

# Cambridge City Council

## Written summary of oral submissions made at Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH 3) and responses to the Action Points raised.

**Application by Anglian Water Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation project (CWWTPR) (ref: WW010003)**

**Deadline 4**

22 January 2024



**This document sets out Cambridge City Council’s (CCC) written summary of oral submissions made at Specific Hearing 3 (ISH 3) on the 10th and 11th January 2024 and responses to the Action Points raised at these hearings.**

This table refers to the agenda published 21 December 2023 [EV-007a] and the Action Points published 17 January 2024 [EV-008v].

Please note that although ISH3 Agenda points 10 (noise and vibration) and 12 (odour) [EV-007a], were not discussed at the hearings, for completeness, CCC have responded to these matters. For clarity, these topics are marked with an asterisk.

AGENDA REF	ACTION POINT REF	TOPIC AND QUESTIONS	SCDC RESPONSE
2	-	<p><b>APPLICATION DOCUMENTS</b></p> <p>a. Whether Cambridge City Council (CCC) / South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) intend(ed) to submit written summaries of oral submissions.</p> <p>b. Applicant’s post hearing submission Appendix C – Working Timetable commissioning / remediation dates clarification.</p>	<p>a. Yes, CCC will submit written summaries of oral submissions.</p> <p>b. N/A</p>

4	-	<p><b>CARBON</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (SCLP) policy CC/3 compliance and BREEAM.</li> <li>b. Carbon assessment, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Baseline of the carbon assessment.</li> <li>ii. Consideration of sludge deliveries.</li> <li>iii. Uncertainty of future emissions and scenarios.</li> <li>iv. Waste disposal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. Whole life carbon assessment, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Scope.</li> <li>ii. Potential for future expansion and upgrades to plant equipment.</li> <li>iii. Offsetting of decommissioning and construction greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.</li> <li>iv. Net zero and carbon offsetting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. Significance of effects.</li> <li>e. Design refinement and GHG emissions.</li> <li>f. Gas to grid capability and alternatives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Local Plan policy compliance – This is a SCDC Policy, please refer to the SCDC response also submitted at Deadline 4.</li> <li>b. Carbon assessment - supportive of the reasoning and need for the DM0 baseline which demonstrates redevelopment of existing WWTP to allow comparisons between realistic outcomes, but SCDC recognise that the inclusion of a current 'business as usual' baseline (as per discussions with the Applicant and Cambridgeshire County Council) will allow for more accurate capture of the overall carbon implications of the scheme.</li> <li>c. Whole life carbon assessment means dealing with multiple assumptions and uncertainties (timescales/process of updating Operational Carbon Management Plan) – CCC is seeking reassurance as to how the carbon data is updated and refined to reflect development decisions, gaps in data and improvement in data accuracy as the scheme progresses, e.g., <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gas to grid Vs CHP</li> <li>- Impacts of decarbonisation of grid</li> <li>- Process emissions</li> <li>- Future expansion &amp; capital replacements</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---	---	---	---

<p><b>9</b></p>		<p><b>GREEN BELT (Agenda)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Clarification around which elements would be inappropriate development.</li> <li>b. Consideration of degree to which effects on the Green Belt have sought to be minimised.</li> <li>c. Adequacy of consideration of non-Green Belt sites.</li> <li>d. Clarification around SCDC’s view in its Local Impact Report that Green Belt release for housing need through the local plan process would not provide ‘exceptional circumstances’, whereas the relocation of a WWTP (for which no evident need has been demonstrated) to the Green Belt in order to enable housing development would demonstrate ‘very special circumstances’.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Please note that points ‘a’ to ‘c’ do not apply to Cambridge City Council. Point ‘d’ (below) applies to both CCC and SCDC as it relates to housing need.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. Both CCC and SCDC have been very clear in all submissions to the DCO examination that the preparation of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP) and the DCO application for the WWTP relocation are two separate processes that follow their own distinct processes and regulations.</li> </ul> <p>The emerging GCLP is consistent with National Policy in that, from a 'plan-making' perspective', the question CCC and SCDC have to consider is whether there are exceptional circumstances to release land from the Green Belt to meet development needs, including housing, but not including waste and minerals.</p> <p>CCC’s position is set out at paragraph 6.62 of its LIR [REP2-043], and that position is that the Council does not consider that overall housing needs alone provide the ‘exceptional circumstances’ required in national policy to justify removing land from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge for housing in the Preferred Options for the emerging Local Plan (First Proposals) and has</p>
-----------------	--	--	--

			<p>clarified that this position is having regard to the identification of the proposed emerging development strategy that can meet needs in a sustainable way without the need for Green Belt release. That last point is important. The Councils' position is in the context that it has so far been possible to identify a development strategy consistent with national and local planning objectives, including proposed site specific allocations for housing, that can meet housing needs in a sustainable way without the need for release of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge that is significant to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt, in particular the setting of Cambridge as a historic city.</p> <p>The Councils have looked on a site-specific basis to consider whether there could be exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release and one site on the edge of Cambridge has been identified as having potential to meet this test, at Cambridge Biomedical Campus on the southern fringe of Cambridge as an extension of an existing internationally important site for life sciences. Three other smaller potential Green Belt releases are proposed in the First Proposals away from Cambridge at Babraham Campus to the south east of Cambridge also for life sciences, and two small sites for housing at Great Shelford and</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Oakington villages where there is particularly good access to high quality public transport.</p> <p>It is important to be clear that the preferred strategy for the GCLP includes the major brownfield site at North East Cambridge that lies within the urban area of Cambridge and is a highly sustainable location. This is of course consistent with existing policy in the 2018 Local Plans. The emerging GCLP is, by necessity, predicated on the existing WWTP site becoming available if this DCO is approved, so that it can be concluded that the emerging NEC policy is deliverable, being the central test, any Inspector examining the GCLP or NECAAP must apply, and the Councils must meet for their plan.</p> <p>That is because it is simply not possible for the emerging local plan to include any proposals relating to the relocation of the WWTP because neither CCC or SCDC are the LPA for waste and minerals. Waste matters are outside the responsibilities of both Councils as district local planning authorities and indeed it would be unlawful for the district council to seek to make any proposals for waste within their Local Plan. It would have been a matter for the County Council as the Waste Planning Authority to address such a proposal within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. As such, the local plan (and indeed the</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>NECAAP) can only progress so far until there is evidence that the NEC site is deliverable, and that will only be in place if and when the DCO is approved.</p> <p>Significantly, if the DCO were not approved and the NEC site was not available to deliver a new city district, the Councils would need to look to identify a replacement site for the majority of the 8,350 homes identified in the emerging GCLP First Proposals that are dependent on the CWWTP being relocated, and in particular that 3,900 homes for the plan period to 2041. See LIR paragraphs 6.34 to 6.35, Map 1 and paragraphs 6.98 to 6.101 [REP2-043] that set out the constraint that the existing CWWTP places on development not only on the current site, but also in the area surrounding it such that only up to 1,425 homes could be delivered if the CWWTP remains in situ and landowners may decide not to bring those land parcels forward for residential if the heart of the new city district cannot come forward. The site of the existing CWWTP is 38.9 ha, whilst the site together with the surrounding constrained area lying within the odour contours is 78.6 ha.</p> <p>If the NEC site is not available, it would be necessary to go through a further process of reviewing the development strategy to identify an alternative site(s) to meet needs for jobs and</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>homes. This will inevitably include reviewing whether the earlier conclusion that there are not exceptional circumstances in principle to justify revisions to the Green Belt remains sound. As set out above, the site that would be required to replace the development capacity unlocked by the relocation of the CWWTP is much larger than the site of the existing CWWTP itself. This reflects not only that displaced development potential needs to reflect the wider constrained area, but also that the NEC site is proposed for a higher density development than has been provided elsewhere reflecting its highly accessible location and excellent public transport links. However, the ExA may find it helpful to be aware as a comparison, that the Cambridge Airport site is 145.4 ha and the GCLP First Proposals identifies it as having potential for 7,000 homes and 9,000 jobs.</p> <p>It is possible that a review of the alternative locations and sites available to meet development needs if the CWWTP is not able to relocate could identify land on the edge of Cambridge in the Green Belt as the most appropriate alternative to NEC to achieve sustainable development and conclude that exceptional circumstances do exist to justify a review of the Green Belt.</p> <p>In a similar way, the Councils' position on exceptional circumstances could also conceivably</p>
--	--	--	--



			<p>change given the Development Strategy Update that was published and agreed by the Councils in January 2023 (LIR Appendix 1, GCSP-6) that identifies an increase in the jobs forecast and the housing need to support those jobs, even though the First Proposals did not identify any exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release for housing in principle.</p> <p>Whilst due to the ongoing uncertainty on water supply the Councils have not at this point identified any changes to the First Proposals strategy to meet those increased needs, once the water supply situation is confirmed, it may be necessary to go through a further process of reviewing the development strategy to identify additional sites to meet the increased needs. This will inevitably include reviewing whether the earlier conclusion that there are not exceptional circumstances in principle to justify revisions to the Green Belt remains sound.</p> <p>However, the applicant is pursuing the proposed relocation through the DCO process. As such, the test applying is whether there are very special circumstances that would justify approving the specific proposal for this new WWTP when having regard to all 'important and relevant' considerations. This clearly needs to have regard to the development comprising inappropriate</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>development in the Green Belt and the extent to which impacts on the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and any other harm could be mitigated. The Councils have set out their position in their LIRs that there would be significant planning benefits arising from proposals for a new city district at NEC proposed in the emerging NECAAP and GCLP, and that the delivery of the assessed development needs of those emerging plans and other related benefits are substantial. As such the Councils consider these benefits carry considerable weight as important and relevant considerations to the DCO weighing in its favour.</p> <p>Whether the Applicant's DCO proposal can demonstrate such very special circumstances is clearly for the ExA to determine. However, in the context of the ExA's question, the Council does not see any conflict in principle between the position taken by the Councils in the Preferred Options for the Local Plan to date, and whether there could be VSC that justify approval of the DCO.</p> <p>In summary, the Councils' position is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Exceptional circumstances for the allocation of a waste water site in the Green Belt is a matter for the County Council as the waste planning authority,</li> </ol>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. The Councils consider in the context of the First Proposals, that for housing and jobs, there are no exceptional circumstances to justify in principle the release of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge, although a very limited number of site-specific exceptional circumstances have been identified.</li> <li>iii. The Councils support the principle of the DCO development in the Green Belt based on a recognition of all the benefits that are capable of being very special circumstances.</li> </ul>
	<b>99</b>	<p><b>GREEN BELT (Action Point)</b></p> <p>Applicant / Cambridge City Council - Clarify whether the Green Belt Assessment [APP-207] should make reference to the Cambridge City Local Plan 2018 and whether there would be any Green Belt land affected within the administrative area of Cambridge City Council.</p>	<p>CCC can confirm that no part of the site is located within the designated Green Belt area of the administrative boundary of Cambridge City Council.</p>
<b>10*</b>		<p><b>NOISE AND VIBRATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Residential receptor sensitivity.</li> <li>b. Likely operational impacts of emergency generators.</li> <li>c. Noise and vibration impacts during decommissioning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This would be a matter for SCDG.</li> <li>b. CCC does not consider that there would be significant operational impacts arising from emergency generators.</li> </ul>

		<p>d. Disapplication of s61 of the Control and Pollution Act 1974.</p> <p>e. Mitigation and monitoring (including handling of complaints, building condition surveys and controls within the CoCP Parts A and B).</p>	<p>c. The Noise and Vibration Chapter of the ES [AS-036] runs through a detailed “decommissioning” noise assessment in accordance with current UK standards. Preliminary assessment indicates low – negligible impacts at receptor locations within the Cambridge City with basic mitigation measures in place. This is aided by the existing high ambient background noise levels and the commercial / industrial nature of the locality. The City Council agree with the results and conclusions presented.</p> <p>d. With regards to S61 disapplication, CCC consider that the CEMP will provide adequacy and will be the primary regulatory framework. CCC have no concern with the disapplication.</p> <p>e. Additional noise protection measures (solid screen hoarding, working hours, commitment to BPM, location of site compounds) are provided within the Noise and Vibration Chapter of the ES [AS-036]. These measures are then represented within the Code of Construction Practice Parts A and B [REP3-026 and REP3-028] which also includes the requirement for the provision of a detailed CEMP which will be supported by a series of topic-related management plans. With the mitigation as proposed, CCC agrees that impacts will be low – negligible but the City Council needs the commitments already made to be reproduced /</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>expanded on where necessary within the required CEMP.</p>
<p><b>11</b></p>		<p><b>LAND QUALITY</b></p> <p>a. Groundwater contamination investigation and monitoring.</p> <p>b. Decommissioning and contamination.</p>	<p>a. Risks to controlled waters from soil or groundwater contamination falls within the remit of the Environment Agency, who would also be able to advise on any required groundwater monitoring.</p> <p>b. In respect of decommissioning, the primary focus for Environmental Health is with regard to human health impacts. Following decommissioning there will be no residual human health risk because the site will be vacant and awaiting redevelopment. CCC's involvement will increase when future development proposals come forward through the appropriate planning channels. As such, when considering human health risks, the responsibility to ensure that the land is suitable for its intended future use(s) rests with those who purchase / subsequently wish to redevelop the land.</p> <p>For these reasons, CCC's Environmental Health advisers do not require that contaminated land investigations and / or remedial activities are carried out as part of the decommissioning process.</p>

			CCC considers that the submissions / proposals made by the Applicant in terms of land quality are satisfactory.
12*	-	<p><b>ODOUR</b></p> <p>a. Impacts during decommissioning. b. Control of odour through the dDCO and environmental permitting.</p>	<p>a. CCC's primary concern in respect of operational impacts was with the proposed vent stack to be located on-site following decommissioning. The Applicant has now provided further clarification on the vent stack and what it will entail, and as such the CCC's concerns have been addressed.</p> <p>CCC's understanding is that odour release from the vent stack is not expected unless there is a problem within the system that needs maintenance / management. These vent stacks are common features throughout Cambridge City.</p> <p>Decommissioning - The Outline Decommissioning Plan [AS-051] provides an overview of where the potential odour releases will be located during decommissioning and over what duration they are anticipated. Mitigation measures are set out within the Outline Decommissioning Plan.</p> <p>b. The recommended odour control mechanisms for decommissioning are provided in Parts A and B of the CoCP which, when read alongside the ODP,</p>

			<p>CCC are confident odorous releases to air will be insignificant at the nearest receptor locations.</p> <p>With implementation of the mitigation as proposed, CCC agree with the Applicant that odour impacts will be low – negligible however CCC consider that the commitments already made should be reproduced and built upon where necessary and appropriate within the CEMP.</p>
	<p><b>102</b></p>	<p><b>OTHER MATTERS (Action Point)</b></p> <p>Cambridge City Council (CCC) - Provide a response to IP comments around potential for any future redevelopment of the existing WWTP site and AQMA implications.</p>	<p><i>This section applies to both SCDC and CCC insofar as it relates to Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)</i></p> <p>At the Environmental Matters hearing, Save Honey Hill Group commented that due to the proximity of the CWWTP site to the A14 and the Air Quality Management Area, the proposed redevelopment of the site in the Proposed Submission NECAAP and emerging GCLP to include residential development close to the A14 would not be acceptable. This is included as number 102 in the ExA's Action Points arising from the hearing. This has been directed to Cambridge City Council but is also relevant to South Cambridgeshire District Council. The Councils' response to that point is as follows.</p>

			<p>The A14 AQMA<sup>1</sup>, which lay within SCDC's administrative area, was revoked in January 2022 because air quality monitoring showed that the area no longer exceeded the threshold for designation. This had been anticipated following the completion of the major A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon improvement scheme, which was fully completed in June 2022.</p> <p>CCC and SCDC continue to monitor the air quality adjacent to the A14 using a Defra approved continuous monitor. This monitor can be considered to be representative of the conditions immediately to the south of the A14 along this stretch of the road. The latest set of ratified annual results available from this monitor indicate levels of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter are well below nationally set Air Quality Objectives. Annual results from all SCDC monitoring can be viewed in an Annual Status Report available on the link provided above, which also includes a link to live data from the continuous monitor.</p> <p>The NECAAP evidence was prepared before the AQMA was revoked given the Proposed Submission NECAAP was agreed by the Councils in January 2022. The evidence includes an Environmental Health Topic Paper (November</p>
--	--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.scambs.gov.uk/environmental-health/pollution/air-pollution/local-air-quality-management>



			<p>2021)<sup>2</sup> , which is informed by an Air Quality Modelling Study prepared in 2019. As demonstrated in the Topic Paper in Figures 1 to 8, in the vicinity of the CWWTP, based on data at that time, there was a limited strip of land immediately south of the A14 and along the northern boundary of the CWWTP where air quality exceeded acceptable levels for sensitive receptors such as residential.</p> <p>With the revocation of the AQMA, it is anticipated that situation will have improved. Notwithstanding, for this and other environmental considerations, the Proposed Submission NECAAP (see CCC LIR Appendix 1 reference GCSP-7, Figure 10: Spatial Framework) proposes that the existing substantial landscape buffer between the CWWTP site and the A14 would remain, with residential development being designed and sufficiently distanced from the A14 to ensure no unacceptable adverse impacts, including in respect of air quality. The NECAAP also includes policies to ensure that the design and location of sensitive receptors such as residential development ensure an appropriate living environment. This issue has been capable of being satisfactorily addressed in other locations along the southern boundary of the A14 for example at Orchard Park which lies between</p>
--	--	--	--

<sup>2</sup> <https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/sites/gcp/files/2021-12/NECAAPTEnvironmentalHealth2020v32021.pdf>

			<p>Cambridge Regional College and Histon Road and there is no reason to consider that cannot be the case here.</p>
--	--	--	--