



Application by Anglian Water Services Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation project

The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)

Issued on 31 January 2024

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) second written questions and requests for information – ExQ2. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ3.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annex C to the Rule 6 letter of 19 September 2023. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with a number ((indicating that it is from an ExQs round of that number) then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on General and Cross Topic issues is identified as Q2.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

Responses should be sent to the [mailbox](#) for the Examination. If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in an email or a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the Case Team.

Responses are due by Deadline 5: Monday 19 February 2024.



Abbreviations which may be used:

A	Article	LDS	Lighting Design Strategy
AAP	Area Action Plan	LERMP	Landscape, Ecological and Recreational Management Plan
AIA	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	LIR	Local Impact Report
AIL	Abnormal Indivisible Load	LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification	LOAEL	Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area	LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
AWS	Anglian Water Services	M	Metres
BMV	Best and Most Versatile	m³	Metres cubed
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain	MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
BOD	Biological Oxygen Demand	MoD	Ministry of Defence
BoR	Book of Reference	MWIA	Mental Wellbeing Impact Assessment
CA	Compulsory Acquisition	MWLP	Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021
CC	County Council	NB	Northbound
CCA	Cambridge City Airport	NCSC	National Cyber Security Centre
CCC	Cambridge City Council	NE	Natural England
CCoC	Cambridgeshire County Council	NEC	North-East Cambridge
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television	NEP	National Environment Programme
CEAS	Cambridge Eastern Access Scheme	NH	National Highways
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan	NO₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
CHP	Combined Heat and Power	NO_x	Nitrogen Oxides
CNI	Critical National Infrastructure	NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
CoCP	Code of Construction Practice	NPPW	National Planning Policy for Waste



COMAH	Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 1999	NPSWW	National Policy Statement for Waste Water
CPNI	Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
CSO	Combined Sewer Overflow	NT	National Trust
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan	NTS	Non-technical Summary (of the ES)
CWS	County Wildlife Site	OHID	Office for Health Improvement and Disparities
CWTP	Construction Workers Travel Plan	OLTP	Operational Logistics Traffic Plan
CWWTP	Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant	OMMP	Outfall Management and Monitoring Plan
CWWTPR	Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation	OMP	Odour Management Plan
DAS	Design and Access Statement	oSMP	outline Soil Management Plan
dB	Decibel	OWTP	Operational Workers Travel Plan
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government	PA2008	Planning Act 2008
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order	PCU	Passenger Car Unit
DCO	Development Consent Order	PDF	Portable Document Format
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	PE	Population Equivalent
DLUHC	Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities	PICP	Pollution Incident Control Plan
DM0	Delivery Milestone Zero	PM_(x)	Particulate Matter (size in microns)
DMP	Decommissioning Management Plan	PRoW	Public Rights of Way
DoS	Degree of Saturation	R	Requirement
DSEAR	Dangerous Substances and Explosive Atmosphere Regulations 2002	RES	Recycling Environmental Services
ECoW	Ecological Clerk of Works	RR	Relevant Representation
EA	Environment Agency	RSA	Road Safety Audit



EEAST	East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	RWCS	Reasonable Worst Case Scenario
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	SAC	Special Area of Conservation
EM	Explanatory Memorandum	SB	Southbound
EMS	Environmental Management System	SCDC	South Cambridge District Council
EqIA	Equalities Impact Assessment	Sch	Schedule
ES	Environmental Statement	SMP	Soil Management Plan
EV	Electric Vehicle	SOAEL	Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level
EWCA	His Majesty's Court of Appeal in England	SoCG	Statement(s) of Common Ground
ExA	Examining Authority	SoS	Secretary of State
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment	SoR	Statement of Reasons
FS	Funding Statement	SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
GCLP	Greater Cambridge Local Plan	STC	Sludge Treatment Centre
GCSPS	Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service	SWMP	Site Waste Management Plan
GPS	Global Positioning System	tCO₂e	Tonnes of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
HART	Hazardous Area Response Teams	TA	Transport Assessment
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling	TCPA	Town and Country Planning Act 1990
HDV	Heavy Duty Vehicle	TP	Temporary Possession
HEMS	Helicopter Emergency Medical Services	TRICS	Trip Rate Information Computer System
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle	UKHSA	UK Health Security Agency
HIF	Housing Infrastructure Fund	VP	Viewpoint
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment	WAML	West Anglia Mainline
HSE	Health and Safety Executive	WTBCN	Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire
IED	Industrial Emissions Directive	WHMP	Wildlife Hazard Management Plan



IEMA	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment	WINEP	Water Industry National Environment Programme
IP	Interested Party	WMPE	Waste Management Plan for England
J	Junction	WWTP	Waste Water Treatment Plant
km	Kilometres	ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Visibility



The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (e.g. [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the [Examination Library](#). It will be updated as the Examination progresses.

Index

1.	General and cross-topic questions.....	7
2.	Principle (including policy and legislative context, need and alternatives).....	8
3.	Agricultural land and soils	9
4.	Air quality	10
5.	Biodiversity	10
6.	Carbon emissions and climate change mitigation and adaptation.....	15
7.	Community	18
8.	Compulsory Acquisition (CA) and Temporary Possession (TP)	22
9.	Design	25
10.	Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO).....	25
11.	Green Belt	28
12.	Health.....	29
13.	Historic environment.....	30
14.	Landscape and visual.....	32
15.	Land quality	34
16.	Major accidents and disasters	35
17.	Material resources and waste	36
18.	Noise and vibration.....	37
19.	Odour	38
20.	Traffic and transport	40
21.	Water resources.....	44

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
1. General and cross-topic questions		
1.1	Applicant, Cambridgeshire County Council (CCoC)	Legal agreement The draft section 106 (Parking) was updated at D3 [REP3-044] to include a Schedule 2 relating to equestrian signage. Please clarify the necessity for this and why this schedule is not referred to in the main body of the legal agreement.
1.2	Applicant, IPs	Policy The National Planning Policy Framework was revised on 19 December 2023. Do you consider this to have any implications for the application?
1.3	Applicant, Environment Agency (EA)	Legislation Noting paragraph (para) 1.10.1 of the Planning Statement [REP1-049], does the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 have any implications for the Proposed Development, including with reference to Part 7 Nutrient pollution standards?
1.4	Applicant	Ministerial statements Please provide copies of any Written Ministerial Statements which you consider to be of particular relevance to the application, or signpost to where these have been provided.
1.5	Applicant	Documents Please provide copies of the 'Greater Cambridge Biodiversity SPD 2022' and the 'Doubling Nature Strategy 2021' referred to at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1).
1.6	Applicant	Action Points The final Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) Action Point [EV-008v] set out below does not appear to have been addressed in your document [REP4-087]. Please address. <i>Clarification around the Applicant's post hearing submission [REP1-082] Appendix C – Working Timetable, including whether it accurately identifies that the remediation of the existing WWTP would occur before commissioning of the proposed WWTP and implications for this if not.</i>
1.7	Cambridge City Council (CCC)	Local Impact Report (LIR) Please clarify whether the number '325' presented in para 6.99 of your LIR [REP2-043] should instead reflect the number '1,425' presented in para 6.35?

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
1.8	Applicant	<p>ES Chapter 2: Project Description</p> <p>In 'Annex A – Consistency Review Overview' to your Deadline (D) 4 covering letter [REP4-001] and in other locations such as Table 2-23: Building sizing of [REP4-022] you state that maximum floor area of the Gateway Building would be 58.2m x 17.1m. However, the ExA understands that the Gateway Building would have two floors.</p> <p>a) Is the 58.2m x 17.1m measurement the building's footprint? b) What is the total floor area (all floors) of the building in square metres? c) What is the total amount of office floorspace in the building in square metres?</p>
1.9	Applicant	<p>Updated documents</p> <p>It is important for clarity, and to avoid any confusion, that when submitting updated documents, the track changed versions accurately reflect all changes made. The ExA notes that, for example, the D4 track changed version of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [REP4-025] does not appear to show all the changes made since the previous version [REP2-007] (e.g. Table 2-10 relating to 'No net loss of habitat through creation – landscape masterplan, bullet point 5 relating to hedgerows and para 3.1.23 relating to hedgerows). Please address this and ensure that any future amended documents are checked thoroughly before submission.</p> <p>Additionally, para 3.1.23 of [REP4-025] (and [REP2-024]), which indicates no important hedgerows would be affected appears to be at odds with the Hedgerow Regulations and Tree Preservation Plans [REP4-021] and Schedule 16, Part 2 of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP4-003] relating to 'hedgerow shown with an [sic] pink line between point H19 and H20'. Please clarify.</p>
<p>2. Principle (including policy and legislative context, need and alternatives)</p>		
2.1	Applicant, CCoC	<p>Policy</p> <p>CCoC's LIR [REP1-133], including para 3.10, identifies Policy 11 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2021 (MWLP) as a key policy consideration. However, the Applicant does not appear to address this policy in any particular detail in its Planning Statement and CCoC does not appear to conclude on compliance with any MWLP policies, including Policy 11, in its LIR.</p> <p>To the Applicant:</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) Please address this policy in detail, including the extent to which it lends support to the Proposed Development, including in respect of the general principle of development.</p> <p>To CCoC:</p> <p>b) Please clarify whether in your view, the Proposed Development would be compliant with <u>all</u> aspects of this policy.</p>
3. Agricultural land and soils		
3.1	Natural England (NE)	<p>Soil management</p> <p>Further to your concerns regarding the outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP), including around the management of peat soils, are you satisfied that the revised version [REP1-033] has addressed your concerns? If not, please explain the reasons why.</p>
3.2	Applicant	<p>Soil management</p> <p>Does the oSMP [REP1-033] make provision for pre-construction soil testing of all agricultural land within the Order limits, noting CCoC's LIR comments [REP1-133] in this respect? If not, how would appropriate methods of soil handling, storage and reinstatement be ensured?</p>
3.3	Applicant	<p>Agricultural impact</p> <p>a) The extent of farm holding 'G040' (Poplar Hall Farm – 26.63ha) on Figure 6.11 of [AS-049] is not clear. Please address this.</p> <p>b) Please also clarify para 3.2.21 of [REP1-031] which states that there would be <i>permanent acquisition of land approximately 24ha</i> (i.e. most of G040) and para 4.2.11 of ES Chapter 6 [AS-024] which states there would be a high impact from <i>permanent acquisition of land</i> and whether this accurately reflects the extent of such compulsory acquisition powers as shown on the Land Plans [REP1-016] for the extent of G040 (and relevant plots in the dDCO [REP4-003] and Statement of Reasons [REP1-009]).</p>
3.4	Applicant	<p>Agricultural impact</p> <p>Please clarify whether the table at Appendix B of [REP1-031] differentiates between compulsory acquisition of freehold, compulsory acquisition of rights and temporary possession and if not, whether this has any implications for assessments? Please also clarify, noting ExQ2.3.3 above, whether the figures in columns 3, 4 and 5 relating to 'G040 Poplar Hall Farm' are correct.</p>
3.5	Applicant	<p>Agricultural impact</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Please signpost to where you addressed [RR-239] with specific reference to the concerns raised within it around the farming business. Please also provide an update in the Compulsory Acquisition Schedule [REP4-015] relating to negotiations with this party (identified as CA-056).
4. Air quality		
No further questions at this stage.		
5. Biodiversity		
5.1	NE, CCoC	Monitoring and mitigation Are you satisfied that the application documents, (including the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [AS-057], Commitments Register [REP1-057], Lighting Design Strategy [REP4-048] and Outline Water Quality Monitoring Plan [REP2-028]) would secure adequate ecological mitigation measures? If not, please explain the reasons for this and any changes you would wish to see.
5.2	Applicant	Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the Wildlife Trust The SoCG with the Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire [REP4-084] has been signed by the National Trust, but not the Applicant. Please ensure that both parties sign the SoCG if it is in final form and submit it at D5.
5.3	Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire	Ecological impacts on Stow-cum-Quy Fen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Within the signed updated SoCG between you and the Applicant [REP4-084], you consider that <i>There is potential for adverse ecological impacts on sites such as Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI</i> . Please set out clearly what adverse ecological impacts you consider could occur with justification.
5.4	National Trust	Recreational impacts on Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI You raised concerns within your relevant representation (RR) [RR-031] regarding increased recreational pressure on Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI from increase disturbance, damage and contamination. However, you also suggest [RR-031] that there are opportunities which have been missed in the wider area to provide better access for multiple users. Might enhancements to increase access within and around Wicken Fen exacerbate suggested recreational pressure on Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI?
5.5	NE	Recreational impacts on Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Please confirm your position regarding the potential for increased recreational pressure on Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI and reasons for this, noting that the Initial Principal Areas of Disagreement Document [REP4-076] indicates your satisfaction with the matter on page 12.
5.6	CCoC	<p>Recreational impacts on Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI</p> <p>Comments contained within your summary of oral representations from ISH3 [AS-179] regarding potential recreational pressure on the SSSI are noted. Do you consider that any increase in visitor pressure on the SSSI would be harmful, or do you consider that it could be that some increased visitor pressure would be acceptable, noting the lack of data to currently quantify the existing level of recreational pressure?</p>
5.7	CCoC	<p>Recreational impacts on Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI</p> <p>The updated Principal Areas of Disagreement [REP4-076] submitted by the Applicant suggests that NE is content that visitor pressure on the SSSI can be monitored and managed through the use of an Advisory Group. If NE confirms this position, would you also be content to manage visitor pressure in this way?</p>
5.8	Applicant	<p>Wicken Fen Vision Area</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 (SCLP) Policy NH/6 relates to Green Infrastructure protection and enhancement. Wicken Fen Vision Area is identified within the SCLP as a targeted area within the Green Infrastructure Strategy Network. Notwithstanding information provided in [REP1-054], please set out further how the Proposed Development would comply with all elements of this policy.</p>
5.9	Applicant	<p>Landscape Ecological and Recreational Management Plan (LERMP)</p> <p>a) Please confirm whether the Advisory Group referred to in para 4.1.2 of the LERMP [REP4-056] would also review any recreational pressure impacts on Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI as a result of the Proposed Development;</p> <p>b) The ExA understands from ISH3 that the Advisory Group would not be secured through the dDCO, rather you intend to make this is a corporate commitment. However, paragraph 4.1.2 of the LERMP states that it would be enforceable through the dDCO. Please clarify this point;</p> <p>c) Given NE's reported agreement that an Advisory Group would sufficiently mitigate the impacts from recreational pressure on Stow-cum-Quy Fen SSSI [REP4-076] and CCoC's request for funding to deliver this [AS-179], Please confirm whether you intend to make any provisions for resourcing of</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>the Advisory Group, such as through a Planning Performance Agreement, and if so, how this would be secured; and</p> <p>d) It is understood that a meeting with the Advisory Group was to take place in January 2024 – please provide an update on the outcomes of this meeting with regards to the Proposed Development.</p>
5.10	Applicant, NE, South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC)	<p>LERMP and wider connectivity</p> <p>Please provide an update on any progression regarding the wording and scope of the LERMP [REP4-056] in respect of wider connectivity concerns and on-going management measures for protected species.</p>
5.11	Applicant	<p>LERMP</p> <p>Please provide a response to CCoC comments regarding the LERMP [REP4-056] contained within its summary of oral submissions from ISH3 [AS-179] (page 7). Please liaise with CCoC to ensure that there is full understanding between both parties as to how species and habitat mitigation would be handled.</p>
5.12	NE	<p>Outline water quality monitoring plan</p> <p>Has the updated outline water quality monitoring plan [REP2-028] addressed your concerns regarding the impacts on designated sites through increased flood levels and mitigating impacts on Wilbraham Fen SSSI?</p>
5.13	Applicant	<p>NPSWW para 3.1.6 and 3.1.7</p> <p>Your comments submitted at D4 [REP4-087] in response to Action Point 61 are noted, including that the wording of R25 of the dDCO would secure a report rather than a financial obligation. However, it appears to the ExA that R25 could potentially secure a financial obligation and evidence of such a financial obligation would need to be submitted to the relevant planning authority in order to discharge the requirement. Therefore, please set out how R25 would comply with paras 3.1.6 and 3.1.7 of NPSWW and the relevant paragraphs of the Planning Practice Guidance in this regard. How would the Proposed Development demonstrate the exceptional circumstances necessary for the use of a negatively worded requirement which could secure a financial obligation?</p>
5.14	Applicant	<p>Examples of providers of river units for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</p> <p>Please provide examples of providers of river units for BNG – the ExA notes your response to the action point 62 [REP4-087], but requests that examples are provided for review by the ExA.</p>
5.15	CCoC, SCDC	Securing BNG

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Do you consider that the dDCO and supporting documents adequately secure 20% BNG for all unit types?
5.16	EA, NE, CCoC, SCDC,	<p>Reedbed</p> <p>Please confirm whether you still consider the introduction of a reedbed system at the proposed outfall necessary (noting that it is the Applicant's stance that it would not be feasible owing to permanent changes to the existing public right of way and existing ditch, and that the sizing of a reedbed to offer meaningful energy dissipation and water treatment function for the size of the catchment area would be in the order of 90 hectares [REP1-078]).</p>
5.17	CCoC	<p>Impacts on Low Fen Drove Way Grasslands and Hedges County Wildlife Site (CWS) and River Cam CWS</p> <p>Please confirm if the amendments made to the Lighting Design Strategy [REP4-048] and to ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [REP4-024] satisfy your concerns regarding the impacts from lighting on Low Fen Drove Way Grasslands and Hedges CWS and River Cam CWS? If not, please set out clearly why and how this could be resolved.</p>
5.18	CCoC	<p>Impacts on Low Fen Drove Way Grasslands and Hedges CWS</p> <p>The Applicant responded to your concerns regarding the presence of calcareous grassland within the CWS under [REP3-054] at paras 2.1.1 – 2.1.7. Please confirm whether this has addressed your concerns on this matter? If not, please set out clearly why and how this could be resolved.</p>
5.19	CCoC	<p>River Cam CWS</p> <p>Please confirm if the amendment made to R7 of the dDCO, which now expressly refers to hard and soft landscaping and ecological habitat creation, satisfies your concerns regarding securing the detailed design within Works Nos. 32 and 39 (please also see the Applicant's response to ISH3 action point 64 for further information [REP4-087])? If not, please set out clearly why and how this could be resolved.</p>
5.20	CCoC	<p>River Cam CWS</p> <p>Has the updated outline outfall management and monitoring plan [REP4-060] addressed your concerns regarding mitigation and compensation for impacts to the River Cam? If not, please set out clearly why and how this could be resolved.</p>
5.21	SCDC	<p>Mitigation</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		You requested [RR-004] further clarification regarding Table 2-8 of ES Chapter 8 which details the maximum design envelope for biodiversity assessment – do you consider that this has been addressed by the Applicant's subsequent submissions, including in updated versions of ES Chapter 8 (including [REP4-024])? If not, please clearly set out your concerns and how they could be resolved.
5.22	SCDC	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>At D4 [REP4-094] you state that <i>Details regarding potential riverbed scour during flood events have not been submitted as yet and is a concern as excessive scour can impact both aquatic and riverbank habitats.</i> Additional Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) modelling of the outfall and impacts on riverbed scour are now proposed to be secured through the Design Code [REP4-085]. Do you consider this satisfactory? If not, please set out clearly why and how this could be resolved.</p>
5.23	CCoC	<p>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Parts A and B</p> <p>Do the updates to the CoCP Parts A and B [REP4-040 and REP4-042] resolve the concerns identified on pages 8 to 10 of your written summary of oral submissions from ISH3 [AS-179] regarding these documents?</p>
5.24	Applicant, CCoC, SCDC	<p>Invasive non-native species</p> <p>Please provide an update on how all parties are addressing matters regarding invasive non-native species.</p>
5.25	Applicant	<p>Impacts on veteran trees</p> <p>The CoCP Part A [REP4-040] was updated at D4 to refer to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) Waterbeach Pipeline [REP1-036] as requested at ISH3. However, para 7.2.66 refers to drawings <i>TPP_WATERBEACH_1_2 to PP_WATERBEACH_15_2</i> of the AIA – the drawings contained within the AIA [REP1-036] are marked as revision B (or 'Rev B') – the CoCP Part A should be updated to refer to the revision number for these drawings to ensure accuracy.</p>
5.26	Applicant	<p>Important hedgerows</p> <p>During ISH3 the ExA asked for all plans and documents to be updated to ensure that they reflected your commitment that Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) would be used to avoid impacts on important hedgerows in relevant locations. Whilst some of the supporting documents have been updated at D4, the design plans [AS-156] have not been. The ExA requests that the design plans are updated to show where HDD would take place to ensure consistency across all supporting documents.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
5.27	CCoC	<p>Important hedgerows</p> <p>Do you have any outstanding concerns regarding the impact of the Proposed Development on important hedgerows?</p>
5.28	Applicant, CCoC, SCDC	<p>Bats</p> <p>Please review and provide a comprehensive response to comments from Chris Smith [REP4-098].</p>
5.29	NE	<p>Bats</p> <p>Do you consider that the information supplied is sufficient to determine the effect of the Proposed Development on populations of barbastelle bat for the purposes of the Environmental Impact Assessment? If not, what additional information do you consider is required? Please refer to comments from Chris Smith [RR-083, REP2-071 and REP4-098] in answering these questions.</p>
6. Carbon emissions and climate change mitigation and adaptation		
6.1	Applicant	<p>Updates to ES Chapter 10: Carbon [REP4-026] at D4</p> <p>Please respond to the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why was Table 2.2 amended to remove Anglian Water carbon models from the list of desktop information sources used to inform the assessment? Why have the figures in Table 3.2 been amended substantially? There are referencing errors at paras 4.6.20 to 4.6.25 – please correct these. Para 4.6.26 states that the Alternative Option of DCO construction model, using biogas in Combined Heat and Power (CHP) during operation (Figure 4.10) shows the scale of emissions are <i>greater</i> than those tested against the 6th Carbon Budget sector decarbonisation trajectories. However, Figure 4.10 does not appear to show this – please review the information and update accordingly. At ISH3 you were asked to provide the net carbon emissions per mega litre for the existing Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP). Table 4.6 has been updated, but still does not provide the requested information. Please update the table accordingly.
6.2	Applicant	<p>ES Chapter 10: Carbon</p> <p>No assessment of the carbon impacts of the Proposed Development using the CHP option appear to have been presented for construction, e.g. in Table 4.1 of [REP4-026]. In order to understand all potential carbon emissions and effects during the construction period, the CHP option should be</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		presented and assessed throughout ES Chapter 10, or justification provided to explain why the CHP option during construction has not been presented.
6.3	Applicant	<p>Design Code</p> <p>a) Does Design Code [REP4-085] 'CAR.10' need updating given that it suggests that carbon reduction targets would be reported to 'PINS' (as well as 'Key Stakeholders/The Council') which would be unlikely to be the case. In addition, the wording of this Design Code appears to be in draft or unfinished. Please review and update as necessary.</p> <p>b) The aim of Design Code 'CAR.01' is difficult to understand. Please reword this to be clearer.</p>
6.4	CCoC, SCDC, CCC	<p>D4 updates</p> <p>Do you consider that the updates to ES Chapter 10 [REP4-026], the outline Carbon Management Plan (oCMP) [REP4-064] and provision of the Design Code [REP4-085] adequately assess the impacts from carbon emissions and sufficiently capture the proposed mitigation measures, including monitoring and reporting? Please set out clearly any outstanding concerns or comments regarding the aforementioned documents, with justification for this and suggested solutions.</p>
6.5	SCDC	<p>D4 updates</p> <p>Do you consider that the updates to ES Chapter 10 [REP4-026], the oCMP [REP4-064] and provision of the Design Code [REP4-085] sufficiently address your comments [REP4-094] regarding the ability to allow for design refinement and carbon data updates?</p>
6.6	CCoC, SCDC	<p>BREEAM</p> <p>Do you consider that BREEAM excellent rating for the Gateway Building and Workshop is satisfactorily secured through the Design Code [REP4-085] and dDCO [REP4-003]? If not, please set out justification for this stance and what changes could be made in order to resolve this matter.</p>
6.7	Applicant, SCDC	<p>South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Policy CC/3</p> <p>Your summary of ISH3 oral submissions [REP4-094] states that <i>The commitment to achieve Net Zero operational emissions, along with the installation of a 5.6MWp solar PV array on site (providing 19% of the sites power demand), should ensure compliance with SCDC Local Plan policy CC/3.</i> However, the dDCO does not secure a minimum MWp for solar panels (as per Schedule 14, Part 22). Given that there would be no guaranteed solar panel provision if the Proposed Development were consented, does this change your stance regarding compliance with SCLP Policy CC/3?</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
6.8	Applicant	<p>Avoided carbon emissions</p> <p>What reassurances can you offer the ExA in terms of the reliability and efficacy of counting avoided emissions in order to inform the detailed CMP which would be secured through R21 of the dDCO [REP4-003]?</p>
6.9	Cadent Gas Limited	<p>Gas to grid capability</p> <p>Your response [REP1-125] to ExQ1.6.30 regarding the capability of the gas network to accept biogas generated by the Proposed Development states that you were considering the matter further and that a response would be provided at the next deadline (D2), which has not been received. Please provide a response to ExQ1.6.30 [PD-008] as requested.</p>
6.10	Applicant	<p>Whole Life Carbon Assessment</p> <p>ES Chapter 10 [REP4-026] reports a residual significant adverse effect during construction / decommissioning activities as per Table 5-1 (with 53,010 tCO_{2e} produced). With the use of the proposed CMP, ES Chapter 10 Table 5-1 reports a non-significant effect for the CHP option during operation. Please clarify how, with the use of the CMP, ES Chapter 10 Table 5-1 arrives at a non-significant effect for whole life carbon of the CHP option, when the CMP would not mitigate the significant effects reported for construction / decommissioning activities and as such, the emissions created during this period would not appear to be negated (notwithstanding that the carbon emissions for the construction of the CHP option are not currently presented with the ES)?</p>
6.11	Applicant	<p>Strategic Carbon Assessment [REP3-042]</p> <p>At ISH3 you confirmed that the indicative demolition carbon emissions presented for the existing WWTP in the Strategic Carbon Assessment [REP3-042] do not include the Waterbeach Water Recycling Centre (WRC). However, at D1 you committed to providing this information (see response to ExQ1.6.38 [REP1-079]). Please can the indicative demolition carbon emissions be updated to include the WRC or further justification provided for this change in stance.</p>
6.12	Applicant	<p>Benefits</p> <p>It is stated within the Planning Statement [REP1-049] (para 1.6.1) that an additional benefit of the Proposed Development is “significantly reduced carbon emissions compared to existing WWTP”. However, Table 4.5 within ES Chapter 10 [REP4-026] confirms that the net carbon emissions for the operation of the proposed CHP option (1,110 tCO_{2e}/year) would be significantly higher than the</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		operating emissions of the existing WWTP (640 tCO _{2e} /year). Please justify the stance taken in the Planning Statement.
6.13	Applicant	<p>CMP</p> <p>a) Would carbon emissions from sludge deliveries be monitored through the detailed CMP secured by R21 of the dDCO [REP4-003]? If not, please explain the reasons for this; or</p> <p>b) If so, would it be the case that if sludge deliveries were increased to the site, then carbon mitigation would need to be sought through the detailed CMP to ensure overall operational carbon neutrality, and should this be the case, how would this be achieved?</p>
7. Community		
7.1	Applicant	<p>Public Rights of Way (PRoW) – diversion (85/6 and 85/8)</p> <p>Please provide a response to part c) of ExQ1.7.16 [PD-008].</p>
7.2	Applicant	<p>PRoW – diversion of 85/6</p> <p>Fen Ditton Parish Council in its written representation (WR) [REP1-143] and CCoC in its response to ExQ1.7.23 [REP1-134] raise concerns around the length of the proposed diversion of footpath 85/6. Could any changes be made to reduce the length of the proposed diversion in response to these comments?</p>
7.3	Applicant	<p>PRoW – clarification regarding access (85/14 and 130/17)</p> <p>Please indicate your intention in respect of the capitalised text in your response to part b) of ExQ1.7.18 [REP1-079].</p>
7.4	Applicant, CCoC	<p>PRoW– management plans</p> <p>In its response to ExQ1.7.23 [REP1-134] CCoC raises a number of points in relation to PRoW.</p> <p>To the Applicant:</p> <p>Please respond to the following points. Where you agree with suggestions please update your application documents accordingly. Where you do not agree, please explain why.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of safety gates might be off-putting (7.6.14 of the CoCP Part A). • A Requirement to provide that the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and CoCP should be approved by the local highway authority (LHA) prior to commencement of any works. • The CTMP or CoCP Part A should provide for condition surveys of affected PRoW, restoration of the full legal width and inspection of works.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Requirement relating to agreement with LHA of a programme of PRow closures and diversions. • The Applicant has stated that access to the new bridleway would be regulated through use of gates and signage – this is not acceptable for a PRow, where access should be unrestricted. The width, surface and boundary treatment of a newly created public bridleway would also need to be agreed with the LHA. • The LERMP does not include any measures detailing the management of PRow during the operational phase of the proposed development. <p>To CCoC:</p> <p>You stated that <i>the proposed bridleway forms an essential part of the mitigation for the development and therefore should be enshrined as a public right of way</i>. Please explain why you consider this to be <i>essential</i> mitigation and clarify which impacts the proposed bridleway would be mitigating?</p>
7.5	Applicant	<p>Site of proposed WWTP – proposed routes</p> <p>In your response to ExQ1.7.25 [REP1-079] it is noted that <i>The Applicant intends to formalise how users are currently using the land required for the construction of the permanent access, proposed WWTP and area required for the landscape masterplan. In developing the landscape masterplan the Applicant has sought to understand how people use this location</i>. However, in response to ExQ1.7.12 it is stated that <i>The Applicant understands there to be no permitted recreational use or permissive or public rights of ways through the proposed WWTP site at present... It is the Applicant's understanding that the land is privately owned, and the public access is unauthorised. The Applicant notes that the current tenant farmer has taken steps to prevent unauthorised access to the land</i>. This appears to be contradictory – please clarify.</p>
7.6	CCoC	<p>PRow – restoration</p> <p>In response to ExQ1.7.28 [REP1-079] the Applicant states that <i>Whilst there is no requirement in the draft DCO (App Doc Ref 2.1) [AS-139] specific to restoring PRowS to a standard acceptable to the highway authority/their previous condition, these measures are outlined in paragraph 7.6.18 of CoCP Part A (App Doc Ref 5.4.2.1) [APP-068]. Requirement 8(1) of the draft DCO (App Doc Ref 2.1) [AS-139], requires that each phase must be undertaken in accordance with the code of construction practice in so far as it relates to the works proposed in the relevant phase and therefore the commitment is secured through that requirement</i>.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Are you satisfied with this arrangement? If not please explain the reasons for this.
7.7	Applicant	<p>Changes to amenity</p> <p>There is not a direct response to the question in ExQ1.7.32 [PD-008] which asks: <i>Whilst significant effects have not been identified, have other magnitudes of impact been identified? If so, please indicate the location and magnitude of the impact(s)</i>. Similarly, the response to ExQ1.7.33 [PD-008] summarises only significant effects.</p> <p>Whilst the ExA understands that the ES <i>methodology focuses on the threshold of significant effects</i> it is interested in the Applicant's opinion as to whether there are any non-significant amenity effects (whether on their own or in combination) that may need to be mitigated. Please set out your opinion on this matter, including by reference to the properties listed in ExQ1.7.33 [PD-008].</p>
7.8	Applicant, CCC, SCDC	<p>Local employment and training opportunities</p> <p>To the Applicant:</p> <p>Whilst the ExA notes the Applicant's Comments on LIR (e.g .reference 12 on page 26) [REP2-036], a response to the following question in ExQ1.7.36 [PD-008] has not been provided: <i>Would the Applicant be willing to enter into any formal commitment at this stage as to the inclusion of under-represented groups or people in need of training / apprenticeships / experience in the construction workforce? If so, please set out the nature of any such commitment.</i></p> <p>In respect of any formal commitment, please respond to the suggestions at 12.16 and 12.17 of CCC's LIR [REP2-043] and at 17.15 and 17.16 of SCDC's LIR [REP4-092] in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local advertising of jobs; and • opportunities for apprenticeship roles. <p>To CCC and SCDC:</p> <p>SCDC's comment at point 17 of [REP3-060] (CCC has made the same comment) questions links with Wisbech College rather than other more local / sustainable institutions, such as the Cambridge Regional College. The Applicant has provided an explanation for this at [REP4-086]. Are you happy with these arrangements in light of this explanation?</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
7.9	CCoC	<p>Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)</p> <p>Does the Applicant's response to ExQ1.12.6 [REP1-079] address the concern that you expressed in relation to ExQ1.7.39 [REP1-134]? If not, how could your concern be addressed?</p>
7.10	Applicant, CCoC	<p>Compliance with policy</p> <p>At para 6.3.5 of its WR [REP1-171] Save Honey Hill Group (SHHG) states that <i>The proposed development fails to accord with Policy 16, in particular Policy 16(f), as it proposes the use of land for regular community recreational use within the consultation area that would surround the new water recycling centre. Please set out your interpretation of part f of Policy 16 of the MWLP.</i></p>
7.11	Applicant	<p>Effect of proposed outfall on PRow</p> <p>SSH notes at 10.3.4 (page 96) of its WR [REP1-171] that <i>The riverside path connecting the communities of Fen Ditton and Horningsea in the Baits Bite Conservation Area PRow 85/6, 85/7 will be affected by a significant concrete structure at the outfall reducing the visual attractiveness, affecting the quality of the path since footfall will be concentrated into a narrow width passing the outfall, and reducing opportunities to experience wildlife and a natural riverbank.</i></p> <p>a) How would the width of the path be affected;</p> <p>b) What would be the width of the path once the outfall structure is in place; and</p> <p>c) How would this width compare with other parts of the riverside path?</p>
7.12	Applicant	<p>Access to residential properties</p> <p>In [REP2-063] SHHG questions (point 7.9) a suggestion that access to Poplar Hall and Poplar Hall Farm would not be affected and also believes that access to Biggin Abbey and Biggin Abbey residences would be affected. Please clarify the position in relation to each of these properties.</p>
7.13	Applicant	<p>Permissive paths</p> <p>In [REP2-063] SHHG states (point 7.24) that <i>It is clearly not acceptable for the permissive access to only be committed to for a period of 30 years.</i> Why is the proposed permissive access proposed for 30 years and not for the lifetime of the development?</p>
7.14	Applicant, Save Honey Hill Group (SHHG), SCDC	<p>Recreational pressure / parking</p> <p>In [REP2-063] SHHG states (point 7.25c) that <i>This answer is illogical. The reality is that the applicant is creating c70 ha of open access woodland and grassland with paths close to the edge of Cambridge replacing an area of open arable land. It is clearly the case that this will be a popular destination for</i></p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>walking and other recreational pursuits and significant numbers of users will come by car. The Applicant appears not to be committing to making appropriate physical provision on its land in the even that, for example, nuisance parking or damage starts to occur.</i></p> <p>a) Please set out your view on whether the provision of car parking for walkers would encourage people to come to the area by car and increase the risk of ‘nuisance parking’;</p> <p>b) The Applicant is proposing a section 106 agreement [REP3-044] in relation to vehicle car parking. Please provide your comments on this, including whether and why you consider that the proposed measures would be successful or not; and</p> <p>c) If additional walkers are attracted by new / enhanced walking opportunities created by the Applicant, provide your view as to whether impacts such as ‘nuisance parking’ and damage should weigh negatively in the overall planning balance? If not, why not?</p>
8. Compulsory Acquisition (CA) and Temporary Possession (TP)		
8.1	Applicant	<p>CA Schedule</p> <p>The Starkie Family are identified in the CA Schedule as having Part 2 (Category 3) interests only. However, the BoR indicates this AP has Part 1 (owner) interests in Plot 048a. Please address this (this was also identified as an Action Point but does not appear to have been addressed).</p>
8.2	Applicant	<p>Book of Reference</p> <p>The names ‘Ian Harvey’, ‘Jenny Langley’ and ‘Robert King’ are identified at Category 3 persons in the CA Schedule. However, these specific names do not appear in Part 2 of the BoR. Please clarify (this was also identified as an Action Point but does not appear to have been addressed).</p>
8.3	Applicant	<p>Statutory Undertakers Progress Schedule</p> <p>The Statutory Undertakers Progress Schedule [REP4-017] notes that whilst the ‘Local Highways Authority’ owns land, s127 of PA2008 would not be engaged given that the owned plots would be subject to interference with private rights only. However, the same is said for, for example, UK Eastern Power Networks PLC, albeit in this case, the Applicant identifies that s127 would be engaged. Please explain the reason for this (this was asked by the ExA at CAH1, but further justification would be welcomed).</p>
8.4	Applicant	<p>Access</p> <p>Please address D4 submission [REP4-103] and the concerns raised around access to allotments.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
8.5	National Highways	<p>Powers sought</p> <p>Please comment on the Applicant's response to CAH1 Action Points 16 and 17 [REP4-087] relating to CA powers sought and clarify why you consider that the powers sought would cause serious detriment to your undertaking, as mentioned in your D4 submission [REP4-096] (noting that you highlight that negotiations are progressing regarding protective provisions / side agreements and noting that that the Applicant has highlighted examples of made DCOs which it states include powers similar to that sought in this instance).</p>
8.6	Applicant	<p>CA Schedule</p> <p>The CA Schedule [REP4-015] notes that it includes all Category 1 landowners, whether or not they have made a representation. Please clarify why, for example, Ambury Developments Limited are not included given that the BoR [REP4-011] shows it as the landowner of some 002 and 004 plots.</p>
8.7	Applicant	<p>Statutory Undertakers</p> <p>Please clarify (for the purposes of the most recent CA Schedule, Statutory Undertakers Schedule, Protective Provisions in the dDCO, SoCG and PADS) whether it is UK Power Networks Ltd or Eastern Power Networks PLC you are negotiating with, as the name of the organisation and details provided around negotiations appears to be inconsistent within and between these documents.</p>
8.8	National Highways, Conservators of the River Cam, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited, EA, CCoC, Arqiva Limited, Sky Telecommunications Services Limited, City Fibre Limited, Vodafone, Eastern Power Networks PLC/UK Power Networks, any other	<p>Statutory Undertakers</p> <p>Please review the Applicant's D4 submissions and identify any outstanding key concerns or impediments with regard to reaching agreement with the Applicant on CA / TP matters and protective provisions, if necessary. Please also clarify whether you are confident of reaching agreement with the Applicant before the close of the Examination, and if not, any implications for this?</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	relevant Statutory Undertakers	
8.9	P.X. Farms Limited	<p>Negotiations</p> <p>Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the Applicant's response to your RR [RR-032] on page 338 of [REP1-078] and set out any outstanding concerns regarding any ongoing negotiations around CA / TP matters?</p>
8.10	Elizabeth Cotton, Gonville and Caius College	<p>Specific plots</p> <p>[REP4-101] notes that in respect of field next to the proposed outfall (understood by the ExA to be referring to Plot 021b), the use of subsidies can have a financial benefit. Please clarify whether subsidies are currently received in respect of this land?</p>
8.11	Gonville and Caius College	<p>Specific plots</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed at CAH1 and in its response to hearing Action Points [REP4-087] (page 5) that there would be no permanent air vent structures on your land. It has also committed to restoring land associated with temporary shafts (Plots 021s and 021r) so that an agricultural use would resume after any construction period, albeit that permanent land acquisition is still sought over these plots given implications for elements of the shafts remaining in situ a number of metres below ground level. Please confirm whether you are satisfied with these arrangements, and if not, the reasons for this.</p>
8.12	Waterbeach Development Company Limited	<p>Negotiations</p> <p>Please provide an update regarding any key outstanding concerns you have relating to the Proposed Development and your land / development interests, and provide an indication as to whether or not you envisage that agreement on all matters will be reached with the Applicant during the course of the Examination (noting that the Applicant states on page 6 of its hearing Action Point response [REP4-087] that it does not foresee an issue with the overlapping of activities of both projects).</p>
8.13	Applicant, CCC, SCDC	<p>Funding</p> <p>Please provide an update regarding how the identified shortfall in funding for the proposed WWTP would be met, and if not yet determined, the likelihood of this happening before the close of the Examination.</p>
8.14	Applicant	<p>Funding</p> <p>Does the Funding Statement [REP4-019] provide a cost estimate for the Waterbeach pipeline element of the Proposed Development. If not, why not?</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
9. Design		
9.1	CCoC, SCDC, CCC, any other IPs	<p>Design Code</p> <p>Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the submitted Design Code [REP4-085], and if not, set out the reasons for this.</p>
9.2	Applicant	<p>Design Code</p> <p>Design Principle 8 in the Design Code [REP4-085] is different to that of Design Principle 8 in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) [AS-168]. Please clarify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the reason for this, noting that collaboration and engagement can be helpful to achieving good design and that section 2.5 of the Design Code appears to be supportive of further design review as necessary; and whether Design Principle 8 in the Design Code relates to all plant equipment (including that associated with the proposed WWTP, which might include, for example, digestors) or to plant equipment associated with specific buildings only, as it is unclear to the ExA as currently written.
9.3	Applicant	<p>Design Code</p> <p>Design Code para 2.5.1 makes reference to the 'Project's Design Champion' and to where this role is 'described within the DAS'. Please either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> signpost to where the role of 'Design Champion' is described within the DAS; or if it is not described within the DAS, provide a greater level of detail of this role, including any relevant design experience, qualifications and any other relevant attributes the person taking on this role would / should possess.
9.4	Applicant	<p>Design Code</p> <p>Please check the Design Code [REP4-085] for formatting / typographical errors, including: section 3.5 (and contents page) regarding the term 'Gateway Design Buildings'; whether paras 2.2.7 to 2.2.9 should be bullet points rather than paragraphs; and whether the design codes should be a mix of italics / not italics.</p>
10. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)		
Note: Questions / comments relate to the D4 version of the dDCO ([REP4-003] clean / [REP4-004] tracked)		
10.1	Applicant	General

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Please remove reference to 'single appointed person' on pages 4 and 5.
10.2	Applicant	<p>Articles</p> <p>Article 6 – this refers to limits of deviation as shown on the Works Plans. However, the Works Plans [AS-150] 'General Notes' No. 3 (above the legend) refers to 'Works Areas' – it is unclear where this term is defined and thus unclear where the boundaries of the limits of deviation would be. Please clarify or amend the article or Works Plans as appropriate.</p>
10.3	Applicant	<p>Articles</p> <p>Article 44(2) – this should refer to the 'Land Plans' rather than the 'Works Plans'.</p>
10.4	Applicant	<p>Requirements (R)</p> <p>R1 'enabling works' (in Schedule 2, Part 1) refers to paras 3.1.7 and 3.3.1 of ES Chapter 2. Does this need amending to reflect changes to ES Chapter 2 submitted at D4 [REP4-022]?</p>
10.5	Applicant	<p>Requirements</p> <p>R7(2) – a) should this make provision for the updated odour assessment to be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority; b) should 'C98 OUE/m3' be defined; and c) should the 'odour impact assessment' be defined?</p>
10.6	Applicant	<p>Requirements</p> <p>R10(1) – Conservators of the River Cam has requested to be added as a consultee on this requirement. Please address this matter.</p>
10.7	Applicant	<p>Requirements</p> <p>R12(3) – should this refer to the <i>detailed</i> operational workers travel plan and should the word 'following' be replaced with 'upon' for clarity and consistency purposes.</p>
10.8	Applicant	<p>Schedules</p> <p>Schedule 1 - should any Work Nos. make provision for gas / electrical connections other than Work No. 9 (noting for example that the Design Plans – proposed WWTP [REP1-019] identifies green arrows showing connections outside Work No.9)?</p>
10.9	Applicant	<p>Schedules</p>

ExQ2: 31 January 2024

Responses due by Deadline 5: Monday 19 February 2024

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Please respond to CCoC's comment at the bottom of page 8 of [REP2-040] regarding Schedule 3 and identification of public highways. Please also clarify whether CCoC's request has effectively already been addressed in Schedule 3 given that some 'streets' are identified as private, and that, on this basis, those which are not identified this way are public?
10.10	Applicant	Schedules Schedule 14, Part 1 'Terminal pumping station' – does this need amending noting that Work No. 16 was amended in the dDCO at D3 to remove reference to an odour control unit and exhaust stack?
10.11	Applicant	Schedules Schedule 14, Part 3 – Please clarify: a) which elements the 'height', 'depth' and 'foundations' in rows 5, 6 and 7 relate to; and b) whether the number of 'screening handling unit', 'odour control unit' and 'odour control unit exhaust stack' accurately reflect the number of these elements specified in Schedule 1, Work No. 4?
10.12	Applicant	Schedules Schedule 14, Part 10 – which Work No. do the proposed 25m high 'vent stacks' relate to and is the naming of these consistent with the relevant Work No. information in Schedule 1?
10.13	Applicant	Schedules Do the Design Plans – proposed WWTP [REP1-019] accurately reflect Schedule 14 parameters (e.g. Schedule 14, Part 11 indicates a digester height of 30.4m, whereas the Design Plans indicate a height of 29.06m)? If not, does this have any implications for ES assessments, such as landscape and visual and associated photomontages?
10.14	CCoC	Schedules Please confirm you are satisfied with Schedule 17(4) and the disapplication of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.
10.15	Applicant	Schedules In Schedule 18 relating to the 'Construction traffic management plan', add a space between 'January 2024' and 'Revision 05'.
10.16	Applicant	Schedules

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Schedule 18 – please review ‘The environmental statement’ section and clarify whether the information and document numbers adequately include the whole of the ES.
10.17	Applicant	<p>Plans</p> <p>Please clarify whether the position of elements shown on the Design Plans – proposed WWTP [REP1-019], such as the digesters (part of Work No.8), accurately correlate with the shaded Work No. as shown on the Works Plans [AS-150]. If not, please explain why and highlight any implications for this.</p>
10.18	Applicant	<p>SHHG comments</p> <p>Please review and respond to each of the SHHG comments / suggestions on pdf pages 8 to 14 (referenced as SHH40) in [REP4-106] concerning provisions of the dDCO.</p>
10.19	CCoC	<p>Temporary PRoW closures and diversions / CTMP</p> <p>Regarding the first row on page 9 of your submission [REP2-040] relating to Article 13, the Applicant added R26 (temporary closures to PRoW) to the dDCO. In addition, the ExA understands that CCoC would be the discharging authority for the CTMP under R9 of the dDCO [REP4-003]. Do these points alleviate your concerns in this regard?</p>
10.20	Applicant, CCoC	<p>Proposed bridleway</p> <p>Regarding CCoC’s comments in the second row on page 9 of [REP2-040]:</p> <p>To the Applicant</p> <p>a) Please confirm whether the proposed bridleway would be a permissive route or a permanent PRoW; and</p> <p>b) If a permissive route, whether this necessitate any amendments to Article 13(4) and Schedule 6, Part 2?</p> <p>To CCoC</p> <p>c) If the bridleway was to be a permanent PRoW, please clarify in detail why you consider protective provisions would be required noting that the Applicant does not intend to make any alterations to the route of the proposed bridleway or its surfacing.</p>
11. Green Belt		
11.1	SCDC	Notwithstanding that you disagree with the Applicant’s view in respect of whether certain elements of the Proposed Development would constitute inappropriate development (e.g. proposed access road and

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		outfall), are you otherwise satisfied / agree with the contents of the Applicant's Green Belt Assessment [APP-207]? If not, please explain the reasons for this.
11.2	SCDC	You address SCLP Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development In and Adjoining the Green Belt in para 7.16-7.20 of your LIR [REP4-092]. It is unclear whether you imply conflict with the policy as a whole due to the words in para 7.18 or whether you imply compliance with the policy as a whole due to the words in para 7.20. Please clarify, and also set out whether you are satisfied that the Applicant's landscape proposals, associated documents and dDCO requirements would demonstrate the 'suitable mitigating measures' you refer to.
11.3	SCDC	The ExA notes that whilst not mentioned in your LIR, SCLP Policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt, is likely to be relevant to the application. Please clarify your views on compliance with this policy.
11.4	CCoC	You note in you LIR [REP1-133] that the MWLP does not contain any Green Belt policies. However, do you wish to comment on any other relevant national and local policies with regard to the Proposed Development and Green Belt matters?
12. Health		
12.1	Applicant	Mental Wellbeing Impact Assessment Please address the comments of CCoC which were set out in response to ExQ1.12.4 [REP1-134].
12.2	Applicant, CCC, SCDC	Mental Wellbeing Impact Assessment The Applicant has prepared a Mental Wellbeing Impact Assessment (MWIA) [AS-077] which does not identify potential significant effects that require further MWIA. To the Applicant: a) CCC noted [REP2-043, para 12.33] that there is no specific reference in chapter 5.2 as to how mitigation would be secured, or when further assessments would be undertaken to monitor change have been included. SHHG has made a similar comment (para 10.3.3 (v) of WR [REP1-171]). Please respond to these comments. To CCC and SCDC: b) Are you satisfied with mitigation measures in relation to potential mental health impacts being secured by way of the CoCP Parts A and B [REP3-026 and REP3-028] and the Community Liaison Plan [AS-132]? If not, please suggest how the mitigation measures should be secured.
12.3	CCC, SCDC	Equality – Gypsies, Roma, Travellers

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In its response to ExQ1.12.6 [REP1-079] the Applicant states that it was advised to communicate with the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller population via the Traveller Liaison Officer.</p> <p>a) Is the Traveller Liaison Officer (TLO) a Council employee?</p> <p>b) Could the TLO confirm that consultation has been undertaken on behalf of the Applicant and whether or not any feedback was given by the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller population?</p> <p>c) Should future consultation / liaison with the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller population be carried out via the TLO?</p> <p>d) To address the comments at 12.27, 12.28 and 12.30 of CCC's LIR [REP2-043], what measures should be included in the CLP?</p>
12.4	Applicant	<p>Existing WWTP – pests</p> <p>Whilst your response relates to the decommissioning phase of the existing WWTP, ExQ1.12.7 related to the situation after the existing WWTP site has been decommissioned, pending any redevelopment. Please respond to the question as originally posed.</p>
12.5	CCoC	<p>Existing WWTP – decommissioning phase impacts</p> <p>In your RR and in your LIR (paras 7.18 and 7.19) [REP1-133] you raised questions about decommissioning phase impacts. Does the Applicant's response to ExQ1.12.8 [REP1-079] address your concerns? If not, please specify the additional information that you are seeking.</p>
12.6	Applicant	<p>Proposed WWTP – mitigation measures</p> <p>ExQ1.12.15 asked whether, given that the CEMP would relate to the construction phase, it is this the most appropriate mechanism to deal with operational phase effects. You said that you would update Table 5-2 in ES Chapter 12: Health [APP-044] to remove reference to CEMP for potential risk to human health from hazardous waste and substances and replace this with a reference to the Site Management Waste Plan (SWMP).</p> <p>a) Should this reference be to the Site Waste Management Plan; and</p> <p>b) If so, according to the dDCO the Site Waste Management Plan would form part of the CEMP – therefore, it is unclear to the ExA how this would address the matter raised in the original question. Please clarify.</p>
13. Historic environment		
13.1	Applicant	<p>Effects</p> <p>Please clarify the reason why Fen Ditton Conservation Area (HE096) is not considered in ES Chapter 13 [REP4-030] under permanent construction effects (paras 4.2.39 to 4.2.59) when Table 1.3 of [REP4-</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		066] identifies adverse effects in this regard (and noting that Horningsea Conservation Area (HE097) is considered for permanent construction effects in ES Chapter 13 when Table 1.3 suggest it would experience a lesser degree of harm in this regard). Please update ES Chapter 13 as necessary.
13.2	Applicant	Effects Please provide details of the size, height and location of the 'ventilation column', and clarify the need for the permanent access route to 'Ventilation Shaft 4' referred to in Table 1.3 for permanent construction effects on Fen Ditton Conservation Area (HE096).
13.3	Applicant	Effects Please clarify the reason why Fen Ditton Conservation Area (HE096) and Horningsea Conservation Area (HE097) are not included in Table 4.2 of ES Chapter 13 [REP4-030] given the adverse effects noted in Table 1.3 of [REP4-066]. Please update ES Chapter 13 as necessary.
13.4	Applicant	Effects Please clarify the reason why paras 4.2.45 and 4.2.50 of ES Chapter 13 [REP4-030] reports minor adverse permanent construction impacts and effects before mitigation on Baits Bite Lock Conservation Area (HE095), when Table 1.3 of [REP4-066] reports moderate adverse impacts and effects in this regard, as does ES Chapter 13 Table 4.2. Please update ES Chapter 13 as necessary.
13.5	Applicant	Effects / mitigation Following on from the above question, please clarify how, as identified in Table 4.2 of ES Chapter 13 [REP4-030], mitigation would reduce 'moderate adverse effects' on Baits Bite Lock Conservation Area (HE095) to 'slight adverse effects' when it is acknowledged in para 4.2.54 that mitigation would not reduce impact magnitude (and would also not change significance of effect for other heritage assets including Biggin Abbey and HLCA22). Please update ES Chapter 13 as necessary.
13.6	Applicant	Effects Please clarify the reason why Fen Ditton Conservation Area (HE096) is not considered in the Waterbeach pipeline section of ES Chapter 13 (e.g. para 4.2.61) [REP4-030] when this element would pass through and near to the conservation area.
13.7	SCDC	Effects Regarding para 9.37 of your LIR [REP4-092]:

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) Please provide further justification for your view that the operational effects would be moderate adverse and thus significant (albeit less than substantial); and</p> <p>b) Clarify whether your view on this matter relates to all five designated heritage assets listed in para 4.3.3 of ES Chapter 13 [REP4-030].</p>
13.8	SCDC	<p>Effects</p> <p>Whilst you disagree with some of the Applicant's reported effects on designated heritage assets, you agree that any harm to their significance would be less than substantial. Accordingly, do you consider that your concerns in this regard would be material to the overall planning balance?</p>
13.9	Applicant	<p>Effects</p> <p>The ExA understands that the permanent adverse construction effects identified in ES Chapter 13 [REP4-030] would remain over the lifetime of the Proposed Development, given their permanence. Please clarify whether any adverse operational effects, even if negligible, might add to any permanent adverse construction effects, to increase the overall effect?</p>
13.10	SCDC	<p>Mitigation / Monitoring</p> <p>Your LIR [REP4-092] at para 9.43 suggests that mitigation measures are monitored during operation, albeit that you are unable to identify mitigation in this regard. The Applicant notes in Table 5-1 of ES Chapter 13 that bunding, planting and lighting control may assist with mitigating adverse effects. These would appear to be secured through relevant requirements of the dDCO and associated documents. What is it specifically you would like to see in addition to this?</p>
13.11	SCDC	<p>Mitigation / Monitoring</p> <p>Your LIR [REP4-092] at para 16.15 suggests that construction lighting should be monitored through the CEMP. The CoCP Part A sets out measures for lighting control, as does the Lighting Design Strategy, to be secured by R14 of the dDCO. What is it specifically you would like to see in addition to this.</p>
13.12	CCoC	<p>Archaeology</p> <p>In response to ExQ1.13.7 and within your LIR [REP1-133], you refer to 'flexibility' being built into the Archaeological Investigation Mitigation Strategy (AIMS). Please review the framework AIMS [AS-088], the CoCP Parts A and B [REP4-040 and REP4-042] and R13 of the dDCO [REP4-003] and clarify whether these are sufficient to address your concerns and if not, the reason for this.</p>
14. Landscape and visual		

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
14.1	Woodland Trust, CCoC	<p>Trees</p> <p>The Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP1-035] has been updated to reflect standing advice in respect of veteran tree T105. Are you satisfied that this overcomes your concern in this regard?</p>
14.2	SCDC	<p>Assessments</p> <p>Your LIR (including para 8.14) [REP4-092] makes reference to the Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment not having been considered by the Applicant as part of ES Chapter 15 [REP4-032]. However, it is referred to in Tables 1-2 and 2-4 and in paras 3.1.1 and 3.1.3 of this ES chapter. Please therefore clarify your concern in this regard.</p>
14.3	Applicant	<p>Woodland</p> <p>Your response to ISH3 Action Point 55 [REP4-087] appears to confirm some woodland loss. Please identify on a plan where this loss would be or signpost to where this is shown and addressed, such as in the Arboricultural Impact Assessments (AIA) [APP-102 and REP1-035] (and if not, confirm whether any documents, such as the AIA, need updating as a result).</p>
14.4	SCDC	<p>Bund planting</p> <p>The Applicant has provided some further information relating to the establishment of planting on bunds at Appendix H of its response to hearing Action Points [REP4-087]. Does this (along with the contents of the updated LERMP submitted at D4 [REP4-056], Design Code [REP4-085] and associated dDCO requirements) assist with alleviating your concerns in this regard? If not, please justify your reasons and if possible, provide any suggestions which may assist with overcoming your concern.</p>
14.5	CCoC	<p>Policy</p> <p>In your LIR [REP1-133], you predominantly address matters relating to footpaths and their users in the Topic 8 section on Landscape and Visual Amenity. However, you highlight that MWLP Policy 17: Design is relevant but do not appear to conclude on compliance or otherwise with this policy. Please provide your view on whether the Proposed Development would comply with this policy.</p>
14.6	Applicant	<p>Landscape, Ecological and Recreational Management Plan (LERMP)</p> <p>LERMP Table 4-1 [REP4-056] refers to a 'Soft Landscape Specification' in respect of trees, shrubs and hedgerows. Please signpost to where this specification can be found, or provide this if it has been omitted.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
14.7	Applicant	<p>LERMP</p> <p>The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.14.16b. However, the question related to woodland planting in LERMP Table 4.2 [REP4-056]. The row under the 'Objectives' section indicates that any trees that fail to thrive in the first year would be replaced. However, Table 5.1 indicates that any woodland tree which fails would be replaced over a longer period. Please clarify.</p>
14.8	Applicant	<p>LERMP</p> <p>Notwithstanding responses to previous ExQs, it remains unclear to the ExA the reason why, in LERMP Table 4.2 [REP4-056], some timeframes are noted as 'not applicable', for example, relating to proposed new areas of woodland maintenance visits. Please clarify.</p>
14.9	Applicant	<p>LERMP</p> <p>Please explain why in LERMP Table 4.2 [REP4-056], proposed screen planting operations do not include some of the operations that tree or woodland planting includes, such as maintenance, failures and protection? Please also clarify what 'screen planting' is and where on the plans within the LERMP this is shown?</p>
14.10	CCoC	<p>PRoW users</p> <p>Your LIR [REP1-133] in the Topic 8 section on Landscape and Visual Amenity makes reference to the incomplete MWIA [APP-113]. An updated version was provided at [AS-077]. Does this alleviate your concerns in this regard?</p>
15. Land quality		
15.1	CCoC	<p>MWLP Policy 5</p> <p>Do you consider that the Proposed Development accords with MWLP Policy 5? Please justify your response.</p>
15.2	EA	<p>Assessment / Monitoring</p> <p>Do you have any outstanding concerns regarding the Applicant's land quality assessments or monitoring proposals?</p>
15.3	NE	Soil management

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Does the Applicant's response to your RR [RR-015] on p187/8 [REP1-078] regarding details of soil profiles and soil balance being contained within the LERMP satisfactorily address your concerns, including those contained within Appendix 1 of your RR? If not, please provide further justification.
15.4	Applicant	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>Within SCDC's LIR [REP4-092], it makes suggestions for requirements regarding land contamination (paras 12.18-12.20). During ISH3, the Applicant confirmed in response to this matter that a quantitative risk assessment would be provided at D5. Is this still the Applicant's intention, and if so, how would this specifically address the requests within paras 12.18-12.20 of SCDC's LIR?</p>
16. Major accidents and disasters		
16.1	Applicant	<p>Hazardous loads / waste</p> <p>In response to ExQ1.16.2 [REP1-079] you have stated that ES Chapter 19 reports neutral / no significant effects in relation to the delivery of hazardous loads. However, in response to ExQ1.20.46 [REP1-079] and in relation to an inconsistency in the application documentation you have stated that hazardous loads have been reassessed with a correct figure of 2,280m³ which would lead to a significant effect, and some documents updated accordingly.</p> <p>a) Please clarify whether your response to ExQ1.20.46 affects your response to ExQ1.16.2;</p> <p>b) Please clarify whether the <i>correct figure of 2,280m³</i> alters any of your analysis or conclusions in the section '<i>Hazardous and contaminated waste</i>' from para 4.2.42 of [REP4-034];</p> <p>c) In para 4.2.47 of [REP4-034] you state that <i>There are very limited sources of land contamination within and adjacent to the Scheme Order Limits. ...Therefore, there are no potential sources of hazardous waste.</i> Please clarify whether this is correct; and</p> <p>d) In response to ExQ1.16.2 you stated that no hazardous loads are currently expected in relation to the construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. Please clarify whether this statement is still correct.</p>
16.2	Applicant	<p>HSE's response</p> <p>The HSE's letter dated 8 August 2022 [REP1-080, PDF page 128/161] that was provided in response to EXQ1.16.5 states that <i>HSEs advice remain the same as advised in letter dated 26th October 2021.</i> Please provide a copy of the letter of 26 October 2021.</p>
16.3	Applicant	Operational phase – security and safety, access and evacuation

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In relation to your response to ExQ1.16.16 [REP1-079] which notes that access would also be available for emergency and security purposes via the gaps in the earth bund, please clarify:</p> <p>a) How, in practice access for vehicles would work given the tree planting surrounding the proposed WWTP, the change in levels between the proposed WWTP access road and the adjacent landscaped areas and the potential use of a 'vehicle restraint system' (e.g. see Figure 2.17 of ES Chapter 2 [REP4-022]); and</p> <p>b) Whether any hardstanding / paved surfaces that are not shown on the submitted drawings would be provided to enable large / heavy vehicles (such as fire tenders) to cross the landscaped area? If so, please indicate the approximate surface area of those hardstanding / paved areas.</p>
16.4	Applicant	<p>Wildlife Hazard Management Plan</p> <p>Please update the application documentation to address Cambridge City Airport's comment [REP1-161] which states that <i>In relation to section 3.2 of the Wildlife Hazard Management Plan ("WHMP"), it should be highlighted that the Airport no longer operates under EASA regulation. The airport is now back operating under UK CAA regulations – UK Regulation (EU) No 139/2014 and consequently the WHMP and any other affected documentation should be updated accordingly.</i></p>
17. Material resources and waste		
17.1	Applicant	<p>Proposed WWTP – operational phase effects</p> <p>In response to ExQ1.17.17 [REP1-079] you noted that <i>CoCP Part A (App Doc Ref 5.4.2.1) [APP-068] is specifically for the construction phase, however, some measures identified could also be applicable to the operational phase.</i> Please explain which measures would be applicable to the operational phase and how these would be secured.</p>
17.2	CCoC	<p>Proposed WWTP – use of resources</p> <p>Please provide a response to ExQ1.17.18 [PD-008] as CCC and SCDC deferred to CCoC on this matter.</p>
17.3	CCoC	<p>LIR</p> <p>Para 11.6 of your LIR [REP1-133] states that <i>Requirement 9 a) xi and b) xi details the need for a Waste Management Plan. This should include the additional mitigation measures.</i> However, no apparent mitigation measures are set out in the LIR. Please specify the additional mitigation measures that you consider should be included, and provide justification for your suggestions.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
17.4	Applicant, CCoC	<p>MWLP Policy 26 and importation of materials for landscaping</p> <p>In the event that any material is imported for landscaping, would there be a mechanism for the relevant planning authority to ensure that the criteria in MWLP Policy 26 can be satisfied before the material is imported?</p>
18. Noise and vibration		
18.1	Applicant, CCC, SCDC	<p>Assessment - residential receptor sensitivity</p> <p>To the Applicant, CCC and SCDC:</p> <p>a) Given that the extent of impacts from noise are based on a comparison of the potential noise impact compared to the existing noise baseline, and the significance of impact also assessed in relation to the LOAEL and SOAEL (and given that the proposed mitigation measures respond to the assessment findings), to what extent would reclassifying residential receptors as 'high sensitivity' rather than 'medium sensitivity' have on the findings in the ES?</p> <p>b) How would a reclassification of residential receptors to high sensitivity affect the findings of the ES regarding vibration?</p> <p>To the Applicant only:</p> <p>c) Please justify why you consider residential receptors to be of medium sensitivity, rather than of high sensitivity?</p>
18.2	CCoC	<p>Assessment – scoping out of emergency generators</p> <p>Within your LIR [REP1-133] (para 7.12), you suggest that further noise and vibration assessments would be needed to ensure that there would be no impacts on human health from noise and vibration when the fixed plant locations have been confirmed. In regard to emergency generators, the Applicant responded and stated [REP1-078] that <i>Generator noise emissions would not be significantly greater than other individual source of noise at the site during operation (i.e. due to occupational noise requirements for employees working at the site). Overall noise levels at the nearest receptors during emergency generator testing would therefore not significantly increase prediction results and would not affect assessment outcomes or significance.</i> Do these comments satisfy your concerns regarding emergency generators being scoped of the ES? If not, please justify your stance.</p>
18.3	Applicant	Assessment – decommissioning processes

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		CCoC's LIR [REP1-133] (7.19) raises a concern that temporary odour controls/scrubbers have not been assessed from a noise and vibration impact perspective within the ES. Please provide a response to this, including the likely impacts.
18.4	Applicant, SCDC	<p>Mitigation and monitoring - complaints</p> <p>At D1, SCDC requested a commitment (such as within the Community Liaison Plan) for the Applicant to notify SCDC's Environmental Health department of any complaints received other than through liaison meetings with third parties, and updates on any complaints received throughout the proposed construction period. Are you willing to accommodate this request and what (if any) agreement has been reached between the Applicant and SCDC regarding this matter?</p>
18.5	CCC	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>Within written summary of oral submissions made at ISH3 [REP4-090], you state on p12/13 that commitments made regarding noise and vibration need to be reproduced / expanded upon within the CEMP. Do consider that the draft CEMP [AS-057] needs to be updated prior to the close of the Examination, or would this information be sufficiently secured through R9 of the dDCO (provision of a detailed CEMP)? If you consider that the draft CEMP [AS-057] needs to be updated, please provide suggested wording for updates as appropriate.</p>
18.6	CCC	<p>Monitoring and mitigation</p> <p>Para 8.19 of your LIR [REP2-043] suggests that the CEMP or alternatively a separate requirement imposed through the dDCO should be included to ensure that any adverse construction and decommissioning noise impacts would be mitigated and minimised to an acceptable level. Do you still consider this to be necessary? If so, please identify where the existing dDCO and supporting documents fail in your view to adequately mitigate construction and decommissioning noise impacts, and provide further justification for this stance.</p>
18.7	Applicant	<p>Removal of the lime dosing facility</p> <p>The ExA notes your confirmation within [REP1-079] (19.19(e)) that the lime dosing facility would be removed as part of the decommissioning activities. Please confirm how its removal would be controlled through the dDCO or supporting documents (as it is not referred to in the outline decommissioning plan [AS-051])?</p>
19. Odour		

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
19.1	CCoC	<p>Clarification of any outstanding matters from CCoC's RR [RR-001]</p> <p>Within your RR [RR-001], it is stated <i>that paragraph 5.1.5 of the Preliminary Odour Management Plan [AAP-140] mentions controls 'expected' to be included. More certainty as to the necessary mitigations needed are sought.</i> You also reference the need to assess the proposal against Policy 18: Amenity Considerations of the MWLP. Do you consider these matters now suitably addressed?</p>
19.2	CCoC	<p>Impacts from the proposed waste water transfer tunnel vent stack</p> <p>Do you consider that the Applicant has satisfactorily addressed your concerns regarding the proposed ventilation stack and potential impacts on future residential receptors? If not, please confirm why.</p>
19.3	CCC	<p>Securing mitigation</p> <p>Within your written summary of oral submissions made at ISH3 [REP4-090], you state on page 15 that <i>odour mitigation commitments should be reproduced and built upon where necessary and appropriate within the CEMP.</i> Do you consider that the draft CEMP [AS-057] needs to be updated prior to the close of the Examination, or would this information be sufficiently secured through R9 of the dDCO (provision of a detailed CEMP)? If you consider that the draft CEMP [AS-057] needs to be updated, please provide suggested wording for updates as appropriate.</p>
19.4	Applicant, SCDC	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>To the Applicant:</p> <p>Within SCDC's LIR [REP4-092], para 13.13 suggests considerations for the dDCO – please confirm if these matters have been discussed with SCDC and if so, provide an update as to what agreement has been made.</p> <p>To SCDC:</p> <p>Para 13.13 of your LIR [REP4-092] suggests a 'requirement' for an outline commissioning plan. Does the submitted outline commissioning plan [AS-053] address this point? What (if any) additional requirements within the dDCO do you consider are necessary – please provide wording and justification (noting that R9 of the dDCO already includes a requirement for a detailed commissioning plan in accordance with the outline commissioning plan)?</p>
19.5	Applicant, SCDC	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>To the Applicant:</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) Some RRs (e.g. [RR-061]) request that the preliminary odour management plan [AS-106] includes formal commitments to corrective actions and a suitable escalation path if odours were to become unacceptable. The ExA note the complaints procedure contained within the preliminary odour management plan. However, there is no commitment within this to ensure corrective actions or an escalation path. Can the preliminary odour management plan [AS-106] or community liaison plan [REP4-078] be updated to provide more clarity / reassurance in this regard?</p> <p>To SCDC:</p> <p>b) Do you consider the complaints procedure identified within the application documents to be satisfactory? If not, please provide suggested amendments as appropriate.</p>
19.6	Applicant	<p>Assessment – decommissioning processes</p> <p>Within CCoC's LIR [REP1-133] (7.19) it is stated that temporary odour controls/scrubbers have not been assessed from an odour impact perspective within the ES. CCoC also queries the impacts from odour during the cleaning processes. Please provide a response to this, including the likely impacts / effects.</p>
19.7	SCDC	<p>Control of odour through dDCO and Environmental Permitting</p> <p>Please confirm whether you require any further clarification from the Applicant regarding control of odour through the dDCO and Environmental Permitting process?</p>
19.8	Applicant	<p>Environmental Permits</p> <p>Please provide an update on Environmental Permitting regarding odour management.</p>
20. Traffic and transport		
20.1	Applicant	<p>Construction traffic</p> <p>Whilst your response in relation to the carbon assessment is noted, please provide the information requested in ExQ1.20.56 c) [PD-008]: <i>Please provide an estimate of any additional mileage and the additional carbon emissions associated with that additional mileage that would be travelled by construction vehicles travelling via the A10 and Waterbeach towards temporary accesses 7, 8 and 9 to avoid Horningsea High Street – para 3.8.20 of ES Chapter 2 [APP-034] suggests that the route via the A10 might be in the region of 7 miles.</i></p> <p>Please also clarify the distance; during ISH3 [EV-007d] the Applicant noted that a direct route via Horningsea would be 5km compared with 2km from the A10.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
20.2	Marshall Group Properties (Cambridge City Airport)	<p>CoCP / Wildlife Management Plan</p> <p>Your WR [REP1-161] said that you are <i>broadly satisfied</i> with the proposed arrangements in the CoCP in respect of the Wildlife Hazard Management Plan. Do you consider that any amendments need to be made to this document for you to be fully satisfied? If so, please set out the amendments.</p>
20.3	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	<p>Railway safety</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the proposed construction routes and their interface with level crossings?</p>
20.4	Applicant	<p>Vehicle parking and staff occupancy</p> <p>You have stated that car parking would be provided at a ratio of approximately two spaces for each member of staff [REP1-079; 20.89 c)]. During ISH3 [EV-007f], the ExA posed a question in relation to untested potential impacts arising from any potential increased number of staff in the Gateway Building, facilitated by any surplus car parking provision. You indicated that a ‘worst case scenario’ had been tested.</p> <p>However, you state in [REP1-079; 20.89 c)] that <i>The number of car parking places for operational staff based at the proposed site under the dDCO is 46, representing the maximum number of vehicle movements assessed in the environmental statement (92). This includes 30 parking spaces associated with the WROL and water resources operations described above. As discussed at 1.25 below, further parking spaces are proposed for cars belonging to tanker drivers (6), additional operational visitors (2) and contingency spaces (5). A further 20 spaces, outside of the bunded area, are provided for “by invitation” visitors to the Discovery Centre.</i> (The ExA notes that the stated numbers do not accord with parking provision shown on the submitted drawings, e.g. [APP-025] illustrates 13 spaces in the Visitors’ Car Park).</p> <p>The outline OLTP [REP4-072; Table 4-2] indicates that there would be 30 office worker car / LGV movements during the ‘AM peak’ (0800-0900) and 30 movements in the ‘PM peak’ (1700-1800). The OWTP also indicates an intention to promote non-car usage such that a maximum of 55% of staff would drive to / from the proposed WWTP by 2033 compared with a baseline of 72% [APP-149; Table 8.2].</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>It appears to the ExA that, whether or not the aforementioned modal shift is fully achieved, there could be surplus car parking. Based on total parking provision (including visitor parking spaces), please explain and include clear references to application documentation to support your responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) how many spaces would be occupied by staff if the <i>maximum number of vehicle movements assessed in the environmental statement</i> occur; b) how many spaces would be occupied by staff if there is no change in staff numbers but the OWTP's 2033 modal shift target is achieved; c) if any unoccupied spaces were all occupied by additional office workers' cars, how many additional journeys would occur during the 0800-0900 and 1700-1800 peaks; d) where the effect of any such additional peak traffic associated with additional office workers has been quantified or assessed in the Environmental Statement and / or the associated Transport Assessment; e) whether the draft DCO includes any provisions restricting the number of office workers in the proposed Gateway Building; f) whether the draft DCO includes any provisions that would prevent unoccupied car parking spaces from being used to accommodate additional (over and above the number assessed in the ES) workers' vehicles; and g) whether the draft DCO includes any provisions to prevent non-visitors from using visitor parking spaces and, if so, how any such provisions would be enforced.
20.5	Applicant	<p>EV charging provision</p> <p>CCoC states [REP2-040; 20.93] that details of EV charging should be presented in the Operational Workers Travel Plan [REP4-070] as well as in the Outline Operational Logistics Traffic Plan [REP4-072] prior to the determination of the DCO application. Do you agree with this? If so, please update the documents accordingly. If not, why do you disagree?</p>
20.6	Applicant, National Highways	<p>Evidence supporting National Highway's decision relating to permanent access options</p> <p>In [REP1-078; page 138] the Applicant states that <i>During the consultation process to identify a suitable access for the proposed WWTP the Applicant proposed Option 3 which consisted of an access directly off the A14. This option was not acceptable to National Highways due to safety concerns and non-policy compliance (DfT Circular 01/2022, paragraph 20) so this option was not pursued.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please explain the evidence that was presented to National Highways to inform this conclusion; and b) In the absence of modelling based on up-to-date traffic information, how could a conclusion on the most appropriate access solution be reached with any certainty?

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
20.7	Applicant, CCoC	<p>Pedestrians</p> <p>The Applicant has noted that the shared use path between Horningsea Road and the proposed WWTP would not be lit [REP1-079; ExQ1.20.25 b)]. Would this be safe, particularly during the hours of darkness, and would it encourage people to travel by modes other than the private car?</p>
20.8	Applicant	<p>Equestrian crossing of A14 overbridge</p> <p>In the draft SoCG with National Highways [REP4-080] it is stated that <i>It is agreed (meeting 16.01.2024) that this parapet height should be 1.8m compliant with both cyclist and equestrian use. This modification is made following stakeholder feedback.</i> How is this secured in the dDCO?</p>
20.9	Applicant	<p>SoCG with National Highways</p> <p>Some matters are coloured amber and marked as 'low'. This combination is not explained in the table on page 2 of [REP4-080] – please explain what 'amber / low' represents.</p>
20.10	Applicant, CCoC	<p>Use of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) geofencing</p> <p>Section 8.2 of [REP4-072] has been amended to replace ANPR monitoring with geofencing. The amendment also suggests that only HGVs would be monitored.</p> <p>To the Applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why has this change been made; and Would non-Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) (including Light Goods Vehicles (LGVs) and employees'/visitors' cars/vans) be monitored / geofenced? If so, how? <p>To CCoC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide your opinion on this change to the proposed method of vehicle monitoring / limiting vehicle movements to specific routes.
20.11	Applicant	<p>Network technician vans</p> <p>Application documentation has been amended at D4 to include reference to 'Network Technician Vans' for which 10 parking spaces would be provided (e.g. Table 6-1 of [REP4-072]).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please confirm whether a 'Network Technician' a field-based role; Please explain the work (if any) that Network Technicians would be undertaking on the proposed WWTP site; Outline OLTP [REP4-072] Table 6-1 indicates 20 Network Technician Van movements per day but Table 4-2 under the heading 'WWTP, Network Tech Vans, office workers (cars and LGV)' refers to 22x2 (<i>morning and evening</i>) movements (i.e. 44 movements) which would be out-of-hours / overnight. Please clarify which vehicles would be making the additional 24 movements;

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		d) If Network Technician Vans are parked on the site overnight, why would they need dedicated parking spaces – could they use spaces that are unoccupied overnight because they are only otherwise used by daytime occupiers of / visitors to the site?
20.12	CCoC	<p>Local diversion of Horningsea Road</p> <p>With reference to the drawings at Appendix E of [REP4-087] please provide your views in respect of the proposed method for laying the pipeline under Horningsea Road, in particular, whether you are satisfied for one lane to stay open when the adjacent lane has been excavated?</p>
20.13	Applicant, CCoC	<p>Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) access to Waterbeach Pipeline construction corridor</p> <p>At Appendix F of [REP4-087], the Applicant states that AIL to site access CA20 would travel across Clayhithe Bridge and that mitigation measures apply to all AIL routes, the main site and the Waterbeach pipeline. However, in response to ExQ1.20.19 [REP1-079] the Applicant said in respect of AIL that <i>These movements would travel to their destination via the Strategic Road Network, the A14, and use the slip roads at Horningsea Road. The Applicant does not expect to have to use any AIL for the Transfer Tunnel or Waterbeach Pipeline.</i> The ExA also understood from the discussion at ISH3 that AIL would only travel to the site of the proposed WWTP via J34.</p> <p>To the Applicant:</p> <p>a) Please clarify the situation and provide a clear and definitive position on AIL routing.</p> <p>b) If AIL would cross Clayhithe Bridge, how would it reach Clayhithe Bridge – via J34 and Horningsea or via the A10 and Waterbeach?</p> <p>To CCoC:</p> <p>c) Please provide your observations on this apparent change to AIL routing. Are you satisfied that AIL could be routed to CA20?</p>
20.14	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	<p>Level crossings</p> <p>At Appendix F of [REP4-087] it is stated that Bannold Road level crossing in Waterbeach has a safe height of 4.9 metres and that the overall height of an AIL vehicle is <i>approximately</i> 4.8 metres. Do any special arrangements need to be made in light of this?</p>
20.15	National Highways	<p>Exclusion zone for SRN</p> <p>Are your concerns relating to potential crane falls on the SRN, as mentioned during ISH3, addressed by the drawing at Appendix J of [REP4-087]?</p>
21. Water resources		
21.1	EA	Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Please confirm whether the Evidence and Risk team have reviewed the modelling to support the updated FRA (referred to in your submission [AS-175]), and if so, whether the modelling is considered to be acceptable? If not, please set out clearly why. Additionally, do you consider the climate change allowances with the updated FRA to be acceptable?
21.2	Applicant	<p>FRA</p> <p>Please confirm which additional scenario suggested by the EA in its submission [AS-175] you intend to provide as part of the updated FRA? When will this modelling and a newly updated FRA be submitted to the EA and into the Examination?</p>
21.3	EA	<p>Licences and permits</p> <p>At D1 [REP1-152], you state that <i>Dewatering is mentioned as a required activity for the site. But, it is not covered in Section 4.3 Licences and Permits. Dewatering is now a licensable activity and whilst there are some exemptions to this, we would expect the applicant's environmental statement to consider any requirement for dewater abstraction licences and make the case as to why the proposed activities qualify from the licensing exemptions.</i> Do you still consider that this matter needs to be addressed by the Applicant, noting that the Applicant states in their response to the ISH3 Action Points [REP4-087] that <i>There is no additional need for a "dewatering licence". A water abstraction licence will be required pursuant to the Water Resources Act 1991 from the Environment Agency for the abstraction of water for the construction works and this is already included in the Consents and Other Permits Register [REP1-047]?</i></p>
21.4	Applicant	<p>Water abstraction</p> <p>Some WRs [e.g. REP1-153 and REP1-155] express concerns regarding the impact of the Proposed Development on water stressed areas and the need to for Cambridge Water to reduce abstraction rates (which IPs suggest needs to be halved). SHHG's WR [REP1-171] states that the Applicant has applied for an Interim Revised Discharge Permit for the existing works, at c 45,000 m³ per day and a Final Discharge Permit for the new works at 55,000m³ per day both for a nominal date of 2027. SHHG states that the Interim Permit application is for well above the existing permitted discharge of 37,330 m³/d, noting that the existing permit in terms of volume is being breached and has been for several years. Please provide a response to these points, and explain how the Proposed Development would ensure that required abstraction rates set by the EA would be achieved and ensure that it would not place additional pressure on areas of existing water stress.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
21.5	EA	<p>Water supply</p> <p>Do you consider that the information provided by the Applicant at D2 [REP2-037] regarding domestic/sanitary water use (responses to question 21.41), which states that the water use between the existing and proposed WWTP would be similar, sufficiently addresses your concerns regarding this matter? Do you have any outstanding concerns regarding water abstraction and impacts on water stressed areas?</p>
21.6	National Trust, NE, CCoC	<p>Outline water quality monitoring plan</p> <p>Do you consider that the outline water quality monitoring plan [REP2-028] sufficiently addresses your concerns regarding dewatering, contamination, monitoring and impacts on downstream ecological receptors? If not, please set out clearly why you consider this to be the case and any suggested amendments to the document with justification.</p>
21.7	NE	<p>Outline water quality monitoring plan [REP2-028]</p> <p>Do you still have concerns regarding groundwater protection and impacts on highly stressed water resources? If so, please set out clearly why this is, and if possible, provide solutions which would in your view address these concerns.</p>
21.8	EA	<p>Installation and commissioning techniques</p> <p>The Applicant states [REP4-087] that a meeting was held on 19 January 2024 with the EA to run through the full operational and installation process for the Waterbeach pipelines and the operational testing that would be undertaken prior to its use. The Applicant states that it prepared a briefing note dated 19 January 2024 for the EA to review, setting out the techniques used and agreement to this wording is sought. Please confirm if this has been reviewed and if you accept the Applicant's proposals? If not, why not? If so, does this information need to be secured through the dDCO?</p>
21.9	CCoC	<p>Surface water drainage</p> <p>The Applicant submitted an updated drainage strategy at D4 [REP4-074] – please review this document and clearly set out any principles you consider to be omitted or amendments to the drainage strategy, with justification, bearing in mind the outline nature of the design proposals.</p>
21.10	Applicant	<p>Surface water drainage</p> <p>Please review CCoC's written summary of oral submissions from ISH3 [AS-179] (page 11) regarding its expectations for surface water drainage and provide an update on this matter at D5.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
21.11	Applicant	<p>Surface water drainage</p> <p>SHHG states at D4 [REP4-106] that <i>the open spaces for ponding appear to be set within some areas identified as ‘at risk of contamination’</i>. Any intended separation from these areas in the event of excess run off during maintenance cleaning, major incident cleaning and or extreme weather events such as flooding of the site is not clear. The presentation would suggest or at least not rule out there is a risk of pollutants entering this drainage system and thus Black Ditch via the attenuation pond. Please provide a response to these comments.</p>
21.12	Applicant	<p>Land drainage</p> <p>The response to ExQ1.21.27 [REP1-079] is noted regarding land drains – could these points of clarification be incorporated within the CoCP Part A [REP4-040] as appropriate to ensure clarity?</p>
21.13	Applicant, SCDC	<p>BREEAM and water efficiency</p> <p>To SCDC:</p> <p>Would achieving BREEAM excellent rating achieve the maximum number of credits for category Wat01 of BREEAM, or would this need to be secured over and above BREEAM excellent?</p> <p>To the Applicant:</p> <p>At D2 [REP2-054], SCDC stated that a ‘requirement’ should be included within the dDCO to ensure that the Proposed Development would not be used or occupied until a water efficiency specification, based on the BREEAM Wat01 Water Calculator Methodology, had been submitted to approved in writing by the relevant planning authority. It is suggested that the maximum number of water credits should be achieved in order to comply with SCLP Policy CC/4 and the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2020. Please provide a response to this request.</p>
21.14	Applicant	<p>Septic tanks</p> <p>Within Appendix C of your D4 submission [REP4-087], you highlight the potential need for monitoring and mitigation of impacts on possible septic tanks located at Poplar Hall, Poplar Hall Farm and Red House Close. How are these measures proposed to be secured?</p>
21.15	Applicant	<p>CFD Modelling</p> <p>The Design Code [REP4-085] submitted at D4 is noted, including Design Code OTF.06. However, should the CFD modelling inform the detailed design of the outfall, rather the detailed design informing the CFD modelling as it is currently worded? Furthermore, the use of terminology such as “appropriate”</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		and “sufficient” are not sufficiently precise. Please amend the wording of Design Code OTF.6 to address the aforementioned points, noting that riverbed and bank protection measures should suitably ensure that the proposed outfall would not result in significant effects, so that it would accord with the findings of the ES.
21.16	Applicant	<p>Water quality assessment</p> <p>a) During ISH3, the ExA queried the purpose of the submitted water quality assessment [APP-161]. You advised that this was not part of the ES and informed the interim environmental permit, so is not relevant to the determination of the application. However, the water quality assessment informs the Water Quality Framework Assessment Report [APP-153] (see para 3.1.17), which does form part of the ES. Please clarify this matter.</p> <p>b) You also advised during ISH3 that an updated water quality assessment was contained within ES Chapter 20 [AS-040]. However, ES Chapter 20 does not appear to provide the same level of detail as that contained within the water quality assessment [APP-161] – for example, the water quality assessment refers to and presents SIMCAT modelling which was undertaken for total phosphorus and an assessment which presents modelling results of orthophosphate concentration data. It is not clear from the ES Chapter 20 whether updated modelling of total phosphorus or suspended solids was undertaken. Please identify how the conclusions within ES Chapter 20 regarding water quality have been derived, with particular reference to phosphorus, ammonia, biological oxygen demand, total suspended solids, dissolved oxygen and phosphorus, when there does not appear to be a detailed assessment (e.g. modelling information) contained within ES Chapter 20.</p>
21.17	CCoC	<p>Water Quality</p> <p>Do you consider your comments in your LIR [REP1-133] under para 14.21 regarding the need for details on water quality and quantity to be controlled through the CEMP to be satisfactorily addressed by the Applicant?</p>
21.18	Applicant	<p>Land drainage</p> <p>The response to ExQ1.21.27 [REP1-079] is noted regarding land drains – could these points of clarification please be incorporated within the CoCP Part A [REP4-040] as appropriate to ensure clarity.</p>