to disagree

480

00:24:15.375 --> 00:24:17.935

with the extent to which the, um, hedge

481

00:24:18.115 --> 00:24:21.095

and tree protection plans and,

482

00:24:21.115 --> 00:24:23.855

and the necessary wording in the requirements

483

00:24:23.995 --> 00:24:28.735

and, um, the draft DC0 secure the protection

484

00:24:28.735 --> 00:24:31.975

of hedge rows that are not shown on those plans.

485

00:24:32.715 --> 00:24:35.295

Um, and, and this was a point obviously that was gone

486

00:24:35.295 --> 00:24:37.895

to in relation to one important hedge row, um,

487

00:24:37.955 --> 00:24:39.215

but it is a wider point,

488

00:24:39.215 --> 00:24:43.015

and I'm don't think it's one that I want to make here now,

489

00:24:43.115 --> 00:24:46.375

but we shall be making a further submission at, at, um,

490

00:24:46.775 --> 00:24:49.295

deadline four, um, to try and resolve this.

491

00:24:49.395 --> 00:24:52.655

It seems to be something that can be resolved

492

00:24:52.715 --> 00:24:54.935

by relatively simple changes

493

00:24:55.115 --> 00:24:57.615

to drafting probably the legends to the plans.

494

00:24:58.235 --> 00:25:01.335

Um, and we will take that up separately with the applicant.

495

00:25:21.925 --> 00:25:23.205

I think that's all. Thank you, madam.

496

00:25:23.855 --> 00:25:24.885

Thank you, Mr. Gilda.

497

00:25:25.145 --> 00:25:26.925

Are there any other ips in the room that wish

498

00:25:26.925 --> 00:25:28.245

to make any comments at this stage?

499

00:25:31.805 --> 00:25:33.465

Did the applicant have any response on Mr.

500

00:25:33.465 --> 00:25:34.465

Gilder's comments?

501

00:25:35.605 --> 00:25:37.665

Um, thank you Mme. Andrew Park, the applicant.

502

00:25:37.665 --> 00:25:40.985

I I think one small point on, um,

503

00:25:41.925 --> 00:25:43.985

the attractiveness or or

504

00:25:43.985 --> 00:25:47.025

otherwise of the recreational facilities

505

00:25:47.025 --> 00:25:49.665

that we are providing Save Honey Hill have been vocal

506

00:25:49.715 --> 00:25:52.425

throughout the process, including consultation

507

00:25:52.735 --> 00:25:54.345

that this is not something

508

00:25:54.345 --> 00:25:56.025

that is wanted in terms of recreation.

509

00:25:56.235 --> 00:25:59.865

Their view and their relevant representation highlights it

510

00:25:59.865 --> 00:26:00.945

up that the, uh,

511

00:26:01.385 --> 00:26:04.665

proposed additional access is not expected to be attractive.

512

00:26:05.295 --> 00:26:06.585

They can't have this both ways.

513

00:26:06.935 --> 00:26:09.305

They can't say there'll be increased recreational pressure

514

00:26:09.445 --> 00:26:12.695

and yet say that there's no recreational benefit.

515

00:26:12.875 --> 00:26:16.015

So I'd ask them to just make sure that they can

516

00:26:16.875 --> 00:26:17.975

be clear on that.

517

00:26:19.035 --> 00:26:22.015

Um, it's difficult for us to address, uh,

518

00:26:23.045 --> 00:26:25.015

what they're asking during consultation

519

00:26:25.035 --> 00:26:26.975

and then to turn around and say, well actually, do you know

520

00:26:26.975 --> 00:26:28.175

what there is an impact here?

521

00:26:28.435 --> 00:26:30.655

We would just rely on the environmental impact assessment,

522

00:26:30.665 --> 00:26:32.815

which has assessed that there is unlikely

523

00:26:32.815 --> 00:26:34.895

to be a significant effect on qan.

524

00:26:35.035 --> 00:26:38.415

And we'd like to talk with the trustees on

525

00:26:38.415 --> 00:26:41.135

how we might mitigate anything going forwards in

526

00:26:41.135 --> 00:26:43.925

that broad regional context outside of the application.

527

00:26:45.115 --> 00:26:47.285

Okay. Thank you. I think Mr. Burley has a question.

528

00:26:47.545 --> 00:26:51.325

Yes, thank you. It's, it's again, related to the use of the

529

00:26:52.285 --> 00:26:53.485

proposed public right of way

530

00:26:53.785 --> 00:26:57.005

and, um, proposed permissive routes.

531

00:26:57.005 --> 00:26:58.245

Coming back to your point there, Mr.

532

00:26:58.415 --> 00:27:02.645

Pryor, about what's set out in the environmental statement,

533

00:27:03.945 --> 00:27:07.605

um, what degree of certainty can we attach

534

00:27:07.665 --> 00:27:08.925

to those conclusions

535

00:27:08.925 --> 00:27:10.885

that there wouldn't be a significant impact?

536

00:27:12.945 --> 00:27:14.605

Uh, thanks sir. Andrew Par, the applicant.

537

00:27:14.865 --> 00:27:19.605

Um, I think if you look at the environmental

538

00:27:19.685 --> 00:27:23.805

statement chapter, um, the evidence base is there,

539

00:27:24.045 --> 00:27:25.845

although it's limited, um,

540

00:27:26.145 --> 00:27:29.445

and that that absence of the baseline, which we recognize

541

00:27:29.465 --> 00:27:31.605

and agree with, with, with, uh,

542

00:27:31.705 --> 00:27:35.765

the council is limited regionally limits what, um,

543

00:27:35.875 --> 00:27:36.965

what we can deliver.

544

00:27:37.465 --> 00:27:39.165

But the evidence

545

00:27:39.165 --> 00:27:41.485

nonetheless has been presented in that es of,

546

00:27:41.505 --> 00:27:42.965

of what's available on the footfall

547

00:27:42.965 --> 00:27:45.725

that we can do do locally and is related to the development.

548

00:27:45.945 --> 00:27:48.085

So you can place some reliance on the environmental

549

00:27:48.085 --> 00:27:50.365

statement findings and the delivery of, of that benefit,

550

00:27:51.355 --> 00:27:52.355

Some reliance.

551

00:27:53.425 --> 00:27:54.805

Uh, and of course,

552

00:27:55.665 --> 00:27:59.965

future usage will depend on the behavior of individuals

553

00:27:59.965 --> 00:28:02.605

that we, we don't know about at the present time.

554

00:28:02.945 --> 00:28:05.525

Uh, partly sir, but also crucially on the delivery

555

00:28:05.865 --> 00:28:07.485

of all the additional housing on the,

556

00:28:07.485 --> 00:28:08.645

on the fringes of Cambridge.

557

00:28:09.075 --> 00:28:12.725

This is not designed to be a destination

558

00:28:12.785 --> 00:28:14.965

and never has, there is no car parking provided.

559

00:28:15.235 --> 00:28:17.525

This is mitigation for existing users.

560

00:28:18.065 --> 00:28:20.045

Um, with, with an increased connectivity

561

00:28:20.465 --> 00:28:22.645

to the open countryside, which has been supported

562

00:28:22.645 --> 00:28:25.045

by both local authorities throughout

563

00:28:25.045 --> 00:28:26.085

the promotion and development.

564

00:28:26.085 --> 00:28:30.245

And indeed those links north to Ea Abbey responded to

565

00:28:30.755 --> 00:28:32.285

stakeholder requests.

566

00:28:32.985 --> 00:28:35.765

We, we didn't just decide to deliver this, um,

567

00:28:35.895 --> 00:28:39.365

permissive path right away, uh, outta our, our heads.

568

00:28:39.365 --> 00:28:41.285

They, they came outta consultation

569

00:28:41.285 --> 00:28:42.765

with the local authorities who wanted

570

00:28:42.865 --> 00:28:45.525

to see this increased recreational opportunity.

571

00:28:46.745 --> 00:28:48.525

So if there is an increased opportunity,

572

00:28:48.615 --> 00:28:50.325

there may be an increase in usage.

573

00:28:50.685 --> 00:28:52.045

I think we have to, I think we have

574

00:28:52.045 --> 00:28:53.245

to acknowledge that. Yes, sir.

575

00:28:53.745 --> 00:28:57.125

So what's the difficulty with providing

576

00:28:57.225 --> 00:29:02.125

or pursuing a, a route by which we adopt a cautious approach

577

00:29:02.335 --> 00:29:04.085

where we say, if there is a problem,

578

00:29:05.055 --> 00:29:07.325

we'll put in place a mechanism to deal with it,

579

00:29:07.425 --> 00:29:09.525

notwithstanding that you may not accept

580

00:29:09.525 --> 00:29:12.805

that there will be a problem, um, in which case

581

00:29:12.805 --> 00:29:14.845

that mechanism may never be engaged.

582

00:29:14.995 --> 00:29:17.645

What would be the problem with following that route?

583

00:29:19.545 --> 00:29:23.725

Sir, I, I don't see a problem in that, in, in discussing

584

00:29:23.725 --> 00:29:25.725

that with, with the relevant stakeholders.

585

00:29:26.345 --> 00:29:29.445

Um, I think the triggers for that could be quite difficult

586

00:29:29.445 --> 00:29:31.365

because you'd have to show a linkage back

587

00:29:31.425 --> 00:29:35.125

to our development, and that's gonna be very, very difficult

588

00:29:35.185 --> 00:29:38.765

to provide on a regional basis to say, is this mechanism,

589

00:29:38.775 --> 00:29:40.445

let's say it's a section 106 agreement,

590

00:29:40.745 --> 00:29:43.325

is there a distinct trigger back to our development?

591

00:29:43.545 --> 00:29:46.125

Why, why would it be a, a trigger linked

592

00:29:46.125 --> 00:29:49.045

to your development rather than a trigger linked

593

00:29:49.105 --> 00:29:52.245

to usage at which level the usage became harmful?

594

00:29:52.595 --> 00:29:54.165

Well, there'd be no, there'd be no

595

00:29:54.565 --> 00:29:55.725

functional linkage to our development.

596

00:29:55.725 --> 00:29:57.445

We'd just be throwing money at a, at a,

597

00:29:57.445 --> 00:29:59.725

at a local problem rather than one link

598

00:29:59.725 --> 00:30:00.885

to our, our development.

599

00:30:01.105 --> 00:30:02.165

But wouldn't that be a problem

600

00:30:02.165 --> 00:30:05.245

that you created or facilitated?

601

00:30:05.505 --> 00:30:06.925

You provided the opportunity. I

602

00:30:06.925 --> 00:30:08.125

Think there's a difference between, and,

603

00:30:08.125 --> 00:30:09.525

and you raised it yourself earlier, sir,

604

00:30:09.525 --> 00:30:12.325

and I, I, I think it was a really useful distinction,

605

00:30:12.395 --> 00:30:14.325

distinction between pressure and harm

606

00:30:14.585 --> 00:30:15.805

and us facilitating it.

607

00:30:16.105 --> 00:30:17.605

We wouldn't be delivering the harm.

608

00:30:17.865 --> 00:30:19.565

Our project would not be delivering the harm.

609

00:30:19.585 --> 00:30:24.085

It is not intended to bring additional recreational users

610

00:30:24.225 --> 00:30:26.285

to the area, and there's no intention that that's the case.

611

00:30:26.285 --> 00:30:28.885

In fact, we, we have explicitly sought

612

00:30:28.905 --> 00:30:32.485

to exclude additional recreational, uh, users from the site.

613

00:30:32.655 --> 00:30:36.605

Would those users, the potential users come?

614

00:30:36.645 --> 00:30:39.165

If you didn't provide the improvements

615

00:30:39.165 --> 00:30:40.325

that you were proposing

616

00:30:41.305 --> 00:30:44.205

It, it would be hard to see, sir, that that

617

00:30:44.885 --> 00:30:48.245

existing informal use of the pathway

618

00:30:48.845 --> 00:30:51.365

wouldn't increase if there were increased housing pressure.

619

00:30:51.365 --> 00:30:54.005

There's already people who use that pathway informally.

620

00:30:54.265 --> 00:30:56.365

It would increase whether we were delivering it or not.

621

00:30:56.365 --> 00:30:58.525

We're seeking a lawful use, but I dunno whether it's

622

00:30:58.525 --> 00:31:01.245

unlawful or not, but it's, it's informal and tolerated.

623

00:31:01.955 --> 00:31:03.125

Okay, thank you. Yeah.

624

00:31:07.525 --> 00:31:09.645

Mr. Smith? Yeah, sorry.

625

00:31:09.645 --> 00:31:12.005

Just go back on, um, my previous promise

626

00:31:12.005 --> 00:31:15.965

to supply various information, uh, what I'm able

627

00:31:15.965 --> 00:31:18.765

to supply is the actual analysis of the trans.

628

00:31:18.865 --> 00:31:20.885

At this point, I think I would want

629

00:31:20.885 --> 00:31:23.085

to make additional submission about the comments I made

630

00:31:23.085 --> 00:31:25.285

about barber styles, et cetera, et cetera.

631

00:31:25.865 --> 00:31:28.045

Um, I'd prefer to do that

632

00:31:28.045 --> 00:31:29.685

after the, the, um,

633

00:31:30.195 --> 00:31:33.325

accompanied site visit if possible.

634

00:31:33.625 --> 00:31:36.205

But I, the dates, I dunno if that fits in with the dates,

635

00:31:36.425 --> 00:31:37.885

but that's being discussed later.

636

00:31:38.465 --> 00:31:40.245

Is that like before deadline four or after?

637

00:31:40.985 --> 00:31:42.045

Uh, it won't be before

638

00:31:42.325 --> 00:31:43.325

Deadline four. Oh, okay. Okay. So

639

00:31:43.325 --> 00:31:45.125

I'll I'll make a, sorry.

640

00:31:47.995 --> 00:31:50.285

Yeah, we, we haven't got a date for the, uh,

641

00:31:50.765 --> 00:31:52.565

a SI as of yet.

642

00:31:52.745 --> 00:31:56.405

Um, also, it's not necessarily an opportunity for us to go

643

00:31:56.405 --> 00:31:57.845

around looking for No, that's fine.

644

00:31:57.875 --> 00:32:00.805

That roof, it's for the XA to look at the site

645

00:32:00.825 --> 00:32:02.525

and the features on the site.

646

00:32:03.065 --> 00:32:06.785

Um, so probably should just make that clear.

647

00:32:06.885 --> 00:32:08.145

That's very clear to me, sir.

648

00:32:08.525 --> 00:32:12.905

Um, so what I'll submit directly, um, for

649

00:32:12.925 --> 00:32:16.665

to sissy applicant is, is that, um, uh, critique

650

00:32:16.665 --> 00:32:17.945

of the actual bat effort.

651

00:32:17.965 --> 00:32:20.225

And I'll, I'll make you on submission to the next deadline.

652

00:32:20.645 --> 00:32:24.485

Um, yeah, could I just make a couple of quick points about,

653

00:32:24.545 --> 00:32:26.205

um, COI fair

654

00:32:26.205 --> 00:32:28.645

and I was gonna make them join the discussions previously.

655

00:32:29.385 --> 00:32:33.425

Um, uh, with the LERP,

656

00:32:33.965 --> 00:32:36.505

the point was made about protective species within that.

657

00:32:37.085 --> 00:32:39.405

Um, my understanding is that normally even that with,

658

00:32:39.565 --> 00:32:42.565

I think there's on a technical point, natural England

659

00:32:42.785 --> 00:32:44.845

for certain types of mitigation for say for bats,

660

00:32:45.095 --> 00:32:47.485

would normally insist there's a guaranteed mechanism

661

00:32:48.025 --> 00:32:51.365

to ensure that mitigation such a bat box, et cetera,

662

00:32:51.395 --> 00:32:55.485

endures, which would normally require a section 1 0 6

663

00:32:55.505 --> 00:32:56.725

or some sort of lander and agreement.

664

00:32:57.265 --> 00:32:58.925

Um, it would seem appropriate to me

665

00:32:58.925 --> 00:33:01.485

that the LERP includes simplifies that point,

666

00:33:01.705 --> 00:33:03.285

but that's just a personal viewpoint.

667

00:33:03.365 --> 00:33:05.805

I don't, I'm not seeing the response, uh,

668

00:33:05.865 --> 00:33:09.245

on the section two on, on, um, uh, COI fan

669

00:33:09.245 --> 00:33:11.285

with the baseline information for recreation.

670

00:33:12.305 --> 00:33:14.605

Uh, my understanding is that the, um,

671

00:33:16.475 --> 00:33:19.525

inspector is the, uh, competent sec.

672

00:33:19.525 --> 00:33:23.365

You're carrying out section 28 assessment, onco fence, um,

673

00:33:23.365 --> 00:33:25.845

under wildlife countryside acts for the impacts,

674

00:33:25.845 --> 00:33:28.165

which parallels the HRA process.

675

00:33:29.145 --> 00:33:30.765

Um, and that is a statute of authority.

676

00:33:30.865 --> 00:33:33.685

You've had a request from Natural England for

677

00:33:33.685 --> 00:33:35.285

that baseline data.

678

00:33:36.225 --> 00:33:37.845

And as search, you're under an obligation

679

00:33:38.385 --> 00:33:40.245

to indicate if you deviate from that,

680

00:33:40.385 --> 00:33:41.565

if you go against that guidance.

681

00:33:42.465 --> 00:33:45.505

Um, that was just a technical point I wanted to raise.

682

00:33:45.725 --> 00:33:48.065

But the second point is, I think from the viewpoint

683

00:33:48.065 --> 00:33:51.345

of the applicant, uh, by providing the baseline data

684

00:33:51.565 --> 00:33:55.385

for COI Finn, because it, this is an EIA

685

00:33:55.645 --> 00:33:58.265

and there is the potential for remediation monitoring, the need

686

00:33:58.265 --> 00:34:00.865

for monitoring under the new regime and for remedial action.

687

00:34:01.815 --> 00:34:04.145

Essentially angling water protect themselves

688

00:34:05.095 --> 00:34:07.905

from any claims, their development is causing recreational

689

00:34:07.905 --> 00:34:10.745

impact by providing that baseline data against which they

690

00:34:10.745 --> 00:34:13.105

can then demonstrate there is no impact.

691

00:34:14.045 --> 00:34:16.865

So just as an observer, it would seem beneficial

692

00:34:17.485 --> 00:34:19.105

for angling water to provide that information.

693

00:34:19.215 --> 00:34:22.705

There's a purely observations not requesting a response.

694

00:34:23.935 --> 00:34:25.605

Thank you, Mr. Good. Did

695

00:34:25.605 --> 00:34:26.725

You have your hand raised again?

696

00:34:28.025 --> 00:34:29.845

Yes, I did. Briefly, Madam.

697

00:34:30.025 --> 00:34:32.725

Um, I didn't quite follow, um, Mr.

698

00:34:33.145 --> 00:34:37.205

P's explanation as to why, what I was saying about

699

00:34:38.545 --> 00:34:42.445

the new works and its recreational areas will channel

700

00:34:42.545 --> 00:34:45.005

and focus recreational activity into

701

00:34:45.005 --> 00:34:46.125

this part of the countryside.

702

00:34:46.565 --> 00:34:49.325

I entirely accept his point that there are,

703

00:34:50.235 --> 00:34:53.765

they don't produce the people who come to use this,

704

00:34:53.875 --> 00:34:55.045

this area of countryside.

705

00:34:55.105 --> 00:34:59.245

But the, the fact that he seems to be suggesting

706

00:34:59.245 --> 00:35:02.765

that Save Honey Hill have somehow, um, are unable

707

00:35:03.105 --> 00:35:04.405

to make a realistic comment

708

00:35:04.405 --> 00:35:07.485

because he's referencing some previous comments

709

00:35:07.515 --> 00:35:08.965

that might have been made at an earlier

710

00:35:09.055 --> 00:35:10.245

stage in the consultation.

711

00:35:10.355 --> 00:35:13.445

Perhaps he could, uh, tell me where those documents are

712

00:35:13.465 --> 00:35:14.765

and we'll obviously go to them

713

00:35:14.825 --> 00:35:16.885

and, um, respond if necessary.

714

00:35:19.155 --> 00:35:22.055

Yes, Madam Andrew pr the applicant, um, the, uh,

715
00:35:22.085 --> 00:35:25.695
safe Honey Hills relevant representation, uh, under

716
00:35:26.935 --> 00:35:28.535
SHH zero four,

717
00:35:29.065 --> 00:35:31.975
paragraphs 10 34, um,

718
00:35:33.475 --> 00:35:38.165
Uh, The proposed additional

719
00:35:38.185 --> 00:35:40.245
access is not expected to be attractive.

720
00:35:41.345 --> 00:35:46.005
Um, uh, further other comments, uh, the,

721
00:35:46.025 --> 00:35:48.765
the development will reduce attractive local opportunities

722
00:35:48.825 --> 00:35:50.005
for physical recreation

723
00:35:50.005 --> 00:35:53.285
and users will drive to venues further afield for exercise.

724
00:35:54.225 --> 00:35:55.485
It reduces choice

725
00:35:55.665 --> 00:35:57.365
and access numerous other comments

726
00:35:57.395 --> 00:35:59.485
that have been made throughout the consultation

727
00:35:59.505 --> 00:36:01.045
and in their relevant representations.

728
00:36:01.305 --> 00:36:04.445

Um, I, I don't wish to labor the point, uh, madam,

729

00:36:04.445 --> 00:36:07.645

but, um, I, I, I think they do need to be sure about

730

00:36:07.645 --> 00:36:09.925

what they're saying here about the attractiveness or

731

00:36:09.925 --> 00:36:12.885

otherwise of the facilities that are provided on site.

732

00:36:14.075 --> 00:36:16.165

Okay. I think you both made your points on this

733

00:36:16.225 --> 00:36:17.525

and the examining authorities

734

00:36:17.525 --> 00:36:19.165

heard this, so thank you very much. Yeah,

735

00:36:19.245 --> 00:36:20.885

I, I will take it up separately with Mr.

736

00:36:20.895 --> 00:36:22.965

Pryor 'cause I don't recognize what he's reading.

737

00:36:23.355 --> 00:36:24.605

Okay, thank you Mr. Gilder.

738

00:36:25.185 --> 00:36:26.925

Um, are there any other ips online

739

00:36:26.925 --> 00:36:28.005

that wish to raise any comments?

740

00:36:28.025 --> 00:36:28.485

At this point?

741

00:36:35.695 --> 00:36:37.715

I'm seeing no hands, no further hands in the room.

742

00:36:38.295 --> 00:36:43.235

Um, so I will, um, move on to, um, gender item number six,

743

00:36:43.235 --> 00:36:44.515

which is water resources.

744

00:36:46.655 --> 00:36:48.665

I'll be starting with significance of effects

745

00:36:49.205 --> 00:36:51.585

and the examining authority will mainly reference a s

746

00:36:51.585 --> 00:36:55.385

chapter 20 on water resources with reference as 40.

747

00:36:55.935 --> 00:36:59.905

This heading within ES chapter 20,

748

00:37:01.205 --> 00:37:02.625

it is stated that during periods

749

00:37:02.625 --> 00:37:05.305

of stormwater discharge into the river can, the magnitude

750

00:37:05.325 --> 00:37:08.065

of impact to water quality results in moderate beneficial

751

00:37:08.065 --> 00:37:11.465

effect within their response to e ex Q1

752

00:37:12.065 --> 00:37:13.065

19.23.

753

00:37:13.565 --> 00:37:14.665

The applicant confirms

754

00:37:14.665 --> 00:37:17.185

that storm modeling predicts fewer than one incident in

755

00:37:17.185 --> 00:37:21.365

every 10 years, given the proposed highly infrequent nature

756

00:37:21.825 --> 00:37:23.645

of the likely stormwater discharge events

757

00:37:23.825 --> 00:37:26.485

and associated impacts on water quality on the river cam,

758

00:37:27.105 --> 00:37:29.125

please can the applicant justify the conclusion

759

00:37:29.125 --> 00:37:31.165

that this results in a moderate, significant,

760

00:37:31.175 --> 00:37:32.485

beneficial effect

761

00:37:38.275 --> 00:37:39.895

Mon koman for the applicant?

762

00:37:41.535 --> 00:37:46.315

So the question relates to our, um, assessment of,

763

00:37:46.815 --> 00:37:50.835

uh, beneficial effect to the river cam as a result

764

00:37:50.855 --> 00:37:52.515

of effluent discharge.

765

00:37:53.695 --> 00:37:58.555

So yes, in our, um, chapter, we, we explicitly assess

766

00:38:00.495 --> 00:38:04.795

the existing permit conditions

767

00:38:06.175 --> 00:38:10.755

versus the proposed indicative permit conditions.

768

00:38:11.735 --> 00:38:15.715

So we evaluate the concentration limits

769

00:38:17.215 --> 00:38:21.715

and we evaluate dry weather flows for existing

770

00:38:21.975 --> 00:38:24.355

and proposed indicative conditions.

771

00:38:25.735 --> 00:38:27.915

Now, we simply, we make a very simple assessment.

772

00:38:27.935 --> 00:38:31.835

We multiply one by the other to calculate effluent load

773

00:38:33.615 --> 00:38:35.805

and effluent load.

774

00:38:36.265 --> 00:38:38.925

For the proposed indicative conditions

775

00:38:40.605 --> 00:38:43.465

are lower by 41%

776

00:38:44.005 --> 00:38:46.865

for total phosphorus compared to the,

777

00:38:47.305 --> 00:38:48.305

Sorry to interrupt. I wasn't

778

00:38:48.305 --> 00:38:49.265

talking about the water quality.

779

00:38:49.445 --> 00:38:51.945

It was the impacts from storm modeling.

780

00:38:53.895 --> 00:38:56.195

Oh, okay. And those events

781

00:38:56.975 --> 00:38:59.115

and the fact that they are, uh, sort of modeled

782

00:38:59.115 --> 00:39:00.635

as a one in every 10 year event.

783

00:39:01.425 --> 00:39:03.115

Okay. So, um,

784

00:39:05.145 --> 00:39:09.235

I'll be supported if I, uh, speak incorrectly on the,

785

00:39:09.235 --> 00:39:10.755

the storm modeling report.

786

00:39:11.095 --> 00:39:14.235

But our assessment in the, uh,

787

00:39:14.235 --> 00:39:17.835

chapter 20 water resources quotes,

788

00:39:17.835 --> 00:39:22.675

the storm modeling report, which models, um,

789

00:39:23.485 --> 00:39:24.715

storm water flows

790

00:39:25.615 --> 00:39:29.755

and the improved storage that we see in the proposed works

791

00:39:30.395 --> 00:39:32.035

compared to the existing.

792

00:39:33.015 --> 00:39:35.555

So the modeling indicates that

793

00:39:36.775 --> 00:39:39.395

in the existing model event,

794

00:39:40.025 --> 00:39:41.995

without this additional storage,

795

00:39:42.685 --> 00:39:45.315

there would be storm spills, um,

796

00:39:45.465 --> 00:39:50.195

approximately once every 10 years for the proposed works

797

00:39:50.345 --> 00:39:55.235

with the improved storage capacity, it would be less than

798

00:39:55.235 --> 00:39:57.835

that, as in, in the modeled period of 10 years,

799

00:39:57.885 --> 00:40:00.035

there is no storm spills.

800

00:40:00.975 --> 00:40:05.965

So that is a reduced incidents according

801

00:40:06.025 --> 00:40:09.005

to modeling of storm spills

802

00:40:09.785 --> 00:40:12.405

for the proposed development compared to the existing,

803

00:40:12.575 --> 00:40:15.525

which can only be a benefit to the river.

804

00:40:15.665 --> 00:40:16.665

Can,

805

00:40:17.615 --> 00:40:19.035

Is that benefit significant,

806

00:40:20.855 --> 00:40:24.035

Um, in combination

807

00:40:24.745 --> 00:40:28.715

with the benefits that we're seeing for water quality

808

00:40:29.135 --> 00:40:32.115

as a result of effluent load

809

00:40:32.715 --> 00:40:36.515

reductions in phosphorus and ammonia nitrogen, then?

810

00:40:36.575 --> 00:40:37.575

Yes.

811

00:40:44.725 --> 00:40:46.005

I think, I'm just trying to understand.

812

00:40:46.225 --> 00:40:48.765

So an event that's likely to happen one in every 10 years,

813

00:40:48.765 --> 00:40:52.835

that's obviously highly infrequent, associating a

814

00:40:54.265 --> 00:40:59.075

significant, moderate, significant impact, um,

815

00:40:59.885 --> 00:41:04.825

which is beneficial, that seems quite

816

00:41:04.945 --> 00:41:08.295

a high level of weight to attract to that

817

00:41:08.755 --> 00:41:10.055

for such an infrequent event?

818

00:41:11.145 --> 00:41:15.515

Well, a reduction in stormwater discharges is

819

00:41:16.595 --> 00:41:21.395

a beneficial, um, impact in itself.

820

00:41:22.335 --> 00:41:27.075

Um, it's a slightly artificial concept, I suppose,

821

00:41:27.335 --> 00:41:31.265

uh, creating these

822

00:41:32.015 --> 00:41:36.445

effects based on the sensitivity of the receptors.

823

00:41:36.505 --> 00:41:40.965

So the river can be, uh, considered on the basis

824

00:41:41.305 --> 00:41:45.405

of, uh, Q 95 flows as being,

825

00:41:46.225 --> 00:41:49.685

um, a highly sensitive, uh, receptor,

826

00:41:50.105 --> 00:41:54.565

and that gives us then a moderate beneficial effect.

827

00:41:58.925 --> 00:42:02.305

And so do the same conclusions apply around

828

00:42:02.985 --> 00:42:04.145

combined sewer overflows?

829

00:42:05.735 --> 00:42:10.425

Well, combined sewer overflows, um, won't, well,

830

00:42:10.425 --> 00:42:11.745

there will be no

831

00:42:12.425 --> 00:42:15.865

combined sewer overflow in the proposed works.

832

00:42:15.875 --> 00:42:17.505

There is no CSO discharge.

833

00:42:17.715 --> 00:42:20.505

There is, there is one that's retained at, um, Riverside.

834

00:42:21.505 --> 00:42:24.545

I understand. So will the, the proposed development utilize

835

00:42:24.545 --> 00:42:25.665

that, that one

836

00:42:25.775 --> 00:42:27.705

That will not be used in the proposed development?

837

00:42:27.765 --> 00:42:29.705

So that's, there will be no combined

838

00:42:29.715 --> 00:42:30.865

sewer overflow whatsoever.

839

00:42:35.495 --> 00:42:37.615

I will, um, refer to Mike Dexter

840

00:42:39.445 --> 00:42:41.375

Morning, uh, Mike Dexter for the applicant.

841

00:42:41.515 --> 00:42:43.895

Um, the Riverside CSA will be remaining in

842

00:42:43.895 --> 00:42:45.135

place to protect the network

843

00:42:46.435 --> 00:42:47.655

And the proposed development will

844

00:42:47.655 --> 00:42:48.815

utilize that if necessary.

845

00:42:49.125 --> 00:42:51.855

It's connected to the same network, so yes. Yep.

846

00:42:55.785 --> 00:42:58.675

There's no, there's been no modeling in combined sewer

847

00:42:58.675 --> 00:43:01.435

overflow events, um, in relation

848

00:43:01.435 --> 00:43:02.475

to the proposed development.

849

00:43:02.895 --> 00:43:04.715

So what weight does the applicant consider

850

00:43:04.715 --> 00:43:06.395

that the examining authority should offer

851

00:43:06.395 --> 00:43:09.355

to the stated benefits from reduced events on water quality,

852

00:43:09.365 --> 00:43:11.235

given the lack of M0 modeling

853

00:43:11.455 --> 00:43:14.435

and the stated infrequency of abnormal operating conditions

854

00:43:27.415 --> 00:43:28.685

Right next left for the applicant?

855

00:43:28.985 --> 00:43:32.845

Um, with the, uh, conclusion being the same, we,

856

00:43:32.865 --> 00:43:35.205

we suggest no, no, no weight to be given

857

00:43:38.815 --> 00:43:40.795

to the CSO uh, riverside.

858

00:43:43.745 --> 00:43:45.765

So the application documents suggest

859

00:43:46.005 --> 00:43:49.165

that there are benefits from reduced combined sewer overflow

860

00:43:49.165 --> 00:43:52.375

events, them being less frequent

861

00:43:52.435 --> 00:43:53.775

as a result of proposed development.

862

00:43:53.835 --> 00:43:56.735

But you're suggesting that we should not offer weight to

863

00:43:56.735 --> 00:43:59.055

that, which I assume is based on the lack of modeling.

864

00:44:01.125 --> 00:44:03.485

I, I, I think perhaps Mr.

865

00:44:03.705 --> 00:44:06.645

Dexter thought that you were asking about

866

00:44:07.515 --> 00:44:11.005

what weight should the panel give to the, um,

867

00:44:11.395 --> 00:44:15.965

extremely rare use of the Riverside CSO, which as he said,

868

00:44:16.145 --> 00:44:20.445

is retained solely for, um, uh, I just look up

869

00:44:20.445 --> 00:44:25.285

what his wording was, um, uh,

870

00:44:25.345 --> 00:44:26.525

to protect the network.

871

00:44:27.705 --> 00:44:32.675

Um, I I may be wrong about that. Um,

872

00:44:32.815 --> 00:44:35.355

To clarify, it's, it's the weight attracted benefits.

873

00:44:35.785 --> 00:44:37.275

Exactly. So, Mr.

874

00:44:37.535 --> 00:44:40.815

Dexter, do you,

875

00:45:28.455 --> 00:45:29.835

We we believe weight should be given

876

00:45:29.855 --> 00:45:32.515

to the improved storm management facility, uh,

877

00:45:32.695 --> 00:45:37.675

at the proposed works, um, with the addition of the circuit

878

00:45:38.215 --> 00:45:41.275

2.4 kilometer, uh, tunnel to the new works,

879

00:45:41.335 --> 00:45:45.235

it affords the proposed development, uh, a level the of, uh,

880

00:45:45.235 --> 00:45:48.115

storm water attenuation to allow for that management

881

00:45:48.115 --> 00:45:50.795

to be done, um, by networks

882

00:45:50.815 --> 00:45:52.355

before it comes to the, um,

883

00:45:52.715 --> 00:45:54.915

proposed wastewater treatment plant, um,

884

00:45:55.185 --> 00:45:57.395

with a commensal amount of storm storage.

885

00:45:57.855 --> 00:46:00.035

Um, that adds quite a big benefit.

886

00:46:00.415 --> 00:46:04.555

So weight to the system as a whole, um, will reduce, um,

887

00:46:05.005 --> 00:46:08.875

storm flows entering, um, the river cam.

888

00:46:09.195 --> 00:46:11.875

I think there's a slight nuance between, uh,

889

00:46:11.905 --> 00:46:14.795

what is A-C-S-O-A combined sewer overflow

890

00:46:14.935 --> 00:46:17.275

and what is actually a storm discharge.

891

00:46:17.745 --> 00:46:20.555

Clearly within the, um, plans that we've submitted,

892

00:46:20.555 --> 00:46:22.395

we have storm outfall pipes,

893

00:46:22.455 --> 00:46:24.635

but they have also, they, uh,

894

00:46:24.765 --> 00:46:27.635

enter the CAM following a level of treatment

895

00:46:27.635 --> 00:46:29.875

through the storm tank, so they're not classified

896

00:46:30.335 --> 00:46:31.795

as C SSO spills.

897

00:46:31.815 --> 00:46:33.075

So, apologies. I,

898

00:46:33.195 --> 00:46:35.275

I may have got tripped upon a technicality there,

899

00:46:35.275 --> 00:46:36.875

but there, there is definitely weight to the

900

00:46:37.595 --> 00:46:40.435

improved storm performance of the new works, uh,

901

00:46:40.435 --> 00:46:41.675

for the reason is just outlined.

902

00:46:41.695 --> 00:46:44.235

But yeah, just wanted to make sure that was being ac

903

00:46:44.235 --> 00:46:45.235

Thank you. Accurately

904

00:46:45.235 --> 00:46:47.315

clear. Yeah, I think if,

905

00:46:47.335 --> 00:46:51.315

if there's not been modeling of the combined sewer overflows

906

00:46:52.765 --> 00:46:55.985

for the purposes of the proposed development, I'm,

907

00:46:55.985 --> 00:46:58.065

I'm still a little unclear on what weight we should offer

908

00:46:58.065 --> 00:47:01.265

to any benefits attracted by that element

909

00:47:01.885 --> 00:47:06.365

versus the stormwater discharges on water quality

910

00:47:15.875 --> 00:47:17.215

To, to give an accurate response.

911

00:47:17.215 --> 00:47:18.655

Could we please take that away?

912

00:47:18.655 --> 00:47:20.855

Just to make from, with the UPM modeling

913

00:47:20.855 --> 00:47:22.575

and other modeling that we've done, we just wanna make sure

914

00:47:22.575 --> 00:47:25.055

what we're re returning back is, is wholly accurate?

915

00:47:27.295 --> 00:47:28.705

Yeah, that's absolutely fine.

916

00:47:33.615 --> 00:47:38.235

Uh, the applicant's response to ex Q1 21.61

917

00:47:39.145 --> 00:47:42.115

regarding why potential climate change impacts on low flows

918

00:47:42.115 --> 00:47:43.355
have not been modeled is noted.

919

00:47:44.175 --> 00:47:46.955
Please, can the applicant justify how the conclusion

920

00:47:46.955 --> 00:47:50.315
of a significant moderate be beneficial effect on water

921

00:47:50.315 --> 00:47:52.155
quality is derived, given

922

00:47:52.155 --> 00:47:54.835
that climate change could have a substantial impact on the

923

00:47:55.115 --> 00:47:57.715
identified benefits on a precautionary

924

00:47:57.715 --> 00:48:00.355
and worse case scenario basis, would the significance

925

00:48:00.375 --> 00:48:02.275
of effect be reduced given that, given

926

00:48:02.275 --> 00:48:03.915
that modeling cannot demonstrate the level

927

00:48:03.915 --> 00:48:05.155
of impact from climate change

928

00:48:08.995 --> 00:48:10.815
Mon koman for the, the applicant?

929

00:48:13.535 --> 00:48:17.755
So in our chapter 20 water resources,

930

00:48:17.885 --> 00:48:20.795
we've discussed the benefits to, um,

931

00:48:21.445 --> 00:48:23.955
river can water quality from the

932

00:48:24.675 --> 00:48:26.635
proposed final affluent discharge based,

933

00:48:26.735 --> 00:48:30.275
as I said earlier on, um, effluent load calculations.

934

00:48:31.055 --> 00:48:34.635
And we see a benefit in the total phosphorus p

935

00:48:34.775 --> 00:48:38.475
and among al nitrogen substantial reductions in effluent

936

00:48:38.475 --> 00:48:41.435
load percentages for, for those particular determinants.

937

00:48:44.435 --> 00:48:48.515
Now, in our future baseline section

938

00:48:48.935 --> 00:48:52.315
of chapter 20, which is section, uh, 3.2,

939

00:48:52.935 --> 00:48:56.795
we discuss various climate change implications, uh,

940

00:48:56.815 --> 00:48:58.555
to the water resources environment.

941

00:48:59.095 --> 00:49:03.315
So we discuss the fairly normal, uh, climate change,

942

00:49:03.975 --> 00:49:07.675
um, implications of things like peak river flows

943

00:49:07.855 --> 00:49:11.195
and, um, uh, rainfall.

944

00:49:12.095 --> 00:49:16.595

But we also note, um, very recent research from UK Center

945

00:49:16.735 --> 00:49:21.515

of Ecology and hydrology where they've performed modeling

946

00:49:21.975 --> 00:49:26.385

of, um, future climate change up

947

00:49:26.385 --> 00:49:27.745

to the year 2050,

948

00:49:27.845 --> 00:49:30.785

and notice that the climate in East Anglia is going to get

949

00:49:31.475 --> 00:49:34.025

drier in most model scenarios.

950

00:49:34.245 --> 00:49:38.905

And when they've applied that to river cam flows, they note

951

00:49:38.905 --> 00:49:43.585

that in most modeled scenarios, um,

952

00:49:44.125 --> 00:49:46.625

in the low flow scenarios, um,

953

00:49:47.805 --> 00:49:50.945

the river can is expected to

954

00:49:51.575 --> 00:49:54.865

have about a 20% reduction in low flows.

955

00:49:56.375 --> 00:49:58.075

Now, in a low flow scenario, of course,

956

00:49:58.075 --> 00:50:02.235

there's less water in the river, um, to dilute

957

00:50:02.815 --> 00:50:03.955

ENT discharge,

958

00:50:04.335 --> 00:50:07.155

and, you know, it is assumed

959

00:50:07.265 --> 00:50:10.715

that there is water in the river to dilute discharge,

960

00:50:10.715 --> 00:50:12.715

otherwise there's no point in, uh,

961

00:50:14.075 --> 00:50:15.275

discharging to a river environment.

962

00:50:17.905 --> 00:50:22.485

So the problem is, is that in the future,

963

00:50:22.625 --> 00:50:27.085

we don't know what that water quality environment

964

00:50:27.195 --> 00:50:29.045

that we're discharging to.

965

00:50:31.035 --> 00:50:35.095

It could be anything between a range of extremes.

966

00:50:35.395 --> 00:50:38.945

So it could be A river

967

00:50:39.055 --> 00:50:43.545

that has highly concentrated phosphorus, ammo,

968

00:50:44.105 --> 00:50:45.505

nitrogen, um,

969

00:50:45.965 --> 00:50:49.745

and as we know at the moment, the river can is, is, uh,

970

00:50:50.115 --> 00:50:54.105

classified as poor status, uh, in relation

971

00:50:54.105 --> 00:50:56.265

to WFD for phosphorus.

972

00:50:56.285 --> 00:50:59.505

So it's by no means a pristine river at the moment.

973

00:51:00.965 --> 00:51:05.225

So in the future, in near 2050, um,

974

00:51:06.685 --> 00:51:10.025

you know, it is possible that the river may, may equally be,

975

00:51:10.525 --> 00:51:12.625

um, not perfectly clean.

976

00:51:13.085 --> 00:51:16.385

Uh, and in which case there is potential

977

00:51:16.385 --> 00:51:18.985

that the relatively cleaner discharge

978

00:51:19.535 --> 00:51:22.545

from the proposed works may actually dilute

979

00:51:23.325 --> 00:51:24.505

an unclean river.

980

00:51:24.845 --> 00:51:27.385

That's one unlikely extreme.

981

00:51:28.005 --> 00:51:29.065

On the other extreme,

982

00:51:29.485 --> 00:51:34.025

the river can maybe be a very clean environment as a result

983

00:51:34.025 --> 00:51:38.305

of, um, catchment management practices upstream,

984

00:51:39.405 --> 00:51:44.105

in which case, as we point out in the chapter, the benefits

985

00:51:44.165 --> 00:51:47.385

to the river from the final effluent might be,

986

00:51:47.385 --> 00:51:48.905

might be different than they're at present.

987

00:51:49.365 --> 00:51:50.425

And that's all we can say.

988

00:51:51.815 --> 00:51:53.905

Yeah, I think that that sort of highlights my point.

989

00:51:53.925 --> 00:51:55.545

It, it's, it's the unknown, isn't it?

990

00:51:55.545 --> 00:51:57.585

We, we just don't know what the river quality will be.

991

00:51:57.605 --> 00:52:00.105

And I think based on the lack of

992

00:52:01.015 --> 00:52:04.105

certainty over the quality of the river in the future,

993

00:52:08.145 --> 00:52:12.775

I think the justification around the significance of effect

994

00:52:12.775 --> 00:52:13.935

and the beneficial effect

995

00:52:15.135 --> 00:52:17.355

and the weight that we could offer to that, given the level

996

00:52:17.355 --> 00:52:20.555

of uncertainty is, is my question here. Yeah.

997

00:52:21.305 --> 00:52:23.795

Well, to take up that point, um,

998

00:52:25.745 --> 00:52:28.085

our analysis has been based only on

999

00:52:28.935 --> 00:52:30.605

indicative consent limits.

1000

00:52:30.635 --> 00:52:32.805

They're not set yet.

1001

00:52:34.415 --> 00:52:37.155

Now, in our assessment, we do say,

1002

00:52:37.455 --> 00:52:42.155

and we do rely on the environment agency adaptive permitting

1003

00:52:43.215 --> 00:52:47.235

in response to factors such as climate change,

1004

00:52:47.925 --> 00:52:52.035

water quality, population growth, et cetera.

1005

00:52:52.695 --> 00:52:57.315

So it is possible that whatever is consented

1006

00:52:57.315 --> 00:53:00.755

for the proposed wastewater treatment for that now

1007

00:53:01.425 --> 00:53:06.205

will then be adapted in the future to deal with

1008

00:53:07.565 --> 00:53:11.245

whatever, uh, climate change and population growth

1009

00:53:11.305 --> 00:53:14.285

and catchment management upstream, um,

1010

00:53:14.615 --> 00:53:15.685

throw throws out the river.

1011

00:53:26.865 --> 00:53:31.445

Thank you. Within the submitted water quality assessment

1012

00:53:31.595 --> 00:53:34.405

with reference a PP 1 61,

1013

00:53:35.055 --> 00:53:37.725

there are clear limitations identified such

1014

00:53:37.725 --> 00:53:41.285

as the assessment of suspended solids being limited, a lack

1015

00:53:41.285 --> 00:53:43.365

of confidence in the findings regarding ammonia,

1016

00:53:43.515 --> 00:53:46.125

biochemical oxygen demand, and dissolved oxygen.

1017

00:53:47.145 --> 00:53:48.605

It recommends a further assessment

1018

00:53:48.905 --> 00:53:50.725

of fo phosphorus is required

1019

00:53:51.185 --> 00:53:53.645

as this may have adverse impacts on a groundwater body,

1020

00:53:54.625 --> 00:53:56.365

and concludes that there are likely significant

1021

00:53:56.365 --> 00:53:57.565

effects from permits.

1022

00:53:58.625 --> 00:54:00.795

However, the environmental statement suggests

1023

00:54:00.795 --> 00:54:02.995

that proposed development would result in reduced

1024

00:54:03.395 --> 00:54:06.155

concentrations in the final treated effluent discharges

1025

00:54:06.455 --> 00:54:09.475

of phosphorus, ammonia, total suspended solids

1026

00:54:09.475 --> 00:54:11.875

and biological oxygen demand compared

1027

00:54:11.875 --> 00:54:14.075

to the existing Cambridge wastewater treatment plan.

1028

00:54:14.975 --> 00:54:16.675

Can the applicant clarify the purpose

1029

00:54:16.695 --> 00:54:19.755

of including the submitted water quality assessment a PP

1030

00:54:19.935 --> 00:54:22.515

1 61 as it's not referenced within

1031

00:54:22.515 --> 00:54:23.595

the environmental statement?

1032

00:54:24.375 --> 00:54:26.955

And then please clarify where additional modeling

1033

00:54:27.895 --> 00:54:30.955

has been carried out to address the limitations identified

1034

00:54:30.955 --> 00:54:32.915

in the water quality assessment, and

1035

00:54:32.915 --> 00:54:34.715

therefore how the conclusions of the ES

1036

00:54:34.715 --> 00:54:36.515

regarding these matters has been derived

1037

00:54:38.385 --> 00:54:39.675

Mona Koman for the applicant?

1038

00:54:40.055 --> 00:54:44.995

Yes, you're correct. That app, a PP 1 6 1, has not been, uh,

1039
00:54:45.395 --> 00:54:47.755
referenced in the water resources chapter.

1040
00:54:47.895 --> 00:54:49.155
It has no relevance there

1041
00:54:49.155 --> 00:54:53.355
because it, it's not, um, a DCO document.

1042
00:54:53.975 --> 00:54:56.555
It supports an interim permit that is unrelated

1043
00:54:56.555 --> 00:54:58.115
to this DCO application.

1044
00:54:58.785 --> 00:55:03.275
However, we have used it in the WFD report,

1045
00:55:03.555 --> 00:55:04.875
a PPP 1 53,

1046
00:55:05.345 --> 00:55:07.995
because it, uh, supports

1047
00:55:08.695 --> 00:55:13.435
to a certain extent the, um, considerations for phosphate

1048
00:55:13.975 --> 00:55:18.675
in the river because it is, um, actually the modeling in

1049
00:55:18.835 --> 00:55:20.595
that report, um,

1050
00:55:23.425 --> 00:55:25.955
does model, uh, uh, phosphate

1051
00:55:26.655 --> 00:55:31.275
and the, as explained in the WFD assessment,

1052
00:55:31.625 --> 00:55:35.715

it's not really identical to the conditions that, uh,

1053

00:55:36.125 --> 00:55:40.155

we're considering for, um, the proposed works in terms

1054

00:55:40.155 --> 00:55:41.515

of phosphate concentrations

1055

00:55:41.515 --> 00:55:43.555

and dry weather, uh, dry weather flows.

1056

00:55:43.935 --> 00:55:45.675

But it gives us an, an indication

1057

00:55:46.015 --> 00:55:49.675

and kind of, it gives, gives a kind of a, a direction

1058

00:55:49.675 --> 00:55:50.875

of travel, as it were

1059

00:55:51.095 --> 00:55:53.675

to supplement our effluent load calculations.

1060

00:55:55.575 --> 00:55:58.955

So yes, it's totally used in the WFG report to support our,

1061

00:55:59.455 --> 00:56:02.155

our, uh, calculations on affluent load,

1062

00:56:02.155 --> 00:56:03.755

and it's not used in the environmental

1063

00:56:04.105 --> 00:56:05.395

statement, chapter 20.

1064

00:56:06.685 --> 00:56:10.615

Okay. And how have the conclusions regarding the, um, uh,

1065

00:56:10.615 --> 00:56:14.015

reduced concentrations in, um, effluent discharges

1066

00:56:14.015 --> 00:56:16.615

of phosphorus, ammonia, total suspended solids

1067

00:56:16.615 --> 00:56:19.695

and biological oxygen, oxygen demand, um, how have they been

1068

00:56:20.295 --> 00:56:22.455

derived or, or, or concluded upon?

1069

00:56:24.585 --> 00:56:27.375

Sorry. Uh, the, the, the question is so relating

1070

00:56:27.375 --> 00:56:28.575

to the water resources

1071

00:56:28.575 --> 00:56:29.855

Chapter exactly, yes.

1072

00:56:29.995 --> 00:56:31.135

Um, the YES suggests

1073

00:56:31.135 --> 00:56:33.135

that the proposed development result in reduced

1074

00:56:33.415 --> 00:56:35.935

concentrations of final treated effluent discharges

1075

00:56:35.935 --> 00:56:37.895

of those elements that I've just referred to.

1076

00:56:38.205 --> 00:56:40.695

Yeah, I just, it's sort of bridging the gap

1077

00:56:40.725 --> 00:56:43.855

between the water, the, um, the water quality assessment

1078

00:56:43.855 --> 00:56:45.855

that's been submitted and the findings

1079

00:56:45.855 --> 00:56:47.375

of the conclusions in the es,

1080

00:56:47.375 --> 00:56:48.975

because there seems to be sort of a gap there

1081

00:56:48.995 --> 00:56:49.995

In terms. Okay. So yeah, uh,

1082

00:56:49.995 --> 00:56:54.055

again, a PP 1 61 is not a DC0

1083

00:56:54.565 --> 00:56:58.375

application document, so we're not referencing

1084

00:56:58.525 --> 00:57:02.335

that whatsoever in the environmental statement.

1085

00:57:02.335 --> 00:57:03.775

We're not making that comparison

1086

00:57:03.775 --> 00:57:05.815

because that is not a DC0 document.

1087

00:57:05.955 --> 00:57:08.055

No, but it is submitted in support of the application

1088

00:57:08.055 --> 00:57:10.015

as a whole, and that those are the conclusions of

1089

00:57:10.015 --> 00:57:11.095

that particular document.

1090

00:57:23.665 --> 00:57:26.095

Madam, I, I think the witness has given the best

1091

00:57:26.115 --> 00:57:27.615

answer that she can.

1092

00:57:28.195 --> 00:57:31.415

Um, it, it is difficult obviously,

1093

00:57:31.415 --> 00:57:35.895
because this, um, emerging

1094

00:57:36.545 --> 00:57:40.455
draft consultative permit, whatever one wants to call it,

1095

00:57:40.965 --> 00:57:42.575
only has that status.

1096

00:57:43.595 --> 00:57:47.735
Um, and the, the ES chapter

1097

00:57:48.515 --> 00:57:52.575
has adopted its own framework, um, of comparisons

1098

00:57:52.635 --> 00:57:54.055
and calculations and

1099

00:57:54.115 --> 00:57:56.855
and so forth, which, which we believe

1100

00:57:56.855 --> 00:57:59.295
to be internally consistent with within itself.

1101

00:58:00.195 --> 00:58:02.495
And, um, the,

1102

00:58:04.955 --> 00:58:06.375
I'm really saying that the,

1103

00:58:06.395 --> 00:58:09.255
the witness has given the best answer that, that she can,

1104

00:58:09.365 --> 00:58:13.135
that in a sense, um, without wishing to,

1105

00:58:13.155 --> 00:58:15.935
to sound impertinent, it's not a valid co comparator

1106

00:58:16.675 --> 00:58:18.015

or comparison to make.

1107

00:58:19.635 --> 00:58:21.775

So where has the assessment been?

1108

00:58:24.015 --> 00:58:26.605

Where is the evidence presented to the examining authority

1109

00:58:26.905 --> 00:58:28.885

to, to support the findings

1110

00:58:28.885 --> 00:58:32.365

of reduced concentrations in the final effluent discharges

1111

00:58:32.365 --> 00:58:33.405

of phosphorus, ammonia,

1112

00:58:33.405 --> 00:58:35.485

total suspended solids and biological ox

1113

00:58:35.545 --> 00:58:37.565

Within Thees chapter?

1114

00:58:38.025 --> 00:58:40.405

So there's a, there's an, there's a assessment there,

1115

00:58:41.885 --> 00:58:43.895

there's modeling that's been undertaken there,

1116

00:58:45.885 --> 00:58:47.135

Mona Koman for the applicant.

1117

00:58:47.515 --> 00:58:50.215

Yes. Within chapter 20, water resources,

1118

00:58:50.235 --> 00:58:54.415

we explicitly assess all determinants, uh,

1119

00:58:54.745 --> 00:58:58.015

total phosphorous, monal, nitrogen, total suspended solids,

1120
00:58:58.015 --> 00:59:01.775
and, uh, by chemical, um, oxygen demand.

1121
00:59:02.275 --> 00:59:04.135
So they're explicitly assessed, uh,

1122
00:59:04.135 --> 00:59:06.135
within the water resources chapter.

1123
00:59:06.755 --> 00:59:10.455
We see, as I said, benefit for, um, uh,

1124
00:59:11.145 --> 00:59:13.855
total phosphorus and among al nitrogen.

1125
00:59:13.875 --> 00:59:17.655
And we're perfectly clear that we don't see a benefit for

1126
00:59:18.495 --> 00:59:20.095
TSS and, and BOD.

1127
00:59:24.635 --> 00:59:26.145
Thank you. Just bear with me.

1128
00:59:26.175 --> 00:59:28.585
I've, uh, my laptop's decided to,

1129
00:59:30.595 --> 00:59:32.935
uh, restart again.

1130
00:59:39.615 --> 00:59:40.575
I think I'll have to, I think

1131
00:59:40.575 --> 00:59:41.695
it's, I'm not sure what it's doing.

1132
01:02:13.375 --> 01:02:14.135
I can only apologize.

1133
01:02:16.665 --> 01:02:18.725

Um, probably didn't like

1134

01:02:18.725 --> 01:02:20.885

Working till quarter to seven last night.

1135

01:02:21.445 --> 01:02:24.285

Possibly not. Um, given

1136

01:02:24.435 --> 01:02:27.045

that the water quality would primarily,

1137

01:02:27.235 --> 01:02:29.125

primarily be controlled

1138

01:02:29.125 --> 01:02:31.645

through the environmental permitting process, which lights

1139

01:02:31.645 --> 01:02:35.405

outside of the DCO process could the applicant identify?

1140

01:02:35.585 --> 01:02:38.245

To what extent can the suggested benefits

1141

01:02:38.245 --> 01:02:40.845

to water quality can be offered weight in consideration

1142

01:02:40.845 --> 01:02:43.125

of the proposed development, noting

1143

01:02:43.125 --> 01:02:45.645

that the water quality framework directive regulations

1144

01:02:45.675 --> 01:02:48.565

require no deterioration of the quality of the river cam,

1145

01:02:48.665 --> 01:02:50.365

but not an enhancement to it

1146

01:02:54.325 --> 01:02:55.705

Mon Coleman for the applicant.

1147

01:02:57.825 --> 01:03:02.725

So indeed, the WFD uh,

1148

01:03:02.725 --> 01:03:06.485

requirements are for no deterioration to the, the river cam,

1149

01:03:07.425 --> 01:03:11.565

and we rely on the regulator to perform the modeling,

1150

01:03:11.785 --> 01:03:15.445

to set the, um, discharge limits for the proposed works

1151

01:03:15.465 --> 01:03:20.005

to ensure, um, no deterioration to the, the river can.

1152

01:03:20.705 --> 01:03:24.565

Our assessment in, in chapter 20, water resources, as I,

1153

01:03:24.825 --> 01:03:28.445

as I specified, is based on indicative, uh,

1154

01:03:28.445 --> 01:03:29.645

permit limits only,

1155

01:03:29.705 --> 01:03:31.885

and they're not necessarily the ones that are going

1156

01:03:31.885 --> 01:03:33.405

to be set by the ea.

1157

01:03:33.635 --> 01:03:37.765

They'll be, uh, modeling separately to determine those, um,

1158

01:03:38.075 --> 01:03:40.605

discharge, uh, consents.

1159

01:03:41.705 --> 01:03:44.925

Um, sorry, can you repeat the start of your question?

1160

01:03:47.775 --> 01:03:50.995

Um, to what extent can the suggested benefits

1161

01:03:50.995 --> 01:03:53.115

to water quality be offered weight in consideration

1162

01:03:53.115 --> 01:03:54.315

of the proposed development,

1163

01:04:03.005 --> 01:04:04.535

just given that we're not controlling it

1164

01:04:04.535 --> 01:04:05.895

through the DCO process? Yeah.

1165

01:04:05.895 --> 01:04:08.415

Um, madam, I think this may be more of a question for Mr.

1166

01:04:08.595 --> 01:04:12.615

Bowles, um, who is,

1167

01:04:13.435 --> 01:04:16.135

um, addressing weight and planning balance

1168

01:04:16.675 --> 01:04:18.455

and very special circumstances.

1169

01:04:18.605 --> 01:04:22.615

This witness is giving the, the technical information.

1170

01:04:23.375 --> 01:04:25.125

Thank you. Um, Mr.

1171

01:04:25.185 --> 01:04:27.405

Bowles, I imagine will be on this afternoon now,

1172

01:04:32.155 --> 01:04:34.625

Would, Would you be able to provide a response then,

1173

01:04:35.985 --> 01:04:38.585

possibly a deadline, A deadline for to that as a, as a,

1174

01:04:38.655 --> 01:04:42.505

Well, we can either, I suspect we'll end up doing both.

1175

01:04:42.885 --> 01:04:44.465

Um, Mr.

1176

01:04:44.725 --> 01:04:47.665

Bowles I know would like to assist today with matters

1177

01:04:47.765 --> 01:04:49.265

of weight, uh,

1178

01:04:49.685 --> 01:04:54.185

and, um, I'm sure that it would be, um, helpful to follow

1179

01:04:54.185 --> 01:04:56.985

that up in writing at deadline for as well.

1180

01:04:56.985 --> 01:04:59.145

Yes, we might have moved on by this afternoon that,

1181

01:04:59.145 --> 01:05:01.265

that was what I was thinking in terms

1182

01:05:01.265 --> 01:05:02.905

of addressing it today. That was all

1183

01:05:03.135 --> 01:05:04.185

Very well, yes.

1184

01:05:04.605 --> 01:05:08.305

But yeah, it, it, it, I'm sure it will come back

1185

01:05:08.855 --> 01:05:12.305

into the consideration of the overall planning balance

1186

01:05:12.525 --> 01:05:14.945

and perhaps when we are in the green belt section.

1187

01:05:15.535 --> 01:05:16.625

Okay. Thank you.

1188

01:05:32.705 --> 01:05:35.325

In Safe Honey Hills a deadline two responses.

1189

01:05:35.555 --> 01:05:37.605

They state that the environmental statement fails

1190

01:05:37.605 --> 01:05:39.885

to consider adverse impacts on water quality

1191

01:05:39.955 --> 01:05:42.525

between the existing Cambridge Water Recycling Center

1192

01:05:42.595 --> 01:05:45.645

outfall and the internal drainage board pumping station

1193

01:05:45.785 --> 01:05:48.325

for the interim water discharge environmental permit.

1194

01:05:48.745 --> 01:05:49.925

Can the applicant provide a

1195

01:05:50.085 --> 01:05:51.205

response to these comments, please?

1196

01:05:55.875 --> 01:05:57.975

Um, shall we, I I think it's best if we

1197

01:05:57.975 --> 01:05:59.215

respond to that one in writing.

1198

01:06:01.005 --> 01:06:02.825

Yes. If you wish. Could,

1199

01:06:02.915 --> 01:06:04.985

would you mind just repeating the question?

1200

01:06:06.005 --> 01:06:08.665

So, save Honey Hills deadline two responses,

1201
01:06:08.665 --> 01:06:11.345
which is Rep 2 0 6 3

1202
01:06:11.685 --> 01:06:13.825
and REP 2 0 60.

1203
01:06:15.055 --> 01:06:17.585
They state that the environmental statement fails

1204
01:06:17.585 --> 01:06:20.185
to consider adverse impacts on water quality

1205
01:06:20.695 --> 01:06:24.265
between the existing Cambridge Water Recycle Water Recycling

1206
01:06:24.265 --> 01:06:28.605
Center outfall, and the internal drainage board pumping

1207
01:06:28.605 --> 01:06:31.085
station for the interim water discharge

1208
01:06:31.085 --> 01:06:32.125
environmental permit.

1209
01:06:40.165 --> 01:06:42.625
Yes, madam, we'll respond in writing to that one.

1210
01:06:42.625 --> 01:06:43.625
Thank you.

1211
01:06:45.185 --> 01:06:46.685
So I'll move on to consideration

1212
01:06:46.705 --> 01:06:49.485
of the River Basin Management Plan update in 2022.

1213
01:06:50.455 --> 01:06:53.605
There was an update to the River Management, uh,

1214
01:06:53.605 --> 01:06:56.165

river Basement Management Plan in December, 2022.

1215

01:06:56.535 --> 01:06:58.325

Could the applicant confirm

1216

01:06:58.385 --> 01:07:00.245

how this update affects the findings

1217

01:07:00.265 --> 01:07:03.205

of the water framework directive assessment, uh,

1218

01:07:03.205 --> 01:07:04.445

and the environmental statement?

1219

01:07:08.005 --> 01:07:10.585

Um, certainly Monica Koman for the applicant.

1220

01:07:11.165 --> 01:07:15.995

Um, I guess it's probably might be helpful

1221

01:07:16.105 --> 01:07:20.155

just to explain the River Basin Management Plan cycles to,

1222

01:07:20.255 --> 01:07:21.595

to address that question.

1223

01:07:22.455 --> 01:07:26.355

Um, so the River Basin Management Plan, um,

1224

01:07:27.455 --> 01:07:30.195

is organized in six year cycles, typically.

1225

01:07:31.015 --> 01:07:35.795

So for example, cycle two of the River Basin management plan

1226

01:07:36.495 --> 01:07:39.795

was from, uh, 2015 to 2021,

1227

01:07:39.815 --> 01:07:43.555

and the formal baseline for that was 2015.

1228
01:07:44.095 --> 01:07:45.955
So that means that in that six year cycle,

1229
01:07:45.975 --> 01:07:47.835
the formal baseline doesn't change.

1230
01:07:48.145 --> 01:07:52.475
It's held at 2015 for WFD status.

1231
01:07:53.115 --> 01:07:56.995
Likewise, for cycle three in which we are at the moment, um,

1232
01:07:57.925 --> 01:08:02.795
which is from 2022 to 2027, the formal baseline,

1233
01:08:03.055 --> 01:08:05.955
uh, for cycle three is, uh,

1234
01:08:06.175 --> 01:08:09.515
the 2019 data on catchment data Explorer.

1235
01:08:11.735 --> 01:08:15.445
Now at the time of, uh,

1236
01:08:15.445 --> 01:08:19.405
writing our WFD assessment we're in 2022,

1237
01:08:20.225 --> 01:08:22.605
and the cycle two

1238
01:08:24.085 --> 01:08:26.095
Data was still the formal baseline.

1239
01:08:26.155 --> 01:08:28.975
So 2015 data was still the formal baseline,

1240
01:08:28.995 --> 01:08:31.015
but we were aware that the cycle three was coming

1241
01:08:31.475 --> 01:08:32.815

but hadn't been formalized.

1242

01:08:32.875 --> 01:08:35.335

So we did actually ask for, um,

1243

01:08:35.485 --> 01:08:38.495

clarification from the Environment Agency whether we should

1244

01:08:38.555 --> 01:08:41.055

use the cycle, uh, two data

1245

01:08:41.235 --> 01:08:44.575

or the, uh, cycle three data for our assessment.

1246

01:08:44.715 --> 01:08:45.975

And they, they confirmed

1247

01:08:45.975 --> 01:08:49.695

that we should use the draft cycle three data, which is the,

1248

01:08:49.715 --> 01:08:52.975

the 2019 formal baseline, um,

1249

01:08:53.005 --> 01:08:56.415

that was formalized in December, 2022.

1250

01:08:56.555 --> 01:08:59.575

So I assume that's the update you're referring to.

1251

01:09:00.515 --> 01:09:03.975

Um, on catchment data explorer, there is also

1252

01:09:04.835 --> 01:09:09.775

2022 update data available, which

1253

01:09:10.475 --> 01:09:12.655

may be also what you're referring to.

1254

01:09:13.005 --> 01:09:14.215

That is interim data

1255

01:09:14.395 --> 01:09:16.455

and doesn't form the formal baseline,

1256

01:09:16.455 --> 01:09:20.255

the formal baseline maintenance 2019 up to the year 2027.

1257

01:09:21.065 --> 01:09:21.535

Thank you.

1258

01:09:26.675 --> 01:09:28.775

Um, I'm going to, moving on to dewatering now.

1259

01:09:29.115 --> 01:09:32.455

Um, please can the applicant confirm whether the

1260

01:09:32.455 --> 01:09:35.295

environmental permits for water abstraction, impoundment

1261

01:09:35.315 --> 01:09:37.215

and dewatering light have been submitted

1262

01:09:37.215 --> 01:09:38.295

to the Environment Agency

1263

01:09:38.835 --> 01:09:40.975

and a likely timescale for their determination?

1264

01:09:45.015 --> 01:09:46.075

My Dexter for the applicant,

1265

01:09:46.215 --> 01:09:48.315

we can confirm they'll be submitted by deadline five.

1266

01:09:51.885 --> 01:09:53.305

Do you know the likely timescales

1267

01:09:53.305 --> 01:09:55.225

for response from the Environment Agency

1268

01:10:02.185 --> 01:10:03.185

Circa two months?

1269

01:10:05.645 --> 01:10:07.525
17, 2 2 2 Months?

1270

01:10:11.365 --> 01:10:13.305
Um, thank you.

1271

01:10:14.135 --> 01:10:15.425
Does the consent center,

1272

01:10:15.425 --> 01:10:19.945
the permits register rep 1 0 4 7 need updating to refer

1273

01:10:19.945 --> 01:10:21.225
to the a dewatering license?

1274

01:10:21.945 --> 01:10:22.305
Specifically?

1275

01:10:27.375 --> 01:10:29.105
This is something that the EA did note,

1276

01:10:41.135 --> 01:10:42.135
Madam. We'll consider

1277

01:10:42.135 --> 01:10:44.405
that and, um, tell you it, uh, deadline

1278

01:10:44.425 --> 01:10:44.965
for in writing,

1279

01:10:51.685 --> 01:10:52.165
I should say.

1280

01:10:52.165 --> 01:10:55.965
Obviously, if, if we conclude it should, then we'll, um,

1281

01:10:56.135 --> 01:10:58.765
we'll, we'll, uh, submit an updated one

1282

01:11:04.705 --> 01:11:07.925

In response to ex Q1 21.7.

1283

01:11:08.225 --> 01:11:10.405

The applicant states that in the event

1284

01:11:10.465 --> 01:11:13.365

of a spillage potentially contaminating groundwater, users

1285

01:11:13.465 --> 01:11:16.045

of private wells would be notified by personal contact

1286

01:11:16.305 --> 01:11:20.365

and by letter within 12 hours, can the applicant confirm

1287

01:11:20.365 --> 01:11:22.965

where this is secured for construction and operation?

1288

01:11:33.995 --> 01:11:35.255

No comment for the applicant.

1289

01:11:35.335 --> 01:11:37.015

I think we'll have to come back to you on that one.

1290

01:11:42.715 --> 01:11:45.305

Could any contamination reach private drinking wells

1291

01:11:45.305 --> 01:11:46.305

within less than 12 hours?

1292

01:11:50.485 --> 01:11:54.705

Monica Coleman for the applicant, we've done

1293

01:11:56.325 --> 01:11:59.975

extensive analysis on contaminant

1294

01:12:01.765 --> 01:12:06.565

transport in our, uh, updated contaminant transport model

1295

01:12:07.825 --> 01:12:11.985

and for most,

1296

01:12:13.045 --> 01:12:17.705

um, uh, kind

1297

01:12:17.705 --> 01:12:20.385

of determinants modeled in, in that report,

1298

01:12:22.115 --> 01:12:25.625

We're talking about extremely slow travel times

1299

01:12:26.205 --> 01:12:30.545

to the compliance point, which is, um, a ditch, uh,

1300

01:12:32.375 --> 01:12:33.905

just to the, the northwest

1301

01:12:33.965 --> 01:12:36.465

of the proposed wastewater treatment plant.

1302

01:12:37.085 --> 01:12:40.385

And we're talking about travel times of over in, in excess

1303

01:12:40.385 --> 01:12:42.825

of a thousand years for most determinants.

1304

01:12:43.645 --> 01:12:45.865

Uh, we do note that, uh,

1305

01:12:46.535 --> 01:12:50.425

there's three determinants which could have a travel time

1306

01:12:50.765 --> 01:12:52.545

of less than a thousand years,

1307

01:12:53.485 --> 01:12:55.865

and, uh, we kind

1308

01:12:55.865 --> 01:12:58.465

of discussed those travel times in more detail,

1309

01:12:59.165 --> 01:13:01.625
but for none of 'em, um,

1310

01:13:01.725 --> 01:13:03.985
are we talking about the order of days there?

1311

01:13:04.605 --> 01:13:06.305
The order of years or centuries?

1312

01:13:14.205 --> 01:13:17.025
Um, Mike, next fifth, applicant, um, just to confirm,

1313

01:13:17.275 --> 01:13:21.745
we've recommended 12 hours, uh, to inform residents to align

1314

01:13:21.745 --> 01:13:25.145
with our normal practices as if the customer,

1315

01:13:25.325 --> 01:13:28.065
as if the private users of the Warhols were

1316

01:13:28.585 --> 01:13:29.745
customers connected to supply.

1317

01:13:39.325 --> 01:13:43.615
Can I ask the environment Agency, um, are they satisfied

1318

01:13:43.645 --> 01:13:46.095
with the applicant's proposals regarding dewatering

1319

01:13:46.095 --> 01:13:48.255
and the impacts on private drinking sources, noting

1320

01:13:48.255 --> 01:13:49.535
that no monitoring is proposed?

1321

01:13:53.595 --> 01:13:55.905
Hello, Madam Neville Bend Environment Agency.

1322

01:13:56.045 --> 01:13:57.625

Um, I'll hand you over to our groundwater

1323

01:13:57.625 --> 01:13:59.905

and contaminated land specialist Graham Phillips.

1324

01:14:05.895 --> 01:14:07.225

Good afternoon, mom. Graham Phillips

1325

01:14:07.225 --> 01:14:08.465

From the Environment Agency.

1326

01:14:09.125 --> 01:14:12.625

Um, the question is to do with dewatering

1327

01:14:12.625 --> 01:14:14.345

and impacts on private water supply.

1328

01:14:14.345 --> 01:14:15.465

If I understand you correctly.

1329

01:14:16.165 --> 01:14:20.705

Um, the applicant has assessed the potential impacts

1330

01:14:20.705 --> 01:14:25.545

of dewatering using standard, um, industry, um,

1331

01:14:27.045 --> 01:14:29.155

algorithms and, and uh, equations.

1332

01:14:29.215 --> 01:14:34.165

And we're fairly satisfied that based on,

1333

01:14:35.215 --> 01:14:40.035

um, the geology, the, um, testing of, uh,

1334

01:14:40.105 --> 01:14:42.875

aquifer properties, there are unlikely to be

1335

01:14:43.465 --> 01:14:48.155

significant widespread impacts dewatering, um,

1336

01:14:49.425 --> 01:14:51.915

that would put five water supplies at risk.

1337

01:14:55.265 --> 01:14:59.365

Thank you. Uh,

1338

01:14:59.365 --> 01:15:00.805

moving on to flood risk.

1339

01:15:01.305 --> 01:15:03.205

Um, the examining authority.

1340

01:15:03.235 --> 01:15:05.605

Note that the code of construction practice parts A

1341

01:15:05.625 --> 01:15:07.365

and B rep 3 26

1342

01:15:07.385 --> 01:15:10.605

and rep 3 28 require the provision

1343

01:15:10.605 --> 01:15:12.365

of an emergency preparedness plan,

1344

01:15:12.365 --> 01:15:14.525

which addresses flood events during construction.

1345

01:15:15.195 --> 01:15:18.725

However, during operation, please can the applicant confirm

1346

01:15:19.065 --> 01:15:21.165

how would the draft DCA secure the provision

1347

01:15:21.165 --> 01:15:24.045

of suitable flood evacuation plans, noting

1348

01:15:24.045 --> 01:15:26.245

that the submitted flood risk assessment confirms

1349

01:15:26.245 --> 01:15:29.125

that flood may occur in adjacent water courses blocking

1350

01:15:29.185 --> 01:15:31.125

access to the site during a flood event.

1351

01:15:38.605 --> 01:15:43.065

Um, so the existing flood risk, uh, assessment, um,

1352

01:15:44.775 --> 01:15:47.745

does assess, um, access

1353

01:15:47.765 --> 01:15:51.065

and egress in, uh, a flood event, noting

1354

01:15:51.065 --> 01:15:55.145

that the proposed wastewater treatment works is in, uh,

1355

01:15:55.545 --> 01:15:56.985

entirely within flood zone one.

1356

01:15:57.085 --> 01:16:01.105

So above all modeled flood levels for any scenario.

1357

01:16:01.925 --> 01:16:05.665

But does note of course that, uh, surrounding water courses,

1358

01:16:06.405 --> 01:16:09.905

uh, may show increased, uh, flood levels.

1359

01:16:10.925 --> 01:16:14.545

Um, there's nothing to indicate that access

1360

01:16:14.685 --> 01:16:18.705

and egress, uh, would be impossible in a flood event.

1361

01:16:19.245 --> 01:16:24.025

Um, but we rec recommend safe refuge

1362

01:16:24.685 --> 01:16:29.425

on site if, uh, access and egress proves not possible.

1363

01:16:31.765 --> 01:16:33.825

May I, uh, invite Sophie

1364

01:16:33.825 --> 01:16:35.345

Stevenson to comment also, please.

1365

01:16:39.985 --> 01:16:42.125

Hi there. Sophie Stevenson for the applicant.

1366

01:16:42.625 --> 01:16:46.245

Um, in terms of flood risk management on the site itself,

1367

01:16:46.265 --> 01:16:47.605

on society's operational,

1368

01:16:48.065 --> 01:16:50.965

the site has a written environmental management system,

1369

01:16:51.095 --> 01:16:53.685

which is informed by an environmental risk assessment

1370

01:16:53.685 --> 01:16:55.085

that's carried out for that site.

1371

01:16:55.745 --> 01:16:58.765

Now we've got two, um, procedures that we have.

1372

01:16:58.825 --> 01:17:02.205

So Anglia Water as a company has, um,

1373

01:17:02.395 --> 01:17:04.685

generic operating procedures in terms

1374

01:17:04.685 --> 01:17:05.805

of flood risk management

1375

01:17:05.805 --> 01:17:09.085

and protocols to be carried out on an operational site

1376

01:17:09.205 --> 01:17:12.125

that cover all of our operational sites,

1377

01:17:12.585 --> 01:17:16.045

but also where any site specific measurements are required.

1378

01:17:16.335 --> 01:17:17.845

These are then included within

1379

01:17:17.845 --> 01:17:19.405

that written management system

1380

01:17:19.705 --> 01:17:22.245

and that written management system forms part

1381

01:17:22.265 --> 01:17:25.005

of our conditions for our environmental permit.

1382

01:17:25.065 --> 01:17:27.765

So that's regulated by the environment agency.

1383

01:17:28.185 --> 01:17:30.005

So it would be covered by those two elements,

1384

01:17:30.005 --> 01:17:32.485

both generic company protocols

1385

01:17:32.545 --> 01:17:34.365

and then site specific measures.

1386

01:17:41.305 --> 01:17:44.905

Thank you. Uh, moving on to,

1387

01:17:45.125 --> 01:17:46.545

excuse me, water efficiency.

1388

01:17:47.125 --> 01:17:48.225

The applicant has

1389

01:17:48.465 --> 01:17:50.425

provided water efficiency figures in response

1390

01:17:50.425 --> 01:17:53.225
to ex Q1 21 point 19,

1391

01:17:54.125 --> 01:17:57.425
but states that these figures exclude other processes, uh,

1392

01:17:57.525 --> 01:18:00.625
or that water processes u uses totaling more than

1393

01:18:00.725 --> 01:18:01.865
200 liters a second.

1394

01:18:02.875 --> 01:18:05.945
Could the applicant confirm why other process water uses

1395

01:18:05.945 --> 01:18:08.065
were excluded from the water efficiency figures?

1396

01:18:08.565 --> 01:18:10.145
And does this mean that water consumption

1397

01:18:10.285 --> 01:18:11.465
is actually higher than that?

1398

01:18:11.465 --> 01:18:12.545
What has been suggested,

1399

01:18:30.245 --> 01:18:34.225
And that'll be a tenant for the applicant, um, there 200

1400

01:18:34.785 --> 01:18:38.625
liters a second that we refer to is actually reuse

1401

01:18:38.725 --> 01:18:41.465
of the effluent on the site itself.

1402

01:18:41.885 --> 01:18:43.905
So we take the final effluent

1403

01:18:44.245 --> 01:18:48.545

and in some cases we will actually disinfect it to use

1404

01:18:48.545 --> 01:18:49.745

as wash water on the site.

1405

01:18:50.325 --> 01:18:52.025

And the effluent from

1406

01:18:52.025 --> 01:18:54.545

that is put back into the treatment process

1407

01:18:54.725 --> 01:18:56.865

and treated further and discharged in that way.

1408

01:18:57.325 --> 01:19:00.225

So the, um, quantities listed

1409

01:19:00.925 --> 01:19:03.745

in the project description is actually the

1410

01:19:03.745 --> 01:19:05.145

potable water supply.

1411

01:19:05.845 --> 01:19:09.825

Um, so it's the only new water that is coming into the site.

1412

01:19:10.975 --> 01:19:14.955

Thank you. And in relation

1413

01:19:14.955 --> 01:19:16.595

to the water efficiency figures

1414

01:19:16.835 --> 01:19:18.475

provided by the applicant, it appears

1415

01:19:18.475 --> 01:19:20.955

that there had been an increase in water consumption from

1416

01:19:20.955 --> 01:19:24.275

286, um, qubit meters per day

1417

01:19:24.275 --> 01:19:26.715
to 325 qubit meters per day.

1418

01:19:27.575 --> 01:19:30.275
Can the applicant confirm why the proposed development

1419

01:19:30.275 --> 01:19:32.955
resorts in higher water consumption levels in comparison

1420

01:19:33.015 --> 01:19:34.715
to the existing wastewater treatment plant

1421

01:19:35.255 --> 01:19:37.595
and do higher levels of water, um,

1422

01:19:38.745 --> 01:19:41.555
consumption there at high levels of water efficiency,

1423

01:19:41.555 --> 01:19:42.715
therefore need to be sought

1424

01:19:42.855 --> 01:19:44.715
to avoid increased rates of abstraction

1425

01:19:46.845 --> 01:19:48.345
And canon for the applicant?

1426

01:19:48.345 --> 01:19:51.945
Again, um, the increase is associated

1427

01:19:51.975 --> 01:19:55.465
with an additional treatment process that has been added

1428

01:19:55.565 --> 01:19:57.745
to the new treatment works, um,

1429

01:19:57.745 --> 01:19:59.745
that is not at the existing treatment works,

1430

01:20:00.165 --> 01:20:04.625

and that is to be able to achieve, uh, the greater level of,

1431

01:20:04.845 --> 01:20:07.765

um, uh, cleaner water basically.

1432

01:20:08.345 --> 01:20:11.885

Um, and this additional treatment process then needs

1433

01:20:11.885 --> 01:20:16.725

additional polymer dose, and we use potable water for that

1434

01:20:16.725 --> 01:20:18.325

because the pipes are so small

1435

01:20:18.385 --> 01:20:20.165

and just need to ensure the quality

1436

01:20:20.265 --> 01:20:21.885

and reliability of that process.

1437

01:20:22.465 --> 01:20:26.005

So it's associated with that, the increase associated

1438

01:20:26.005 --> 01:20:29.445

with growth, um, in terms of the other existing processes

1439

01:20:29.545 --> 01:20:32.045

so small that it's not really the step change,

1440

01:20:32.105 --> 01:20:34.245

the step changes with that additional treatment process.

1441

01:20:34.955 --> 01:20:37.925

Okay, thank you. And has the applicant co had

1442

01:20:37.925 --> 01:20:39.365

correspondence with Cambridge Water

1443

01:20:39.555 --> 01:20:41.845

regarding the water supply to the proposed development?

1444

01:20:42.385 --> 01:20:44.045

And can the applicant summarize what,

1445

01:20:44.085 --> 01:20:45.765

if any agreement has been reached with this party?

1446

01:20:47.485 --> 01:20:52.325

Um, Uh,

1447

01:20:52.425 --> 01:20:53.725

my Dexter for the applicant, yes.

1448

01:20:53.745 --> 01:20:55.725

We have, um, discussed with Cambridge Water

1449

01:20:55.825 --> 01:20:57.965

and it's included within our statement of common ground

1450

01:20:59.775 --> 01:21:00.785

Regarding This matter.

1451

01:21:00.845 --> 01:21:03.905

Has agreement being reached in terms of water supply

1452

01:21:04.165 --> 01:21:05.385

and water efficiency?

1453

01:21:09.415 --> 01:21:12.355

We believe so. We just wait for their final confirmation.

1454

01:21:14.985 --> 01:21:17.495

We'll hope to put in, uh,

1455

01:21:17.835 --> 01:21:20.215

an agreed position at deadline four,

1456

01:21:20.275 --> 01:21:24.175

but in any event, uh, we'll put in an update at that stage.

1457

01:21:30.005 --> 01:21:32.695

Does the Environment Agency have any comments on the water

1458

01:21:32.695 --> 01:21:34.655

consumption figures provided by the applicant

1459

01:21:34.655 --> 01:21:36.855

and as discussed just a moment ago?

1460

01:21:38.855 --> 01:21:40.485

Thank you, madam. No comment at this stage

1461

01:21:40.485 --> 01:21:42.525

because it'll be looked at through the permit applications.

1462

01:21:46.965 --> 01:21:49.025

Um, sorry. Could the Environment Agency repeat

1463

01:21:49.025 --> 01:21:50.305

that? I couldn't quite understand.

1464

01:21:50.925 --> 01:21:52.905

Yes. Sorry. Neville Been Environment Agency.

1465

01:21:53.085 --> 01:21:55.935

Um, the, these details will be looked at

1466

01:21:55.935 --> 01:21:56.975

through the permit applications,

1467

01:21:57.435 --> 01:21:58.735

the abstraction license, sorry,

1468

01:22:00.575 --> 01:22:02.555

But you haven't got any fundamental concerns

1469

01:22:02.555 --> 01:22:03.875

regarding the water efficiency?

1470

01:22:04.455 --> 01:22:05.715

Um, at this from previous,

1471

01:22:06.225 --> 01:22:09.155

from previous conversations we were being, we were waiting

1472

01:22:09.215 --> 01:22:10.515

for the applicant to, um,

1473

01:22:10.785 --> 01:22:13.475

provide consumption estimates alongside water

1474

01:22:13.475 --> 01:22:14.515

efficiency standards.

1475

01:22:14.695 --> 01:22:16.395

Um, I haven't personally seen them,

1476

01:22:16.455 --> 01:22:19.755

but like I said, we'll expect those to be submitted as part

1477

01:22:19.755 --> 01:22:20.915

of the abstraction license.

1478

01:22:46.495 --> 01:22:47.545

Mike, next step, the applicant.

1479

01:22:47.765 --> 01:22:51.785

Um, just as a point of note, um, the, the increase

1480

01:22:51.785 --> 01:22:54.785

that we described currently is, is process dependent.

1481

01:22:55.285 --> 01:22:58.705

Um, just want to draw the, uh, officer's, uh, attention

1482

01:22:58.705 --> 01:23:00.945

that we are securing Bri.

1483

01:23:01.305 --> 01:23:03.265

Excellent for, for the buildings of water consumption

1484

01:23:04.135 --> 01:23:06.845

from a personal use, uh, should, should see a,

1485

01:23:07.085 --> 01:23:08.245

a, a good improvement.

1486

01:23:11.645 --> 01:23:13.865

Um, this question's for Cambridge County Council

1487

01:23:13.965 --> 01:23:15.345

as the local lead federal authority.

1488

01:23:15.965 --> 01:23:17.945

Um, can they confirm whether they consider

1489

01:23:17.945 --> 01:23:19.225

that the water efficiency figures

1490

01:23:19.425 --> 01:23:20.785

provided by the applicant to be acceptable

1491

01:23:21.885 --> 01:23:25.595

and do the councils, uh, need to consider that they need

1492

01:23:25.595 --> 01:23:26.675

to be secured through the draft?

1493

01:23:26.755 --> 01:23:27.755

ECO

1494

01:23:28.555 --> 01:23:30.105

Madam, um, I have Mr.

1495

01:23:30.365 --> 01:23:32.625

Um, Harry Pickford, who's the principal officer

1496

01:23:33.085 --> 01:23:35.105

for sustainable drainage, um,

1497

01:23:35.335 --> 01:23:38.145

from the LLFA on the on online.

1498
01:23:43.865 --> 01:23:45.735
Thank you. It's Harry Pickfords on

1499
01:23:45.735 --> 01:23:46.895
behalf of Cambridge County Council.

1500
01:23:47.195 --> 01:23:49.415
Um, it's not really for the LFA

1501
01:23:49.415 --> 01:23:51.135
to comment on the water efficiency side of things.

1502
01:23:51.195 --> 01:23:53.415
We, um, rely on kind of the,

1503
01:23:53.435 --> 01:23:54.935
the comments from the Environment Agency

1504
01:23:54.935 --> 01:23:56.015
to cover that side of things.

1505
01:24:00.455 --> 01:24:01.065
Okay, thank you.

1506
01:24:17.345 --> 01:24:19.445
At deadline two, south Cambridge

1507
01:24:19.445 --> 01:24:21.885
to District Council submitted a requi submitted

1508
01:24:21.885 --> 01:24:24.445
that a requirement should be included within the draft DCO

1509
01:24:24.505 --> 01:24:26.925
to ensure that the proposed development would not be used

1510
01:24:26.945 --> 01:24:30.965
or occupied until water efficiency spec specification.

1511
01:24:31.335 --> 01:24:34.565

Based on the BRI Wat zero one water calculator methodology

1512

01:24:34.825 --> 01:24:36.725

had been submitted to and approved in writing

1513

01:24:37.465 --> 01:24:40.365

by the local planning authority, they suggests

1514

01:24:40.365 --> 01:24:42.565

that the maximum number of water credits should be achieved

1515

01:24:42.565 --> 01:24:45.605

in order to meet with policy CC four of the South Cambridge,

1516

01:24:45.605 --> 01:24:47.285

her local plan 2018,

1517

01:24:47.285 --> 01:24:49.965

and the GA Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design

1518

01:24:49.965 --> 01:24:51.685

and Construction SPD 2020.

1519

01:24:52.555 --> 01:24:53.725

With the councils be able

1520

01:24:53.725 --> 01:24:56.725

to clarify whether achieving BRI Excellence Standard would

1521

01:24:56.885 --> 01:24:58.725

also achieve the maximum number of credits

1522

01:24:58.725 --> 01:25:01.445

for water efficiency for category what zero one

1523

01:25:01.905 --> 01:25:03.845

or is this something which would be secured over

1524

01:25:03.845 --> 01:25:05.045

and above Brim?

1525
01:25:05.325 --> 01:25:06.325
Excellent.

1526
01:25:06.995 --> 01:25:09.185
Madam, I'm afraid that, uh, Ms. Martin,

1527
01:25:09.365 --> 01:25:11.105
who is the appropriate person to deal

1528
01:25:11.105 --> 01:25:12.585
with this is not available today.

1529
01:25:13.195 --> 01:25:16.345
Would it be acceptable to take that question away, uh,

1530
01:25:16.365 --> 01:25:17.545
and give you a written answer?

1531
01:25:17.725 --> 01:25:20.425
Um, as an action point? Thank you.

1532
01:25:21.935 --> 01:25:25.895
Thank you. I dunno if the applicant could

1533
01:25:25.895 --> 01:25:26.935
answer that potentially.

1534
01:25:29.795 --> 01:25:31.335
If you don't know, then we can

1535
01:25:31.335 --> 01:25:32.415
rely on the councils to respond.

1536
01:25:32.595 --> 01:25:36.015
No, we, we don't know the council's attitude,

1537
01:25:36.495 --> 01:25:38.535
although as usual, it,

1538
01:25:38.595 --> 01:25:41.015

it would clearly be infinitely preferable

1539

01:25:41.015 --> 01:25:43.735

to have a conversation before everybody submits at stage

1540

01:25:43.735 --> 01:25:47.815

four, um, rather than the other option.

1541

01:25:49.245 --> 01:25:51.175

Adam? Yes, if this could be formed part

1542

01:25:51.175 --> 01:25:52.175

of our discussions on the

1543

01:25:52.175 --> 01:25:53.375

statement to common ground, and so be it.

1544

01:25:56.655 --> 01:25:58.935

I mean, this was more of a technical point from my point

1545

01:25:58.935 --> 01:26:00.455

of view, uh, and whether,

1546

01:26:03.545 --> 01:26:05.715

whether it the Brim

1547

01:26:06.355 --> 01:26:08.515

excellent standard also achieves the maximum net number

1548

01:26:08.515 --> 01:26:09.875

of credits for water efficiency,

1549

01:26:10.455 --> 01:26:13.795

but I I will wait to hear back from the council on that.

1550

01:26:13.795 --> 01:26:15.195

Yeah, it, it seems a reasonable assumption,

1551

01:26:15.455 --> 01:26:18.595

but um, we don't know, so we can't assure you about that.

1552

01:26:22.485 --> 01:26:24.865

Uh, moving on to hydrological contamination.

1553

01:26:25.935 --> 01:26:27.745

Have the en, uh, environment Agency

1554

01:26:27.745 --> 01:26:29.065

and applicant concluded matters

1555

01:26:29.065 --> 01:26:31.385

regarding potential leakages from infrastructure

1556

01:26:31.695 --> 01:26:33.225

that would be used for underground

1557

01:26:33.245 --> 01:26:35.585

or support a table transmission of pollutants?

1558

01:26:42.185 --> 01:26:46.035

Well, we've, we've submitted a number of of documents, um,

1559

01:26:47.545 --> 01:26:52.315

such as the HIA, uh, a PP 1 59, uh,

1560

01:26:52.575 --> 01:26:53.595

the Dewatering

1561

01:26:53.595 --> 01:26:58.435

and Pump test, uh, technical note, a PP 1 54, uh, both

1562

01:26:58.435 --> 01:27:02.555

of which contribute to our, um, updated contaminant

1563

01:27:03.075 --> 01:27:05.795

transport model, a PP 1 58.

1564

01:27:06.215 --> 01:27:09.275

All these documents have been, um, submitted.

1565

01:27:09.855 --> 01:27:13.915

Um, I believe the, um,

1566

01:27:14.475 --> 01:27:16.915
contaminant transport model, um,

1567

01:27:17.655 --> 01:27:19.755
has been certainly read

1568

01:27:20.015 --> 01:27:24.075
and, uh, agreed with by the Environment Agency.

1569

01:27:25.815 --> 01:27:28.005
Thank you. And can I ask the Environment Agency?

1570

01:27:29.895 --> 01:27:32.485
Hello, madam? Once I've never been Environment Agency once

1571

01:27:32.485 --> 01:27:34.045
again, I'll hand over to my colleague Graham Phillips.

1572

01:27:36.475 --> 01:27:38.165
Good afternoon, ma'am. Graham Phillips from the

1573

01:27:38.165 --> 01:27:39.165
Environment Agency, please,

1574

01:27:39.165 --> 01:27:40.765
could you repeat the question again?

1575

01:27:42.355 --> 01:27:45.815
Yes. Um, have you concluded matters with the applicant

1576

01:27:45.815 --> 01:27:48.335
regarding potential leakages from infrastructure

1577

01:27:48.525 --> 01:27:49.975
that would be used for underground

1578

01:27:50.075 --> 01:27:52.575
or sub water table transmission of pollutants,

1579

01:27:52.575 --> 01:27:53.775

which you previously raised?

1580

01:27:55.615 --> 01:27:57.015

I would say to a large extent, yes.

1581

01:27:57.135 --> 01:27:58.735

I think there are still some discussions

1582

01:27:58.735 --> 01:28:01.055

to be had about the Water Beach transfer pipeline,

1583

01:28:01.055 --> 01:28:03.295

the construction of that, um,

1584

01:28:03.715 --> 01:28:08.175

and, uh, monitoring that might detect any leaks

1585

01:28:08.175 --> 01:28:09.535

during operation.

1586

01:28:10.925 --> 01:28:12.965

I understand that, uh, pressure testing

1587

01:28:14.025 --> 01:28:16.205

during operation would identify leaks.

1588

01:28:16.245 --> 01:28:18.645

I guess there are questions about, uh,

1589

01:28:18.665 --> 01:28:20.285

if there are a leak where it might occur.

1590

01:28:21.085 --> 01:28:23.365

Ultimately it comes down to the design of that pipeline.

1591

01:28:23.625 --> 01:28:25.205

Is it best available technology?

1592

01:28:36.115 --> 01:28:38.255

Can I ask if the applicant's intending on providing any

1593

01:28:38.255 --> 01:28:39.455
more information in this regard?

1594

01:28:40.155 --> 01:28:41.815
Um, we, we can respond at the

1595

01:28:42.015 --> 01:28:43.175
deadline for, if that's okay.

1596

01:28:43.635 --> 01:28:46.175
To that point, our best available technologist

1597

01:28:46.175 --> 01:28:48.455
for Water speech pipeline, but we are proposing to do

1598

01:28:48.455 --> 01:28:50.215
as suggested with pressure testing

1599

01:28:50.395 --> 01:28:54.655
and, um, quantity assurance for the installation. Um,

1600

01:28:55.285 --> 01:28:56.285
Okay. I just want to ensure

1601

01:28:56.285 --> 01:28:57.655
that the dialogues still continue

1602

01:28:57.655 --> 01:28:58.695
with the Environment Agency if

1603

01:28:58.695 --> 01:28:59.855
they consider something to be outstanding.

1604

01:28:59.855 --> 01:29:02.925
Obviously if it's a case of updating a document, um,

1605

01:29:02.985 --> 01:29:05.365
to conform with, uh, best practice measures, then

1606
01:29:06.975 --> 01:29:08.505
We'd encourage you To do that.

1607
01:29:09.285 --> 01:29:12.625
Uh, clearly madam, uh, we are very keen to speak

1608
01:29:12.685 --> 01:29:16.545
to the officers of, of all these relevant, um, agencies

1609
01:29:16.605 --> 01:29:20.225
and authorities, uh, and seek agreement

1610
01:29:20.405 --> 01:29:23.705
or seek to understand if, if there can't be agreement.

1611
01:29:24.925 --> 01:29:28.915
Um, so I assume

1612
01:29:28.945 --> 01:29:32.595
that Mr. Phillips is the person for us to contact.

1613
01:29:35.315 --> 01:29:39.765
Thank you. Is the

1614
01:29:39.765 --> 01:29:41.405
Environment Agency satisfied

1615
01:29:41.525 --> 01:29:44.085
that the preliminary risk assessment suitably addresses

1616
01:29:44.085 --> 01:29:46.565
their concerns regarding hydrological contamination

1617
01:29:51.055 --> 01:29:52.645
Level Bend Environment Agency?

1618
01:29:52.745 --> 01:29:54.965
Um, I'll again pass you over to Graham Phillips.

1619
01:29:58.295 --> 01:30:00.495

I think the answer to that has to be yes, there is,

1620

01:30:00.495 --> 01:30:01.935

there has been a preliminary risk assessment.

1621

01:30:01.995 --> 01:30:03.255

We have reviewed it and we are

1622

01:30:03.255 --> 01:30:04.655

generally satisfied with that.

1623

01:30:15.375 --> 01:30:17.485

Thank you. And has the Con SIM modeling been shared

1624

01:30:17.485 --> 01:30:19.965

with the Environment Agency as per the deadline one update

1625

01:30:19.965 --> 01:30:21.085

to the statement of common Ground,

1626

01:30:21.105 --> 01:30:23.565

and does the Environment Agency have any updates

1627

01:30:23.585 --> 01:30:25.085

or comments that they wish to make on this?

1628

01:30:29.445 --> 01:30:30.505

Graham Phillips? Again,

1629

01:30:30.505 --> 01:30:33.825

Martin from the Environment Agency, um, I've seen a report,

1630

01:30:34.445 --> 01:30:37.265

uh, on the con sim modeling, uh, which details

1631

01:30:37.365 --> 01:30:38.385

how it's been configured

1632

01:30:38.385 --> 01:30:41.985

and parameterized, uh, based on that it's acceptable.

1633

01:30:42.065 --> 01:30:45.035

I haven't actually received the digital models

1634

01:30:46.175 --> 01:30:48.715

and, uh, run them with the software.

1635

01:30:48.995 --> 01:30:52.795

I could do that if it were to be of benefit, essentially,

1636

01:30:52.795 --> 01:30:54.635

it would just be down to me checking that

1637

01:30:55.295 --> 01:30:58.075

it is being configured and parameterized as per the report

1638

01:30:58.095 --> 01:30:59.955

and the results are as per reported.

1639

01:31:02.265 --> 01:31:03.785

I think the question is are you satisfied

1640

01:31:03.785 --> 01:31:06.225

with the information that's been provided and if you are

1641

01:31:08.305 --> 01:31:09.305

Yes. Yes, I think

1642

01:31:09.305 --> 01:31:11.565

the, the contenting model is, is appropriate

1643

01:31:11.625 --> 01:31:14.485

and I'm happy with the, the results

1644

01:31:14.545 --> 01:31:16.085

and, and what's been provided. Yeah.

1645

01:31:16.715 --> 01:31:21.615

Okay. Thank you. And can the applicant confirm why

1646

01:31:21.615 --> 01:31:24.695

the recommendations contained within Section 6.3

1647

01:31:24.915 --> 01:31:27.255

of the preliminary risk assessment are not taken forward

1648

01:31:27.255 --> 01:31:29.855

and secured through the draft DCO, such

1649

01:31:29.855 --> 01:31:31.655

as a foundation works risk assessment,

1650

01:31:31.755 --> 01:31:33.375

an intrusive ground investigation?

1651

01:31:38.005 --> 01:31:40.625

Uh, Madam, I think that, um,

1652

01:31:40.835 --> 01:31:43.985

might be best dealt within the next session on land quality.

1653

01:31:45.825 --> 01:31:47.695

Sorry, they do overlap slightly. Yes.

1654

01:31:47.755 --> 01:31:49.775

Um, but we, we can certainly come back to it.

1655

01:31:50.385 --> 01:31:53.535

Thank you. I I don't think the relevant witnesses in the

1656

01:31:53.535 --> 01:31:57.765

room at the moment, the land quality, oh, he's here.

1657

01:31:59.085 --> 01:32:00.725

I will see if he's ready to deal with

1658

01:32:00.725 --> 01:32:02.085

that question in this session.

1659

01:32:07.295 --> 01:32:09.715

Uh, could the applicant confirm why the recommendations

1660

01:32:09.715 --> 01:32:12.675
contained within Section 6.3, uh,

1661

01:32:12.675 --> 01:32:15.155
of the preliminary risk assessment are not taken forward

1662

01:32:15.255 --> 01:32:16.915
and secured through the draft ECO, such

1663

01:32:16.915 --> 01:32:18.795
as a found foundation works assessment

1664

01:32:18.895 --> 01:32:20.595
and intrusive ground investigation?

1665

01:32:23.695 --> 01:32:25.875
Uh, do you know Joel Elli for the applicant?

1666

01:32:26.215 --> 01:32:30.195
Um, the intrusive ground investigation has,

1667

01:32:30.815 --> 01:32:31.995
is been completed

1668

01:32:31.995 --> 01:32:35.395
and reported, sorry, evening has been completed

1669

01:32:35.455 --> 01:32:37.475
and is reported in the Yes.

1670

01:32:37.735 --> 01:32:39.875
Um, I can't answer the question.

1671

01:32:40.525 --> 01:32:41.715
Close to the microphone please.

1672

01:32:41.725 --> 01:32:43.755
Sorry, I can't answer the question in relation

1673

01:32:43.815 --> 01:32:45.595

to the securement in the DC0

1674

01:32:45.895 --> 01:32:47.675
of the foundation works risk assessment.

1675

01:32:47.785 --> 01:32:48.995
I'll have to take that one away.

1676

01:32:49.845 --> 01:32:54.475
Thank you. Um, so moving on to surface water drainage,

1677

01:32:54.695 --> 01:32:56.355
the examining authority, understand

1678

01:32:56.355 --> 01:32:59.555
that Cambridgeshire County Council seek further detail

1679

01:32:59.585 --> 01:33:01.995
regarding the surface water drainage strategy.

1680

01:33:03.015 --> 01:33:05.555
The council has requested calculations of the volume

1681

01:33:05.695 --> 01:33:07.035
of groundwater accounted

1682

01:33:07.035 --> 01:33:08.675
for in the surface water drainage strategy.

1683

01:33:09.655 --> 01:33:11.035
If the calculations are available,

1684

01:33:11.045 --> 01:33:12.515
could the applicant provide them

1685

01:33:12.515 --> 01:33:13.915
to the council to aid their assessment?

1686

01:33:38.185 --> 01:33:39.455
Sorry, could you repeat the question?

1687
01:33:40.165 --> 01:33:43.685
Yeah. Um,

1688
01:33:44.625 --> 01:33:46.965
the councils requested calculations of the volume

1689
01:33:46.985 --> 01:33:48.485
of groundwater accounted

1690
01:33:48.485 --> 01:33:50.325
for in the surface water drainage strategy.

1691
01:33:51.215 --> 01:33:53.005
Could these calculations be provided?

1692
01:33:55.165 --> 01:33:57.465
Um, we, we haven't done the calculations for the,

1693
01:33:57.485 --> 01:33:58.785
the groundwater to date.

1694
01:33:59.575 --> 01:34:02.705
Okay. We've, uh, risked customers as a low probability

1695
01:34:02.925 --> 01:34:04.105
for, um,

1696
01:34:04.345 --> 01:34:07.545
experiencing the groundwater p um, into the drainage network.

1697
01:34:08.655 --> 01:34:12.965
Okay. Um, I understand that there's going

1698
01:34:12.965 --> 01:34:15.125
to be an updated drainage strategy submitted at deadline

1699
01:34:15.185 --> 01:34:17.485
for, if I've understood that correctly.

1700
01:34:22.485 --> 01:34:24.305

My text of the applicant. I I believe we have some

1701

01:34:24.305 --> 01:34:25.345
amendments yes to.

1702

01:34:25.735 --> 01:34:30.335
Okay. Um, Cambridge County

1703

01:34:30.335 --> 01:34:32.815
Council's obviously requested quite a lot of details

1704

01:34:32.815 --> 01:34:34.815
regarding the surface water drainage strategy.

1705

01:34:35.875 --> 01:34:40.615
Um, I think until obviously we've seen

1706

01:34:40.615 --> 01:34:42.695
that a deadline fall, there's probably not much point in

1707

01:34:42.695 --> 01:34:44.655
going into too much detail on this matter.

1708

01:34:45.365 --> 01:34:47.775
However, could the county council

1709

01:34:48.435 --> 01:34:50.415
as a lead local federal authority

1710

01:34:51.205 --> 01:34:53.815
tell me if they have any specific major concerns

1711

01:34:53.815 --> 01:34:55.415
regarding the surface water drainage

1712

01:34:55.845 --> 01:34:58.885
that they think could not be, be overcome at a later stage?

1713

01:35:01.205 --> 01:35:03.575
Adam, uh, Mr. Pickford again, um,

1714

01:35:03.675 --> 01:35:05.055
should be able to assist with that.

1715

01:35:07.795 --> 01:35:09.985
Thank you. Harry Pickfords, chemistry County Council.

1716

01:35:10.325 --> 01:35:13.545
Um, I think the main thing is it's the level of uncertainty

1717

01:35:13.545 --> 01:35:14.585
that just needs to be ruled out.

1718

01:35:14.845 --> 01:35:17.585
Um, so once we have the information,

1719

01:35:17.635 --> 01:35:18.635
Sorry Mr. Pigford,

1720

01:35:18.635 --> 01:35:20.385
we we're struggling to hear you a little bit.

1721

01:35:20.385 --> 01:35:21.425
If you could speak a little louder,

1722

01:35:21.425 --> 01:35:22.945
that would be great. Thank you.

1723

01:35:23.055 --> 01:35:25.705
Yeah. Can you hear me okay now? Yes.

1724

01:35:25.855 --> 01:35:28.985
Yeah, Perfect. Um, yeah, so I think there's, it's,

1725

01:35:28.985 --> 01:35:31.585
it's mainly the level of uncertainty that we have

1726

01:35:31.585 --> 01:35:33.625
around kind of the information we've asked for.

1727

01:35:33.685 --> 01:35:37.225

So I guess until we've kind of received the information that

1728

01:35:38.115 --> 01:35:40.655

may well come through in this updated drain strategy under

1729

01:35:41.135 --> 01:35:43.015

deadline for, um, it's difficult

1730

01:35:43.015 --> 01:35:44.655

to necessarily provide too much comment,

1731

01:35:44.755 --> 01:35:48.535

but it's, it's kind of the, the uncertainty, um, in the,

1732

01:35:48.635 --> 01:35:51.255

the kinda proposals that are being put forward to date.

1733

01:35:56.285 --> 01:35:59.175

Obviously the, the detailed design is not yet known

1734

01:35:59.395 --> 01:36:01.895

of the proposed wastewater treatment plant.

1735

01:36:02.035 --> 01:36:05.655

So, um, in, in terms of a, a detailed level of,

1736

01:36:05.755 --> 01:36:07.055

of surface water drainage, that

1737

01:36:07.055 --> 01:36:08.775

that simply can't be provided as yet.

1738

01:36:09.235 --> 01:36:11.415

Are there any fundamental concerns that you have?

1739

01:36:13.165 --> 01:36:15.385

Um, I think that the main thing that we need

1740

01:36:15.385 --> 01:36:19.705

to get across is the fact that the requirement,

1741

01:36:19.785 --> 01:36:22.585

I know there's sort of a lot hanging on requirement 15,

1742

01:36:22.675 --> 01:36:24.665

which relates to the, the drainage strategy.

1743

01:36:25.685 --> 01:36:27.785

Um, those are principles that need

1744

01:36:27.785 --> 01:36:29.225

to be agreed under the drainage strategy

1745

01:36:29.605 --> 01:36:30.905

around discharge rates

1746

01:36:31.245 --> 01:36:35.905

and, um, kinda areas, area drainage for, for, um,

1747

01:36:36.695 --> 01:36:38.505

tons of different, different bits that we're looking at,

1748

01:36:39.175 --> 01:36:40.345

such as the kind

1749

01:36:40.345 --> 01:36:42.185

of peral paving extents and that kind of thing.

1750

01:36:42.185 --> 01:36:44.545

And I, I appreciate the, the level of detail will come

1751

01:36:44.545 --> 01:36:46.735

through under the requirement,

1752

01:36:46.755 --> 01:36:49.495

but it's the principles that we are agreeing to

1753

01:36:49.555 --> 01:36:51.495

and the extent that we're necessarily expecting to see

1754

01:36:52.465 --> 01:36:55.455

these drainage, um, kinda infrastructure being provided.

1755

01:36:56.435 --> 01:36:59.175

Um, which is, you know, it, it's sometimes just a case

1756

01:36:59.175 --> 01:37:00.855

of including a couple of sentences.

1757

01:37:00.975 --> 01:37:04.335

I think just to kind of provide a little bit more, um,

1758

01:37:05.005 --> 01:37:07.735

certainty that the information that we're gonna be,

1759

01:37:07.895 --> 01:37:11.765

I guess agreeing to is what we would kind expect to see, uh,

1760

01:37:12.195 --> 01:37:13.565

sort of progress

1761

01:37:13.685 --> 01:37:17.145

and become evident in terms of the, the details

1762

01:37:17.145 --> 01:37:18.585

that will come through on the requirement 15.

1763

01:37:20.715 --> 01:37:23.215

Is the applicant clear on the principles which the local

1764

01:37:23.215 --> 01:37:25.655

lead flood authority require?

1765

01:37:37.785 --> 01:37:39.565

Uh, no, we're not madam.

1766

01:37:40.675 --> 01:37:43.485

Okay. I think probably a conversation needs to happen

1767

01:37:43.485 --> 01:37:45.085

between the local authority

1768

01:37:45.145 --> 01:37:47.925

and applicants so that they are aware of the,

1769

01:37:47.945 --> 01:37:49.925

the principles that they're setting out. Ye

1770

01:37:50.385 --> 01:37:51.385

Yes, of course.

1771

01:37:51.505 --> 01:37:53.405

Um, talking is always good.

1772

01:37:53.865 --> 01:37:57.325

Um, but your last question

1773

01:37:57.555 --> 01:37:59.605

with respect is highly pertinent

1774

01:37:59.905 --> 01:38:03.925

and, um, you know, at the risk of sounding rather blunt,

1775

01:38:04.585 --> 01:38:08.485

the last answer to you, um, did not communicate

1776

01:38:08.485 --> 01:38:09.925

to us what is required.

1777

01:38:10.505 --> 01:38:14.565

And so we, if, if there is something, um,

1778

01:38:15.365 --> 01:38:19.645

definite that's, uh, that's really of concern

1779

01:38:20.145 --> 01:38:25.085

and appropriate to this stage of the process, then um, I ask

1780

01:38:25.085 --> 01:38:27.885

through through you, please, for your sake

1781

01:38:27.885 --> 01:38:30.925

and our sake, could it be clearly articulated?

1782

01:38:31.785 --> 01:38:33.925

Um, because with,

1783

01:38:34.115 --> 01:38:37.965

with the greatest respect the last answer didn't do that.

1784

01:38:38.105 --> 01:38:40.085

Mm-Hmm. I think that LLFA needs

1785

01:38:40.085 --> 01:38:42.525

to be clear about the principles that they are seeking

1786

01:38:42.955 --> 01:38:45.125

regarding the Surface Water JD scheme.

1787

01:38:45.465 --> 01:38:47.645

Um, and I would ask that they are

1788

01:38:47.965 --> 01:38:51.925

provided by the next deadline, please if,

1789

01:38:51.945 --> 01:38:53.645

if not better directly to the applicant,

1790

01:38:53.745 --> 01:38:54.885

but certainly to us as well.

1791

01:38:55.295 --> 01:38:57.325

Madam Message received and understood.

1792

01:39:03.285 --> 01:39:05.025

Um, I'll be moving on to the outline.

1793

01:39:05.025 --> 01:39:08.185

Water quality monitoring plan now, which is rep 2 28.

1794

01:39:19.315 --> 01:39:20.995

I think we'll stop there. Um,

1795

01:39:21.055 --> 01:39:23.675

before I move on, um, just so we can give everybody a break,

1796

01:39:27.895 --> 01:39:31.155

If we are, uh, planning to stop, uh, fin Trusts would like

1797

01:39:31.175 --> 01:39:34.555

to, uh, comment regarding surface water drainage

1798

01:39:34.555 --> 01:39:36.235

and outline water quality management

1799

01:39:36.235 --> 01:39:37.275

plan at appropriate time.

1800

01:39:37.345 --> 01:39:41.675

That is notice. Thank you as Ms. Cotton. Yep. Noted.

1801

01:39:42.245 --> 01:39:43.915

Thank you. Yeah, I think we'll adjourn the hearing

1802

01:39:46.115 --> 01:39:48.575

for 45 minutes, so we'll return exactly.

1803

01:39:48.795 --> 01:39:51.535

Um, 1 45, the hearing's now adjourned.