

Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project  
Anglian Water Services Limited

# Statement of Common Ground: Cambridge City Council

Application Document Reference: 7.14.2  
PINS Project Reference: WW010003

Revision No. **042**  
February 2024

## Document Control

<b>Document title</b>	Statement of Common Ground
<b>Version No.</b>	2
<b>Date Approved</b>	
<b>Date 1<sup>st</sup> Issued</b>	12 July 2022

## Version History

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Description of change</b>
1	12/7/2022	KT	Changes to section 4
2	27/09/23	KT	Format and content amendments to reflect the position in the Relevant Representations and Rule 6 Letter dated 19 September 2023
3	20/12/2023	CT	CCC Amends to SOCG
4	25/01/2024		Update for Deadline 5

## **Contents**

1	Introduction .....	4
1.1	Purpose of this Document .....	4
1.2	Approach to the SoCG .....	4
1.3	Status of the SoCG.....	6
2	Consultations and engagement.....	7
3	Documents considered in this SoCG .....	7
4	Summary and Status of Agreement.....	8
5	Agreement on this SoCG.....	73
	Appendix 1 Summary of Pre-Application engagement.....	74

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this Document

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (“SoCG”) is submitted as part of an application by Anglian Water Services Limited (“Anglian Water”) and (“the Applicant”) for a Development Consent Order under the Planning Act 2008 (‘the Application’) for the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTPR).
- 1.1.2 The Application is for the provision of a new modern, low carbon waste water treatment plant for Greater Cambridge. The project is an enabler of sustainable growth. The relocation of the existing works, from its current site, will unlock the last large brown field site in Greater Cambridge and allow the creation of a new city district and provide much needed housing and commercial space in a sustainable location, with access to transport, jobs and recreational opportunities.
- ~~1.1.3 This SoCG Statement of Common Ground has been prepared by the Applicant Anglian Water and agreed with Cambridge City Council (CCC). CCC is a statutory consultee for the project.~~
- ~~1.1.3 This Statement of Common Ground confirms the position of these two parties to their agreement or otherwise on CWWTPR Application.~~
- 1.1.4 To date, CCC have provided views on draft proposals at different phases of consultation of the design development.
- 1.1.5 In this SoCG, reference to ‘the parties’ means the Applicant Anglian Water and CCC.
- 1.1.6 This SoCG has been prepared to identify matters agreed, still in discussion and matters between the parties. currently outstanding between Anglian Water and CCC.

## 1.2 Approach to the SoCG

- 1.2.1 The SoCG will evolve as the DCO application progresses to submission and through examination. It is structured as follows.
- Section ~~24~~ confirms the pre-application consultation undertaken to date between the Applicant Anglian Water and CCC.
  - Section ~~32~~ identifies the relevant documents on which the agreements recorded in this SoCG were reached.
  - Section ~~43~~ provides a summary of matters that have been agreed, are ~~still~~ still in discussion and not agreed.

“Agreed” indicates where the issue has been resolved and is recorded in **Green** and marked **Low**

“Under Discussion” indicates where these issues or points will be the subject of on- going discussion whenever possible to resolve or refine the extent of disagreement between the parties and is recorded in **Amber** and marked **Medium**

“Not Agreed” indicates a final position and is recorded in **Red** and marked **high**

- Section [54](#) includes the signatures of all parties to confirm their agreement that this SoCG is an accurate record of issues and discussions as at the date of this SoCG.

1.2.2 This SoCG relates to the following topics;

**(i) Strategic Development Plan Context** ~~Development Plan Context~~

- History of the North East Cambridge area
- Extant Development Plan Context
- Emerging Development Plan Context
- Extent to which housing needs could be met without the relocation of the CWWTP
- Progressing the emerging Development Plans
- Significance of North East Cambridge to the Cambridge Economy
- Government’s Cambridge 2040 initiative
- Summary of the Planning Benefits of DCO Proposal

**(ii) Carbon**

**(iii) Land Quality and Contamination**

**(iv) Odour Impacts**

**(v) Air Quality Impacts**

**(vi) Noise and Vibration**

**(vii) Public Health**

**(viii) Community Impact**

**(ix) Public Rights of Way**

**(x) Highways and Transportation**

**(xi) Climate Resilience**

**(xii) Other Matters**

- ~~Development Plan Context~~
- ~~Benefits of the DCO Application and Project~~
- ~~Alternatives~~
- ~~NPPF and Green Belt Policy~~
- ~~Biodiversity (ES Chapter 8) [Doc ref 5.2.8]~~
- ~~Climate Resilience (ES Chapter 9) [Doc ref 5.2.9]~~
- ~~Carbon (ES Chapter 10) [Doc ref 5.2.10]~~
- ~~Community (ES Chapter 11) [Doc ref 5.2.11]~~
- ~~Health (ES Chapter 12) [Doc ref 5.2.12]~~
- ~~Historic Environment Chapter 13 (Doc Ref 5.2.13)~~
- ~~Landscape and Visual Amenity (ES Chapter 15) [Doc ref 5.2.15]~~
- ~~Air Quality (ES Chapter 7) [Doc ref 5.2.7]~~
- ~~Odour (ES Chapter 18) [Doc ref~~
- ~~Lighting (ES Chapter 15) ) [Doc ref 5.2.15]~~
- ~~Noise & Vibration (including Construction) (ES Chapter 17) [Doc ref 5.2.1~~
- ~~Traffic & Transport (ES Chapter ES chapter 19) [Doc ref. 5.2.19]~~
- ~~Waterbeach New Station~~

## 1.3 Status of the SoCG

1.3.1 This version, Version 2 of the SoCG represents the position between [the Applicant Anglian Water](#) and CCC as of ~~19 February 2024~~ [27 September 2023](#) (covering the pre-application and pre-examination stage of the process). The SoCG will continue to be reviewed and progressed through Examination as well as any actions arising from the Issue Specific Hearings on the draft DCO.

1.3.2 [A Principle Areas of Disagreement document on specific points between SoCG's will be updated and submitted to the Examining Authority \(ExA\) during the examination to reflect issues that require further discussion to achieve agreement.](#)

## 2 Consultations and engagement

2.1.1 The Applicant has engaged with CCC in a series of meetings within a Technical Working Group (TWG) forum and in one to one meetings on specific issues. The Parties also meet on a monthly basis to review programme, specific topics and engagement requirements. The record of this engagement is set out in Appendix 1.

## 3 Documents considered in this SoCG

3.1.1 In reaching common ground on the matters covered in this SoCG, at this point in time, the parties have considered and make reference to the documents listed against the topics above and to the draft the Management Plans and DCO Work and is updated to reflect submissions made in Relevant Representations and the Local Impact Report Plans along with information presented at the Technical Working Group meetings.

## 4 Summary and Status of Agreement

## 4.1 Strategic Development Plan Context ~~[THIS SECTION (BLUE) IS STILL UNDER REVIEW BY CCC]~~

- 4.1.1 ~~The relevant Development Plan and the local policy context relevant to the Proposed Development is set out in Section 2.3 of the Planning Statement (AS-128) and Section XX of the LIR (Doc Ref) and is agreed in substance but not necessarily in presentation (eg where comment and interpretation is provided).~~
- 4.1.2 ~~The Local Plan Policy Compliance Table attached at Appendix 2 identifies the relevant local policies and includes an assessment of the compliance of the Proposed Development with those policies so far as agreed between the parties.~~
- 4.1.3 ~~The emerging North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) is being prepared in accordance with the requirement set out in Policy 15 of the adopted Cambridge City Local Plan 2018 and has progressed to a stage where the City Council and District Council have approved a Proposed Submission Regulation 19 version of the NECAAP which makes provision (Policy 1) for NEC to accommodate 8,350 new homes (3,900 in the period to 2041) and 15,000 new jobs, predicated on the relocation of the existing WWTP. Public consultation on the Proposed Submission Regulation 19 version of the NECAAP must await the outcome of this DCO application. Nevertheless, it is agreed between the parties that, given the detailed studies undertaken to date on the suitability and capacity of NEC to accommodate development, that the draft NECAAP is an important and relevant matter in the determination of the DCO application to which substantial weight should be given.~~
- 4.1.4 ~~The status of the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP) is set out in Section 2.3 of the Planning Statement (AS-128) and Section XX of the LIR (Doc Ref). The last update provided to Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council members was in January/February 2023 when a Development Strategy Update (Regulation 18 Preferred Options) report which drew on representations to the GCLP First Proposals consultation held in 2021 and evidence completed since then, was presented to members who confirmed (at South Cambridgeshire District Council Cabinet on 6 February 2023) a clear position on NEC as one of three key strategic sites which will form “central building blocks of any future strategy for development” in the next GCLP Draft Plan (Regulation 18) consultation. It is agreed between the parties that this is also an important and relevant matter in the determination of the DCO application to which ..... weight should be given.~~
- 4.1.5 ~~The continued water supply issues causes the delay to the progression of the preparation of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP), which will replace both the adopted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans 2018 and cover the period to 2041, and the implications of current delays to the GCLP programme on the planning considerations relevant to the DCO application.ont~~
- 4.1.6 ~~Current questions over water supply are frustrating further progression of the GCLP, but long term measures to resolve this issue (including through the delivery of new reservoirs and other measures proposed in the draft WRMPs) have been identified which will enable the strategic sites (including North East Cambridge) to come forward.~~

4.1.7 — Resolution of the water supply issue without risk of significant changes to the spatial development strategy for homes and jobs in the emerging GCLP (specifically the three key strategic sites) can be confidently presumed given the initiatives announced by the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities on 24 July 2023 and given that these sites are still some way away from delivery (for example, in the case of NEC and East Cambridge, because of the need for relocation of existing activity until the late 2020s/early 2030s) such that, even if the resolution of the problem cannot be accelerated, there can be confidence that new housing to meet Greater Cambridge’s requirement can come forward with the new reservoir in place.

4.1.8 — In respect of the water supply issue, and for the avoidance of doubt, the Environment Agency has not raised the issue of water supply in relation to the DCO and in its relevant representation it states:

*The proposed new facility is replacing the existing works so no additional demand to the water supply will be made.*

**Table 4.1: Details of the summary and status of agreement on Development Plan Context**

Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	Status	Comments
Agreement on list of relevant policies	Medium	
Agreement on Local Plan Policy Compliance Table	Medium	
Agreement on the position that delays to the GCLP as a result of water supply issues do not materially affect the case for CWWTPR as presented in the DCO application	Medium	
Agreement on the position that consolidation of the Cambridge Water Recycling Centre within Cambridge City to provide a new treatment plant facility on the current site is not a feasible option	Medium	

<u>Statement/document on which agreement is sought.</u>	<u>AW Comments</u>	<u>CCC Comments</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>List of relevant policies</u>	<u>See Planning Statement [REP1-049] Appendix 5 for a list of the relevant Development Plan policies.</u>		<u>low</u>
<u>Local Plan Policy Compliance Table</u>	<u>See Planning Statement – Local Policies Accordance Table [REP1-</u>	<u>The Local Polices accordance table [REP1-051]</u>	<u>low</u>

054].

History of the North East  
Cambridge area

See Planning Statement [REP1-  
049] Section 2.

For over 20 years the existing  
CWWTP site and surrounding  
area has been promoted  
through consecutive statutory  
planning policy documents for  
redevelopment, to make the  
most of the Greater Cambridge  
area's sustained economic  
growth and, more recently, the  
significant investment in  
sustainable transport provision  
that serves the North East  
Cambridge area.

As set out in the LIR (para 6.5), a  
document capturing the  
Chronology of the investigations  
into the feasibility of  
redevelopment of the  
Cambridge Waste Water  
Treatment Plant site (November  
2021) [LIR Appendix 1, GCSP-18]  
is a supporting document for the  
emerging North East Cambridge  
Area Action Plan (see Emerging  
Development Plan Context  
section below). It shows the long  
history of consideration of the  
site of the existing plant and the  
surrounding underutilised

brownfield area.

This confirms the series of development plans that have sought to redevelop the CWWTP and surrounding land as an integral part of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. It has not been possible to capitalise on the locational and sustainable transport benefits of the site over that period as various studies concluded that it was not financially viable. The HIF funding secured in 2019 is a game changer and overcomes the viability constraint. As such, the emerging NECAAP and GCLP include the NEC site as a key part of the development strategy for the area, subject to the DCO being approved. See LIR paras 6.4-6.24.

Extant Development Plan Context for the existing CWWTP site

See Planning Statement [REP1-049] Appendix 5 for a list of the relevant Development Plan policies, and paragraphs 2.3.7 to 2.3.11.

The relevant policies in the extant development plans are South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018, Policy SS/4 and Figure 6 and Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Policy 15 and Figure 3.3. These are mirror policies in each plan and each figure shows the whole

of the Cambridge Northern Fringe area across both Councils' areas. The policies envisage the creation of a 'revitalised, employment focussed area centred on a new transport interchange'. They allocate the area for high quality mixed-use development, primarily for employment use as well as a range of supporting uses, commercial, retail, leisure and residential uses (subject to acceptable environmental conditions). They state that the amount of development, site capacity, viability, timescales and phasing of development will be established through the preparation of an Area Action Plan for the site prepared jointly by the two Councils. See LIR paras 6.25-6.27.

Emerging Development Plan Context

<u>Proposed Submission North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP)</u>	<u>1.1.1 See Planning Statement [REP1-049] paragraphs 2.3.12 to 2.3.20.</u>	<u>A Proposed Submission AAP (Regulation 19) has been agreed by the Councils for future public consultation, subject to the DCO for the relocation of the CWWTP being approved. The AAP</u>
---	---	---

		<p><u>allocates the wider NEC area for a new city district providing approximately 8,350 new homes, 15,000 new jobs and new supporting infrastructure. See LIR paras 6.29-6.34.</u></p>
<p><u>Emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP)</u></p>	<p><u>4.1.2 See Planning Statement [REP1-049] paragraphs 2.3.21 to 2.3.36.</u></p>	<p><u>The emerging GCLP incorporates the proposals contained in the NECAAP through the proposed allocation of North East Cambridge within the spatial strategy for Greater Cambridge in the First Proposals (Reg 18) 2021 (proposed Policy S/NEC) [LIR Appendix 1, GCSP-5 and Appendix 1, GCSP-5a], having tested the merits of the location as part of the process of identifying the preferred development strategy. The emerging GCLP and its supporting evidence show the highly sustainable locational merits of the NEC area for a new residential-led City district. The area proposed to be allocated in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan is the same as that covered by the NECAAP. The process tested a wide range of strategic locations through a</u></p>

range of evidence and concluded that NEC is the most sustainable location for development in Greater Cambridge. A Development Strategy Update in January 2023 confirmed that NEC should form a central building block for any future strategy for development for Greater Cambridge and was confirmed by the Councils for inclusion within the emerging GCLP. See LIR paras 6.50-6.63 and 6.72-6.77.

Implications of Water Supply, including for Plan timetables

4.1.3 See Planning Statement [REP1-049] paragraph 2.3.30 to 2.3.36.

There remains uncertainty over the ultimate level of development that can be served with a sustainable water supply, it is anticipated that there should be a conclusion to the Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP) being prepared by Cambridge Water around the end of 2023. If there is a further delay, it is considered that a resolution is likely to be achieved by the end of the DCO examination process. Whilst there are delays to the emerging Local Plan process, it is not anticipated that the water supply situation would delay taking

		<p><u>forward the Proposed Submission NECAAP following the conclusion of the DCO process. See LIR paras 6.64-6.71.</u></p>
<p><u>Extent to which housing needs could be met without the relocation of the CWWTP</u></p>	<p><u>4.1.4 See Planning Statement [REP1-049] Section 2.1 and Applicant’s Comments on South Cambridgeshire District Council Deadline 2 submission [REP-XXX] 2.3.1, page 64.</u></p>	<p><u>If the DCO were not approved or if for any other reason the release of CWWTP does not occur, this would mean that the long-sought regeneration of North East Cambridge would remain undeliverable and the local plans would be further delayed. The Councils would therefore necessarily have to go back through the process of considering the available broad locations for development that performed next best against the guiding principles. There would be a need to identify and allocate other strategic scale site(s) within Greater Cambridge to meet the area’s need for housing and employment, so far as is possible within infrastructure constraints, including water supply and housing deliverability considerations. on the basis of the evidence available to the District Council at this time, the alternative locations to North</u></p>

East Cambridge that could be available to meet the Councils development needs are all less sustainable in transport terms and the carbon emissions arising. it is not the Councils' position that active alternatives to the North East Cambridge scheme have been or are being identified. See LIR paras 6.78-6.82.

Progressing the emerging Development Plans

Housing Trajectory on the CWWTP site in the emerging NECAAP and Local Plan

The draft NEECAAP makes provision for the NEC to accommodate 8,350 new homes, 15,000 new jobs, and the provision of various community, cultural, and open space facilities in NEC. Of the 8,350 new homes, approximately 5,400 is expected to be delivered on the existing CWWTP site.

The housing trajectory in the Proposed Submission draft of the NECAAP indicates 1,900 homes coming forward on the ~~the Applicant Anglian Water~~ and City Council owned land over the plan period 2020 – 2041, out of a total of 5,500 homes on that land. The housing trajectory in the emerging GCLP follows the approach in the NECAAP. See LIR paras 6.84-6.89.

Degree of certainty that the NECAAP and emerging Local Plan would be found sound and adopted and timescales for this

4.1.5 See Planning Statement [REP1-049] paragraph 2.3.12 to 2.3.36.

The Proposed Submission NECAAP has already been approved by both authorities and would be advanced, following a further health check, to publication and submission for examination if the WWTP DCO is

approved. Objections to the principle of development will largely fall away if the DCO is approved. The independent examination process is the appropriate forum through which to debate any site specific concerns, and the Councils will be directed by the appointed Planning Inspector to make such changes as may be required to make the final NECAAP sound and capable of formal adoption. See LIR paras 6.90-6.94.

Degree of certainty for redevelopment of existing CWWTP site

4.1.6 See Planning Statement [REP1-049] paragraph 2.3.12 to 2.3.36.

The Applicant Anglian Water and the City Council have appointed a master-developer to bring forward a planning application for redevelopment of the existing CWWTP site. The Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service has recently commenced preapplication discussions with the master-developer team and a Planning Performance Agreement has been entered into. Members of both Councils have continued to reiterate their clear desire to see the regeneration of the NEC area. See LIR paras 6.95-6.97.

What could be achieved in North

If the CWWTP were to remain its

Consolidation of the Cambridge

East Cambridge if the CWWTP remains in situ

in existing location, the full NEC development would not be delivered and therefore, fewer homes and jobs would be created.

See Planning Statement [REP1-049] paragraph 2.3.20.

Water Recycling Centre within Cambridge to provide a new treatment plant facility on the current site was considered as part of the business case supporting the HIF bid, which concluded that without the potential for housing, any redevelopment would not attract HIF type funding, and this would render a consolidation option unviable. Only three land parcels providing for residential development in the NECAAP lie outside the odour contours using Figure 1 from the 2020 updated Odour impact assessment as the worst-case scenario for what could take place with the CWWTP remaining in situ, totalling 1,425 dwellings. However, in the absence of the regeneration of the wider NEC area and the provision of a higher quality environment, it is uncertain whether the landowners would continue to support residential development in favour of other more suitable uses such as office and lab space. See LIR paras 6.34-6.35 and 6.98-6.101.

Relationship between the ReWWTP DCO and the emerging development plans

The progression of both the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) and Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP) are dependent on the WWTP being approved for relocation.

See Planning Statement [REP1-049] paragraphs 2.3.12 to 2.3.36.

The Council considers there is an interdependence between this DCO application process and the development plan process in so far as that process relates to the proposed redevelopment of the site of the existing Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant (CWWTP) and the surrounding area. The emerging North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) and Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP) are predicated on the relocation of the WWTP and can therefore only progress to Reg 19 consultation once there is evidence to demonstrate that the site is deliverable. The HIF provides evidence that the relocation is now viable after many years where this has not been the case. If the DCO is approved, that will provide evidence that the relocation can take place to a suitable alternative site. In turn, the emerging NECAAP and GCLP provide evidence to the DCO process of the significant planning benefits that relocation of the WWTP will enable to be

Weight to be given to emerging development plans and how the Examining Authority should avoid prejudicing the outcome of the emerging Local Plan and AAP examinations when attributing weight to those documents

A key part of the emerging development plans is to provide more homes and jobs across the Cambridgeshire district. Both the emerging GCLP and NECAAP emphasise the importance of the NEC in addressing these needs.

See Planning Statement [REP1-049] paragraphs 2.3.12 to 2.3.36.

delivered. See LIR paras 6.1, 6.36, 6.72 – 6.77 and 6.102 – 6.106.

While the Councils appreciate that the Proposed Submission draft of the NECAAP carries 'limited' weight in the determination of new planning applications under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 coming forward within the NEC area, the Councils are of the opinion that the draft NECAAP can be given considerable weight as a matter that is both important and relevant to the DCO application. In particular, the draft AAP is being prepared in accordance with the adopted 2018 Local Plans policies, in that it establishes the "amount of development, site capacity, viability, timescales and phasing of development" as required of the preparation of an Area Action Plan for the site within the extant Local Plan policies. In this context, the AAP is less about the principle of redevelopment and more about consideration of the amount and type of development that could be realised should

relocation of the CWWTP take place. Such considerations are informed by evidence base studies, community engagement, and responses to consultation. With respect to the emerging GCLP, the evidence supporting the local plan considers the locational merits of the NEC area against all other reasonable options and concludes it is the most sustainable location in Greater Cambridge for housing and employment development. See LIR para 6.107-6.110

Significance of North East Cambridge to the Cambridge Economy

NEC is a key strategic site in the Cambridgeshire area. It is a highly sustainable location and the relocation of the WWTP will provide the opportunity for 8,350 homes to be delivered alongside the creation of 15,000 new jobs, and provision of various community, cultural, and open space facilities in NEC.

See Planning Statement [REP1-049] Sections 1.1, 2.1 and 2.2.

The provision of 8,350 net additional homes would make a substantial contribution towards meeting Greater Cambridge's housing needs to 2041 and well beyond and would support the continue economic growth of the area and Greater Cambridge. The location of the existing CWWTP and surrounding area is in a key strategic location adjacent to Cambridge Science Park, a leading location for the technology sector, one of the key sectors in the nationally significant Cambridge economy.

<p><u>Government’s Cambridge 2040 initiative</u></p>	<p><u>Through the relocation of the WWTP, there will be an opportunity to develop the land it currently occupies for the NEC.</u></p> <p><u>See Planning Statement [REP1-049] Sections 1.1, 2.1 and 2.2.</u></p>	<p><u>See LIR paras 6.111-6.112.</u></p> <p><u>Government’s Cambridge 2040 initiative recognises the significance of the Cambridge economy and in respect of NEC is seeking to accelerate the relocation of the WWTP (subject to planning permission), and unlock an entire new City quarter.</u></p> <p><u>See LIR paras 6.113-6.115.</u></p>
<p><u>Benefits arising from vacation of the existing WWTP site</u></p>	<p><u>A number of benefits will be provided.</u></p> <p><u>See Section 4.2 and Table 4.3 below, and Planning Statement [REP1-049] Sections 2.1 and 2.2.</u></p>	<p><u>There is clear evidence through the emerging plan making processes in respect of the NECAAP and GCLP of the significant planning benefits that would be enabled by the relocation of the CWWTP site.</u></p> <p><u>See LIR paras 6.1, 6.29 – 6.33, 6.52 – 6.63 and 6.116.</u></p>

## 4.2 Benefits of the DCO Application and Project ~~[THIS SECTION (BLUE) IS STILL UNDER REVIEW BY CCC]~~

~~4.2.1—The benefits of the DCO Application and Project are set out in the Planning Statement (App Ref Doc 7.5).~~

~~4.2.2—The benefits arising from the Proposed Development are described at paragraphs 6.2.13 – 6.2.14 of the Planning Statement (Application document reference 7.5). These benefits fall under two headings and are summarised as follows:~~

- ~~i.—Benefits arising from the vacation of the existing WWTP site~~
- ~~ii.—Operational benefits arising from the proposed WWTP~~

~~4.2.3 — Decommissioning and release of the existing WWTP site will enable regeneration and the creation of a new district delivering 8,350 homes (40% affordable), 15,000 new jobs and a wide range of community, cultural and open space facilities (including a community garden and food growing spaces, indoor and outdoor sports facilities) on a brownfield site within the urban area of Cambridge.~~

~~4.2.4 — Specifically, relocation will deliver a 42 hectares brownfield site for redevelopment and release a further 35 hectares of land currently constrained to general industrial and office use on an area of land forming the gateway between Cambridge North station and the Cambridge Science Park which is identified in the Regulation 19 version of the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) as having the potential to provide:~~

~~On the existing WWTP site — 5,500 new homes~~

~~23,500 m<sup>2</sup> new business space~~

~~13,600 m<sup>2</sup> new shops local services, community, indoor sports and cultural facilities~~

~~2 primary schools and early years centres and land safeguarded for 1 additional primary school if needed (and space set aside for a secondary school if needed)~~

~~On the surrounding area — 2,850 new homes~~

~~105,000 m<sup>2</sup> new business space~~

~~5,000 m<sup>2</sup> re-provided business floorspace~~

~~23,200 m<sup>2</sup> re-provided industrial, storage and distribution space (B2 and B8)~~

~~Partial retention of existing commercial floorspace~~

~~6,100 m<sup>2</sup> new shops, community and cultural facilities (including community centre and indoor hall, health facility and visual and performing arts hub)~~

~~4.2.5 — The release of the existing WWTP site to enable the delivery of the regeneration benefits listed above is the rationale for this project. It will, however, deliver other benefits which are described at paragraphs 1.4.1 — 1.6.1, 2.2.1 — 2.2.17 and 6.2.13 of the Planning Statement (Application document reference 7.5). These can be summarised as:~~

~~4.2.6 — **Environmental benefits** through the delivery of a new modern, low carbon waste water treatment facility:~~

- ~~• significantly reducing carbon emissions (from being operationally net zero and energy neutral)~~
- ~~• improving storm resilience (by making storm overflows and CSOs less likely to occur)~~
- ~~• improving the quality of recycled water returned to the River Cam (by reducing concentration in final treated effluent discharges of phosphorus, ammonia, total suspended solids and BOD)~~

- ~~maximising public value and supporting the circular economy (by more efficiently and effectively recycling and re-using waste water in the interests of public health)~~
- ~~restoring and enhancing the surrounding environment (by increasing biodiversity by a minimum 20% complementing local initiatives such as the Cambridge Nature Network and Wicken Fen Vision)~~
- ~~substantially reducing the number of homes and properties which may potentially experience odour (when compared to the equivalent area for the Proposed Development)~~

4.2.7 ~~The commitment to higher energy efficiency, on-site renewable energy provision, high standards of design and sustainable transport measures are clear environmental benefits, representing a move towards a low carbon economy and promoting more sustainable means of travel. These are key objectives of the NPSWW and the NPPF and are environmental benefits that we consider should carry moderate weight.~~

4.2.8 ~~**Social benefits** through:~~

- ~~improving access to the countryside (by the delivery of new paths and accessible open spaces)~~
- ~~enhancing education (through the facilities provided in the Discovery Centre and increased access to the WWTP)~~
- ~~enhancing recreational opportunities (formalising recreational access and providing wider connectivity through new and enhanced public rights of way)~~

4.2.9 ~~The provision towards new recreational space and enhanced public rights of way, while necessary to mitigate the impact of the development, would also be available to everyone in the local area. These are social benefits of the scheme which we consider should carry moderate weight.~~

4.2.10 ~~**Economic benefits** through:~~

- ~~investment in construction and related employment for its duration~~
- ~~increasing operational employment~~
- ~~supporting planned population growth and urbanisation in Waterbeach (in water treatment terms)~~
- ~~increasing operational resilience and flexibility to accommodate population growth projections plus an allowance for climate change into the 2080s in accordance with Anglian Water's statutory duties and with capability to efficiently and economically expand within~~

the WWTP site to accommodate anticipated flows into the early 2100s in support of the spatial development strategy for homes and jobs set out in the emerging GCLP and the ambitions set out in the recent announcement by the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities on 24 July 2023 to ‘supercharge’ Cambridge as Europe’s science capital.

**Table 4.2: Details of the summary and status of agreement on the Benefits of the DCO Application and Project. [THIS SECTION (BLUE) IS STILL UNDER REVIEW BY CCC]**

<u>Benefits of the proposal</u>	<u>AW Comments</u>	<u>CCC Comment</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>Planning Benefits</u>	<p><u>Decommissioning and release of the existing WWTP site will enable regeneration and the creation of a new district delivering 8,350 homes (40% affordable), 15,000 new jobs and a wide range of community, cultural and open space facilities (including a community garden and food growing spaces, indoor and outdoor sports facilities) on a brownfield site within the urban area of Cambridge.</u></p> <p><u>Specifically, relocation will deliver a 42 hectares brownfield site for redevelopment and release a further 35 hectares of land currently constrained to general industrial and office use on an area of land forming the gateway between Cambridge North station</u></p>	<p><u>The Council recognises there are substantial planning benefits that would arise as a consequence of the development proposal, benefits that have been identified for over 20 years in Regional, Structure and Local Plans, but that have not been able to be delivered due to viability constraints. The HIF funding provides a once in a generation opportunity to address the viability issue that has prevented regeneration for decades. There is very little potential for regeneration of the CWWTP site and surrounding area of North East Cambridge Area without the relocation of the CWWTP. The District Council considers the benefits that would arise to be as set out in its LIR and as</u></p>	

and the Cambridge Science Park which is identified in the Regulation 19 version of the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) as having the potential to provide:

On the existing WWTP site -

- 5,500 new homes
- 23,500 m2 new business space
- 13,600 m2 new shops local services, community, indoor sports and cultural facilities
- 2 primary schools and early years centres and land safeguarded for 1 additional primary school if needed (and space set aside for a secondary school if needed)

On the surrounding area -

- 2,850 new homes
- 105,000 m2 new business space
- 5,000 m2 re-provided

business floorspace

- 23,200 m2 re-provided industrial, storage and distribution space (B2 and B8)

**Partial retention of existing commercial floorspace**

**Environmental Benefits**

**Environmental benefits** through the delivery of a new modern, low carbon waste water treatment facility:

- significantly reducing carbon emissions (from being operationally net zero and energy neutral)
- improving storm resilience (by making storm overflows and CSOs less likely to occur)
- improving the quality of recycled water returned to the River Cam (by reducing concentration in final treated effluent discharges of

phosphorus,  
ammonia, total  
suspended solids and  
BOD)

- maximising public  
value and supporting  
the circular economy  
(by more efficiently  
and effectively  
recycling and re-  
using waste water in  
the interests of  
public health)
- restoring and  
enhancing the  
surrounding  
environment (by  
increasing  
biodiversity by a  
minimum 20%  
complementing local  
initiatives such as  
the Cambridge  
Nature Network and  
Wicken Fen Vision)
- substantially  
reducing the number  
of homes and  
properties which  
may potentially  
experience odour<sup>4</sup>

(when compared to the equivalent area for the Proposed Development)

The commitment to higher energy efficiency, on-site renewable energy provision, high standards of design and sustainable transport measures are clear environmental benefits, representing a move towards a low carbon economy and promoting more sustainable means of travel. These are key objectives of the NPSWW and the NPPF and are environmental benefits that we consider should carry moderate weight.

---

**Social Benefits**

**Social benefits** through:

- improving access to the countryside (by the delivery of new paths and accessible open spaces)
- enhancing education (through the facilities provided in the

Discovery Centre and increased access to the WWTP)

- enhancing recreational opportunities (formalising recreational access and providing wider connectivity through new and enhanced public rights of way)

The provision towards new recreational space and enhanced public rights of way, while necessary to mitigate the impact of the development, would also be available to everyone in the local area. These are social benefits of the scheme which we consider should carry moderate weight.

---

### Economic Benefits

***Economic benefits*** through:

- investment in construction and related employment for its duration
  - increasing operational employment
  - supporting planned population growth
-

and urbanisation in Waterbeach (in water treatment terms)

- increasing operational resilience and flexibility to accommodate population growth projections plus an allowance for climate change into the 2080s in accordance with [the Applicant's Anglian Water's](#) statutory duties and with capability to efficiently and economically expand within the WWTP site to accommodate anticipated flows into the early 2100s in support of the [spatial development strategy for homes and jobs](#) set out in the [emerging GCLP](#) and the ambitions set out in the recent

announcement by the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities on 24 July 2023 to 'supercharge' Cambridge as Europe's science capital.

**Operational Benefits**

**Other Benefits**

<b>Statement/document on which agreement is sought.</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Agreement on the benefits arising from vacation of the existing WWTP site	Low	
Agreement on the operational and other benefits arising from the Proposed	Medium	

### 4.3 Alternatives ~~[THIS SECTION (BLUE) IS STILL UNDER REVIEW BY CCG]~~

- ~~4.3.1 — The Alternatives chapter of the Environmental Statement (Volume 2 Chapter 3 Site Selection and Alternatives) describes the site selection process and the approach undertaken by the Applicant to refine the design of the proposed Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project (CWWTPRP) and the alternatives which have been considered as the CWWTPRP has developed. The site selection exercise concluded that there are no alternative sites suitable for the proposed development within the built up area or outside of the Green Belt.~~
- ~~4.3.2 — It is agreed that the applicant followed a thorough and systematic criteria based approach to both the initial identification of potential sites and to the final site selection and that this provides robust justification for why areas of search were identified and dismissed or taken forward. The final site selection was also the subject of comprehensive public consultation and engagement.~~
- ~~4.3.3 — The North East Cambridge Area Action Plan (NECAAP) ‘Chronology’ report July 2021 provides a summary chronology of evidence prepared in the period between 1989 and 2021 which assessed the feasibility of regeneration of the CNFE/NECAAP area [add footnote to explain difference?] including consolidation or relocation of the Cambridge WWTP either on the current site or elsewhere. The chronology includes reference to the relevant development plans in place or being prepared at the time of those feasibility exercises, including the emerging NECAAP, shows that various studies conclude that consolidation of the Cambridge Water Recycling Centre within Cambridge City to provide a new treatment plant facility on the current site is not a feasible option. Following securing the HIF funding for the CWWTP relocation costs, it is confirmed that redevelopment of the WWTP area through relocating the WWTP off-site is a viable proposition.~~
- ~~4.3.4 — Section 4 ‘Area Action Plan and Reasonable Alternatives’ of the NECAAP Sustainability Appraisal November 2021 contains a description of the likely effects of the options for the overall development of the NEC site, having regard to different assumptions relating to the WWTP. Evidence supporting the emerging GCLP is clear that the NEC site is the most sustainable location for strategic scale development available within Greater Cambridge.~~
- ~~4.3.5 — The consequences, therefore, of no relocation are likely to be a significant reduction in the potential delivery of homes in NEC contrary to the objectives currently contained within the emerging joint GCLP. Since the enlarged NECAAP area (from the adopted 2018 Local Plans) is a key component of future pipeline housing and other development supply in the new plan period to 2041, loss of the full development potential of this area is likely to have a significant effect on the ability to provide housing (and associated community and cultural facilities) in this area and prevent the achievement of the NECAAP aim to rebalance an employment dominated part of Cambridge, achieving a sustainable mix of housing, work, retail and leisure and reducing the need to travel by exploiting its proximity to sustainable transport infrastructure including the guided busway, Cambridge North Station, cycling infrastructure and walking routes.~~

- 4.3.6 — The consequences, therefore, of no relocation are likely to be a significant reduction in the potential delivery of homes in NEC contrary to the objectives currently contained within the emerging joint GCLP. Since the enlarged NECAAP area (from the adopted 2018 Local Plans) is a key component of future pipeline housing and other development supply in the new plan period to 2041, loss of the full development potential of this area is likely to have a significant effect on the ability to provide housing (and associated community and cultural facilities) in this area and prevent the achievement of the NECAAP aim to rebalance an employment-dominated part of Cambridge, achieving a sustainable mix of housing, work, retail and leisure and reducing the need to travel by exploiting its proximity to sustainable transport infrastructure including the guided busway, Cambridge North Station, cycling infrastructure and walking routes.
- 4.3.7 — Cambridge City Council’s relevant representations (paragraph 25) recognise that “should the relocation of the CWWTP not occur, both the District Council and Cambridge City Council would have to try and identify and allocate other land within Greater Cambridge to meet the area’s strategic requirements for housing and employment”. Given that this exercise would need to align with the approach adopted to date for the development strategy in the emerging GCLP (ie to promote sustainability through provision of sustainable travel), the Councils acknowledge that “this would likely include consideration of other strategic locations, including the Edge of Cambridge in the Green Belt and New Settlements with high quality public transport connections to Cambridge”.
- 4.3.8 — In the absence of other available sites capable of strategic scale development available within Greater Cambridge (which are not already part of the Councils’ spatial development strategy for homes and jobs being proposed through the emerging joint GCLP), this exercise is likely to result in the need to allocate land in significantly less sustainable locations, either beyond the Cambridge Green Belt or within it.

**Table 4.3: Details of the summary and status of agreement on Alternatives.** [THIS SECTION (BLUE) IS STILL UNDER REVIEW BY CCC]

Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	Status	Comments
The evidence base supporting the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan concludes that, of all the spatial options considered, the NEC site (which includes the proposed development site) is the most suitable and sustainable location for development in Greater Cambridge.	Medium	
The feasibility studies conclude that consolidation of the Cambridge Water Recycling Centre within Cambridge City to provide a new treatment plant facility on the current site is not a feasible option.	Low	
The consequences of no relocation are likely to be a significant reduction in the potential delivery of homes in NEC contrary to the objectives currently contained	Medium	

within the emerging joint GCLP.

In the absence of other available sites capable of strategic scale development available within Greater Cambridge (which are not already part of the Councils' spatial development strategy for homes and jobs being proposed through the emerging joint GCLP), loss of the NEC for the delivery of new homes is likely to result in the need to allocate land in significantly less sustainable locations, either beyond the Cambridge Green Belt or within it.

Medium

CCC will defer to the Examining Authority to assess if the Application accords with the requirements of the EIA Regulations 2017

## 4.4 NPPF and Green Belt Policy

4.4.1 It is agreed that no part of the Order Limits overlap Green Belt land within Cambridge City's authority area. Therefore, any Green Belt policy relating to Green Belt in the adopted Cambridge Local Plan 2018 is not relevant to this project.

### 4.3.94.4.2

~~4.3.104.4.3~~ The Green Belt policy situation is set out in the Planning Statement (App Doc Ref 7.5). The policy requirement on Green Belt is as set out at Section 4.8 of the National Policy Statement on Wastewater, chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies 4 and S/4 of the adopted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans.

~~4.3.114.4.4~~ Section 4 of the Planning Statement (Application document reference 7.5) assesses the Proposed Development against the policies set out in the National Policy Statement for Waste Water March 2012 (NPSWW). In the context of the NPSWW policies relating to 'Land Use', and noting that a significant proportion of the project falls within Green Belt (as defined in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018), paragraphs 4.8.26 – 4.8.45 address the consistency of the Proposed Development to Green Belt policy which fundamentally aims to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraph 4.8.18 of the NPSWW (which mirrors paragraph 137 of the NPPF) directs the decision maker to resist inappropriate development in the Green Belt except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

~~4.3.124.4.5~~ The Green Belt purposes as set out in the NPPF are:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

~~4.3.134.4.6~~ Paragraph 2.30 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan sets out the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt:

- Preserve the unique character of Cambridge as a compact, dynamic city with a thriving historic centre;
- Maintain and enhance the quality of its setting; and
- Prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the city.

~~4.3.144.4.7~~ Policies 4 and S/4 of the adopted Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans respectively do not allow inappropriate development unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. However, they do allow for appropriate development including engineering operations.

~~4.3.154.4.8~~ The total area of land contained within the Draft Order Limits is XXX hectares. The land at Milton west of the Railway line and at Waterbeach north of Bannold Road totalling XX hectares is outside the Green Belt boundary. The remaining XXX hectares is within the Cambridge Green Belt. This is broken down as follows:

~~4.3.164.4.9~~ INSERT TABLE OF AREAS SETTING OUT WHAT IS NOT INAPPROPRIATE AND WHAT IS INAPPROPRIATE

~~4.3.174.4.10~~ The appropriate areas of the development are the access roads and the transfer pipelines.

~~4.3.184.4.11~~ The Outline [ ] has been produced to demonstrate [ ]

**Table 4.4: Details of the summary and status of agreement on NPPF and Green Belt Policy**

SoCG ID	Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	Status	Comments
	-Agreement on Green Belt Purposes	Low	
	-Agreement on areas inside and outside the Green Belt	Low	

~~Agreement on appropriate and inappropriate development~~

Medium

## 4.44.5 Biodiversity

~~4.4.14.5.1 The Environmental Statement App Doc Ref 5.2.8 identifies potential adverse impacts on ecological receptors and has been produced to demonstrate proposed mitigation and compensation as part of the project and is supported by the book of figures (App Doc Ref 5.3.8)~~

~~4.4.24.5.2 The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is set out in App Doc Ref 5.4.8.13.~~

~~4.4.34.5.3 The Habitats Regulation Assessment is provided at App Doc Ref 5.4.8.16.~~

**Table 4.5: Details of the summary and status of agreement on Biodiversity**

SoCG ID	Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	Status	Comments
	<del><u>Assessment Approach</u> The assessment presented in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity App Doc Ref 5.2.8 including the data gathering methodology, baseline, scope of the assessment and the assessment methodology set out is appropriate.</del>	Low	The Approach has been agreed within Technical Working Groups between 11 March 2021 and 18 November 2021.
	<del><u>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</u> The BNG report at App Doc Ref 5.4.8.13 and the outcome of the calculations for the measures habitat, hedgerow and river is appropriate.</del>	Low	Agreed
	<u>River Units</u> The calculation of the biodiversity net gain and how this will be secured in the dDCO requires further assessment.	Medium	Under review within biodiversity TWG 2 October 2023 to agree calculations and proposals to secure delivery of river units.

<p><u>Further details and comments on:</u>          Biodiversity Chapter 8 (App Doc Ref 5.2.8) Table 2-8          Appendix 8.4 Ornithology Baseline Technical Appendix          Appendix 8.8 Badger Technical Appendix          Preliminary Ecological Appraisal</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>For review and further discussion.</p>
--	---------------	---

## 4.54.6 Climate Resilience

4.5.14.6.1 The assessment of the effects, and their significance, of climate change as it applies to the infrastructure that forms the Proposed Development and also considers in combination climate impacts on the wider environment and community is set out in Chapter 9 of the ES (App Doc Ref 5.2.9).

4.5.24.6.2 The Assessment of the parameters of the climate assessment is presented from a sustainable construction point of view.

**Table 4.6: Details of the summary and status of agreement on Climate Resilience**

Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	AW Comments	SCDC Comments	Status
<p>The assessment presented in Environmental Statement Climate Resilience Chapter [Doc. Ref. 5.2.9] [APP-041] assessing the use of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA EIA Guide to Climate Change Resilience and adaptation 2020 and IEMA methodology for in combination climate impacts (ICCC) is appropriate including the data gathering methodology, the Rochdale parameters, future baseline of 2090-2099, and the use of the two assessment methodologies for identifying risks in extreme weather on infrastructure and processes as well as the impact of the project on the environment and community.</p>	<p><u>Assessment appropriate</u> <u>agreed</u></p>	<p>The District Council has assessed the possible impacts identified in the Climate Resilience Chapter of the ES [Doc. Ref. 5.2.9] [APP-041] from a sustainable construction view (rather than a flooding or drainage), and therefore the District Council’s comments focus on the receptor identified as physical infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>
<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> The mitigation proposed within App Doc Ref 5.2.9 at para 2.8</p>	<p><u>Assessment appropriate</u> <u>Agreed</u></p>	<p>The District Council notes that weather resilience measures for the</p>	<p><u>Medium</u> <u>Low</u></p>

are agreed.		construction phase have been outlined in Chapter 9 of the ES [Doc. Ref. 2.8.25] and it is important that these follow through into a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) as the proposed development progresses	
Secondary Mitigation Measures focus on management plans and the monitoring of impacts and management of impacts during the operational phase. These management plans should be secured either by way of a requirement or within a section 106 Agreement.	Review how secondary mitigation measures will be secured.	The District Council notes that weather resilience measures for the construction phase have been outlined in Chapter 9 of the ES [Doc. Ref. 2.8.25] and it is important that these follow through into a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) as the proposed development progresses	<b>Medium</b>
<u>Decommissioning</u> The scope of the assessment should include the construction and decommissioning.	Review paragraph 2.7 and table 2.8 Ap Doc Ref	This applies to Cambridge City Council only	

## 4.64.7 Carbon

4.6.14.7.1 This chapter presents the findings of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) completed in relation to the potential carbon emissions generated by the Proposed Development.

4.6.24.7.2 The Assessment is set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 10 (App Doc Ref 5.2.10).

4.6.34.7.3 An Outline is provided at Carbon Management Plan 5.4.10.2

4.6.44.7.4 The Planning Statement Strategic Carbon Assessment supports the Carbon chapter and carbon Management Plan and is set out at (App Doc Ref 7.5.2).

**Table 4.7: Details of the summary and status of agreement on Carbon**

Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	AW Comments	CCC Comments	Status
<p>The assessment presented in Environmental Statement Chapter 10 Carbon (App Doc Ref 5.2.10) assessing carbon emissions the use of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA EIA Guide to assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and their significance (2022) and the parameters of the assessment at paragraph 2.6 of App Doc Ref 5.2.10, and the baseline options for assessing the carbon emissions are appropriate.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The City Council is broadly satisfied with the approach to assessing carbon emissions as set out in the Carbon Chapter of the ES [Doc ref: 5.2.10] [APP-042] and the use of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) EIA Guide to Assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and their significance (2022).</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>
<p><u>The scope of the assessment</u>            The implications of decommissioning should form part of the whole carbon assessment. An assessment of the whole life carbon impact of relating to future development of the site should be included.</p>	<p>Review in conjunction with Strategic Carbon Assessment. (App Doc Ref 7.5.2).</p>	<p>The parameters of the assessment, including capital carbon from construction, transport of materials and construction works, emissions from land use change as well as the operation of the proposed ReWWTP are considered to be reasonable.</p> <p>It is noted that only limited construction will be undertaken within Cambridge City, mostly associated with the vent shaft and waste transfer tunnel.</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>

		<p>The combined construction, operational and decommissioning activities associated with the whole development, including development within South Cambridgeshire District at the ReWWTP site would generate in excess of 104tCO<sub>2</sub>e over its lifetime [Doc ref: 5.2.10] [APP-042]. The net whole life emissions of the proposed development preferred option (DCO) would lead to an estimated -32,330tCO<sub>2</sub>e due to avoided emissions from export of gas to grid. The alternative proposed development using Combined Heat and Power (CHP) engines (DM0), is estimated to give net emissions of 71,480tCO<sub>2</sub>e, clearly demonstrating the carbon emissions benefits of the proposed development preferred option (DCO).</p> <p>The City Council agrees with carbon emissions factors applied [Doc ref: 5.2.10] [APP-042]. There is a high level of uncertainty relating to future energy policy which affects the likely future baseline carbon intensity of national grid electricity</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>and gas supplies.</p> <p>As a result, this can impact the projected emissions avoided through the use of CHP and the export of biomethane to the grid. The City Council agrees with the Applicant's submission and considers it to be reasonable based upon current known data.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation</u> The securing of adequate mitigation measures to ensure future carbon reductions through later design stages and onsite construction activities is sought.</p>	<p>Review in conjunction with Carbon Management Plan App Doc Ref 5.4.10.2 and Requirement 21 of the dDCO.</p>	<p><u>Construction Mitigation</u> The City Council notes that the assessment demonstrates that carbon emissions from construction activities can be reduced by 48% when comparing the DM0 baseline with the DCO preferred development. This is mainly achieved through a change in the sand filtration process and a reduction in the size of onsite facilities such as tanks, tunnels and roads, saving on the processing of raw materials [Doc ref: 5.2.10] [APP-042]. The Applicant has a target to achieve a 70% reduction, meaning a further 22% reduction, (equating to just over 21,000 tonnes of CO2e), is still required. Secondary mitigating measures have been identified, such as:</p>	<p>Medium</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued innovation review;</li> <li>• Material specification, requiring low carbon intensity materials; and</li> <li>• Efficient construction</li> </ul> <p>It is noted that such savings will be achieved during the later design stages, and it is therefore important that a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [Appendix 2.1 Code of Construction Practice Part A CoCP Appendix 2.1 a [APP-068] is provided, and the whole life carbon assessment is updated as this detail becomes available.</p> <p><u>Operational Carbon Mitigation</u> The City Council notes in Section 4 of the Carbon ES Chapter [doc ref: 5.2.10] [APP-042], the Applicant refers to further measures to improve energy efficiency and generate renewable energy being evaluated further at design stage. This includes the installation of a 7mW solar photovoltaic array.</p> <p>The City Council considers it is</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>essential to ensure that the provisions of the Development Consent Order (DCO) include allowance for a continual process of refinement of information and data to be provided to the City Council. As the development scheme moves towards detailed design, it is important in the City Council's view that the most accurate information should be made available to inform the development.</p> <p>The City Council notes in Section 2.8 of the Carbon ES Chapter [doc ref: 5.2.10] [APP-042] that mitigation will be controlled through the DCO and that further carbon reductions will be achieved through later design stages and onsite construction activities (e.g., 22% shortfall in construction phase target). As this is a continually evolving area in relation to design, uncertainty in future energy policy and the impact on future carbon intensities, an outline of the timescales for monitoring, reviewing and updating the carbon emissions associated with this</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>project should be required in the City Council's view in order to ensure the most accurate information is available to inform the development and ensure the scheme is meeting standards and targets in relation to carbon.</p>	
<p><u>Requirements</u></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decommissioning of the ReWWTP has been excluded from the carbon assessment due to the long lifespan of the development. It is noted that there are no proposals for decommissioning before 2050 making attempts to quantify carbon emissions associated with this difficult. Although the City Council agrees that quantifying these emissions would be a best estimation, the implications of decommissioning should form part of the whole life carbon assessment.</li> <li>The City Council acknowledges that the ReWWTP development is designed for a long working life with the ability to adapt and expand in the future. This is positive from a climate resilience perspective, but</li> </ul>	

		<p>consideration should be made for quantifying the carbon impact of possible future expansion plans. Although it is assumed that expansion plans would be subject to separate planning applications if and when required, the City Council recommends a section should be included within the whole life carbon assessment relating to future development of the site and the potential carbon emissions resulting from this as this may impact on the deliverability of net zero aspirations.</p>	
--	--	---	--

## 4.74.8 Community

- [4.7.14.8.1](#) The Community Chapter of the Environmental Statement Chapter 11 (App doc Ref 5.2.11) presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) with specific relation to Community. Its purpose is to inform how the surrounding communities may be affected by the relocation of the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant.
- [4.7.24.8.2](#) The Assessment of is supported by Volume 3 - Book of Figures Community (App Doc Ref 5.3.11) and Environmental Statement - Volume 4 - Chapter 11 - Appendix 11.1 Community Questionnaire (App Doc Ref 5.4.11.1).
- [4.7.34.8.3](#) The Outline Community Liaison Plan (CLP) is provided at (App Doc Ref 7.8) and has been produced as part of the suite of Management Plans created from considering consultation responses.

**Table 4.86: Details of the summary and status of agreement on Community**

Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	AW Comments	SCDC Comments	Status
<p>The assessment presented in the Environmental Statement Chapter 11 Community (App Doc Ref 5.2.11) including the data gathering methodology, baseline, scope of the assessment and the assessment methodology set out is appropriate.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The District Council is generally in agreement with the methodology employed by the Applicant as set out in the Community Chapter of the ES [Doc 5.2.11] [AS-028]. The District Council considers that some of the impacts are beneficial to local communities. However, there are other impacts that will not have a positive impact.</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>
<p>Mitigation</p>		<p>The District Council recommends that cycle parking at the new facility would need to be sufficient to cater for staff requirements and should accord with adopted cycle parking standards. This can be secured by way of DCO requirements.</p>	
<p>The inclusion and approach adopted by the CLP (App Doc Ref 7.8) is agreed.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The District Council supports the inclusion of an on-going Community Liaison Plan as proposed in [Doc Ref 7.8] [AS-132] with the status of this as a</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>

<p><u>Public Rights of Way</u> The extent of the new bridleway and extension of the B1047 (as set out in the DDCO at Schedule 6 Part 2) to include equestrian use needs to be further considered, SCDC consider it would be beneficial to include equestrian access as part of the new circular route proposed to include equestrian access across the non-motorised user section of the Horningsea bridge.</p>	<p>It is not agreed that it is appropriate to include any further equestrian access within the proposed new Public Rights of way than is currently presented as the new bridleway between Low Fen Drove Way (byway 14) and Station Road as shown coloured purple on sheet 6 f the rights of way plans (App Doc Ref 4.6.6). The inclusion of Equestrian access across the existing Horningsea bridge is not considered appropriate for safely reasons.</p>	<p>live document. In respect of the Public Rights of Way the District Council notes that that the extension to the B1047 does not include equestrian use. The District Council considers that if the public benefit of the proposals is to be fully realised, it would be beneficial to include bridleway use as part of this circular route which would connect to new developments at Marleigh as well as Cambridge.</p>	<p style="background-color: #00FF00; text-align: center;">High</p>
<p><u>Recreational Use</u> The impact of additional recreational pressure on the Low Fen Way grassland and hedges County Wildlife site as referenced within the Landscape Ecology and Recreational Management Plan (LERMP) (App Doc Ref ) and the effect of further recreational impact from future development should be considered further.</p>	<p><del>Proposals for the monitoring of any recreational pressure is set out within the draft S106 Agreement. SCDC to review the draft section 106 agreement at (App-Doc-Ref ).</del> <u>The Applicant has proposed and held the first Combined Recreational pressure group on 24 January 2024. This combined group will continue to address the concern regarding potential recreational pressure on the area as the result of new development in North East Cambridge. The aim of the group is to continue beyond the CWWTPRP and facilitate wider long-term strategic discussion. The Applicant</u></p>		<p style="background-color: #FFD700; text-align: center;">Medium</p>

	<u>Anglian Water</u> is not seeking to be the leader of the forum/group but is happy to facilitate its administrative set up and continue to be part of this for the future. It is not accepted that the new development will be the cause of recreational impact. This will come from growth from residential developments.		
<b>Mitigation Requirements</b>		The District Council recommends that cycle parking at the new facility would need to be sufficient to cater for staff requirements and should accord with adopted cycle parking standards. This can be secured by way of DCO requirements.	

## 4.84.9 Health

4.8.14.9.1 The Environmental Statement Volume 4, Chapter 12 (App Doc Ref 5.2.11) provides the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) completed in relation to the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on health.

The Assessment is supported by Volume 3 - Book of Figures Health

[4.8.24.9.2](#) The Assessment is supported by Volume – Book of Figures (App Doc Ref 5.3.12) and Appendix 12.1 Health Screening (App Doc Ref 5.4.12.2) and Chapter 12 - Appendix 12.3 Health Evidence Review (App Doc Ref 5.4.12.3).

**Table 4.97: Details of the summary and status of agreement on Health**

Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	AW Comments	SCDC Comments	Status
<p><u>Assessment Approach</u> The assessment presented in Environmental Statement Chapter 12 Health (App Doc Ref 5.2.11) including the data gathering methodology, geographical study area, baseline, scope of the assessment and the assessment methodology set out is appropriate.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The City Council agrees with the approach taken by the Applicant to the assessment and the methodology of health impacts associated with the proposed development as outlined in Chapter 12 of the ES (Health) [Doc.Ref.5.2.12] [APP-044].</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>
<p><u>Range of Stakeholders</u> CCC seek further clarity on the acceptance of the range of stakeholder consulted as part of the consultation process.</p>	<p>Review Consultation summary report and/or discuss further</p>	<p>The City Council is not clear from the stakeholder engagement details provided [Doc ref 5.2.11] [AS-028] if any proactive engagement was undertaken with the Gypsy, Roma, Traveller (GRT) community. There are 2 sites within close proximity to the site, at Milton and on Fen Road. To ensure this minority ethnic group is adequately</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>

		<p>represented, the City Council consider that all on going community engagement plans/strategies should involve this cohort.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that whilst the pre application consultation was wide it is noted that the level of response was low [Doc ref 5.2.11] [AS-028]. Therefore, the City Council considers that there needs to be active engagement along the lines suggested to protect the interests of previously identified vulnerable population groups.</p>	
<p><u>Traffic Monitoring</u> CCC will continue to review if adequate provision within the Traffic Management Plans, including the Construction Management Plan has been included to ensure the impact of construction traffic is adequately monitored, including the Community Liaison Plan and that adequate mitigation has been included.</p>	<p>For further review within outline Management Plans within Traffic and Access TWG.</p>	<p>In respect of Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (ES Chapter 19, Appendix 19.7) [Doc ref 5.4.19.7], [AS-109], the reports states that controls will be put in place to prevent construction traffic from travelling through Cowley Road and Milton Road. The CMTP also sets out [Section 6.9 of the CTMP [Doc ref</p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>

		5.4.19.7], [AS-109] also sets out that construction traffic must avoid the AM and PM peak periods as well as school pickup and drop off hours. The City Council therefore requests that the details of how this will be monitored, reported and enforced be provided within the CMTP.	
<p><u>Health and Wellbeing</u></p> <p>The assessment approach and methodology presented within the Health Mental Wellbeing Impact Assessment is appropriate, but clarity is sought as to how this will be further monitored and mitigated and secured within the provisions of the dDCO.</p>	Further Requirement within dDCO sought. For discussion.	In respect of the mental health and wellbeing assessment [Appendix 12.3, App Doc Ref 5.4.12.3] [AS-077, the City Council is satisfied that baseline measurements have been taken however is it is noted that 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. The City Council considers t this information needs to be provided.	<b>Medium</b>
<p><u>Community Liaison Plan</u></p>		The City Council considers that provision needs to be made within the Community Liaison	

		<p>Plan to ensure effective engagement with identified vulnerable population groups including the Gypsy, Roma, Traveller (GRT) community is undertaken.</p> <p>The City Council supports the provision of a Community Liaison Plan (CLP) as proposed in [Doc Ref 7.8] [AS-132] to be put in place to proactively inform local communities and stakeholders of any scheduled construction works and the potential duration of those works. Works falling outside of agreed core working hours should be made clear, along with any potential obstruction to PRowS, businesses, facilities and local infrastructure.</p>	
--	--	--	--

## 4.94.10 Historic Environment

~~4.9.14.10.1~~ The Historic Environment of the Environmental Statement (App Doc Ref 5.2.13) reports on the likely impact of the Proposed Development on the Historic Environment. This chapter considers built heritage, archaeological remains and historic landscape.

~~4.9.24.10.2~~ The Assessment of impact is set out in the Historic Environment Baseline Assessment at App Doc Ref 5.4.13.1.

~~4.9.34.10.3~~ The Assessment is supported by the Gazeteer of Assets (App Doc Ref 5.4.13.2) the Historic Landscape Classification (App Doc Ref 5.4.13.3) and the Historic Environment Impact Assessment tables (App Doc Ref 5.4.13.4).

~~4.9.44.10.4~~ The plans and figures in support are set out in the Historic Environment Plans (App Doc Ref 4.17) and the Book of Figures (App Doc Ref 5.3.12).

**Table 4.8: Details of the summary and status of agreement on Historic Environment**

SoCG ID	Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	Status	Comments
	<del>The collation of available heritage data, archaeology and built heritage surveys, setting assessments and geophysical surveys are adequate.</del>	Low	Agreed
	<del>The proposed approach to assessing impact upon the historic environment/heritage assets and the historic characterisation exercise and the Archaeological Investigation Strategy is appropriate.</del>	Low	Agreed
	<del>The lighting strategy proposed as part of the Environmental Statement is appropriate to mitigate the visual impact on heritage assets.</del>	Low	Agreed
	<u>Classification</u> <del>The impact assessment in respect of Biggin Abbey as a “temporary minor adverse impact” paragraph 4.2.12 (App Doc Ref 5.2.13 Table 2-2)</del>	High	Not agreed this classification reflects the impact given the period of construction.
	<del>The operation of the proposed development in the opinion of SCD equate to minor/moderate adverse effect not the negligible adverse effect presented.</del>	High	

<p>The overall assessment conclusion that the proposed development will cause less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets is agreed, however the level of adverse effects from the proposed landscape mitigation is greater than expressed in the assessment.</p>	High	Impact of mitigation proposals not agreed
--	------	---

### 4.104.11 Landscape and Visual Amenity

~~4.10.14.11.1~~ The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) assesses the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on landscape and visual amenity during construction, operation and decommissioning. The study area for the assessment includes the area largely within 2km of the Scheme Order Limits.

~~4.10.24.11.2~~ The Assessment of LVIA is set out in Chapter 15 of the ES (App Doc Ref 5.2.15) and is supported by the LVIA Methodology at Chapter 15 Appendix 15.5 App Doc Ref 5.4.15.5

~~4.10.34.11.3~~ The book of supporting figures is produced at 5.3.15.

**Table 4.9: Details of the summary and status of agreement on Landscape and Visual Amenity.**

SoCG ID	Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	Status	Comments
	<p><u>Assessment Approach</u> The assessment presented in Environmental Statement Chapter 15 (App Doc Ref 5.2.15) including the data gathering methodology, baseline, scope of the assessment and the assessment methodology set out is appropriate.</p>	Low	Agreed
	<p><u>Methodology</u> Clarification is sought on the language used for the assessment. Major, Moderate, Minor and Negligible is identified however the LVIA uses terms, large, moderate, slight and negligible. The methodology refers to guidance documents GLVIA 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. The</p>	Medium	To confirm correct terminology and reference to guidance documents for Examination.

<p>Landscape Institute Technical Guidance note 2/19 Residential Visual Amenity should also be referenced.</p>		
<p><u>Design Approach</u>          The design approach and its suitability in the location is not agreed. The implementation and resilience of the landscape solution (including planting on the elevated bund) requires clarification during examination for suitability. Consideration of alternative measures, monitoring and mitigation should the trees and vegetation in the location fail to thrive should be included in the Landscape Ecology and Recreational Management Plan (App Doc Ref 5.4.8.14) including the suitability of the use of the soils excavated from the footprint and pipeline excavations for the elevated bund.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>For further review and discussion in Examination.</p>

## 4.114.12 Air Quality Land Quality and Contamination

4.11.14.12.1 The Air Quality Land Quality chapter of the ES presents the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on Land Quality and Contamination during its construction, operational and decommissioning phases.

4.11.24.12.2 The Assessment of Air Quality is set out in 5.2.7 Environmental statement - Volume 2 - Chapter 7 - Air Quality (App Doc Ref 5.2.7) and supporting Air Quality Assessment Method 5.4.7.1 ES Volume 4 Chapter 7 Appendix 7.1 (App Doc Ref 5.4.7.1)

4.11.34.12.3 The supporting figures are provided at 5.3.7 Environmental Statement - Volume 3 - Book of Figures Air Quality

**Table 4.10: details the summary and status of agreement on ~~Air Quality~~ Land Quality and Contamination**

<b>Statement/document on which agreement is sought.</b>	<b>AW Comments</b>	<b>SCDC Comments</b>	<b>Status</b>
<u>Assessment Approach</u>		Land contamination is briefly discussed within Chapter 14 of The Environmental Statement [Doc ref 5.2.14] [AS-032]. In general terms, the City Council considers the contamination and land quality assessment to be acceptable.	
<b>Mitigation</b>		The City Council will not require any specific construction mitigation measures. Notwithstanding the absence of a site-wide full ground investigation report, the City Council notes a potential risk to any contractor involved in decommissioning works on the existing site, particularly where any excavations are required. However, this is a matter of standard site health and safety procedure and falls within the remit of the Health and Safety Executive.	
<b>Requirements</b>		Decommissioning works at the existing site to be completed in full and fully in accordance with the Decommissioning Plan. This will ensure that there is no potential for any continued contamination of subsurface soils.	

## 4.124.13 Odour

[4.12.14.13.1](#) The Odour chapter of the ES Chapter 18 (App Doc Ref 5.2.18) presents the potential impacts of the Proposed Development from odour on sensitive receptors and the surrounding environment during its construction, operational and decommissioning phases.

[4.12.24.13.2](#) The Assessment of odour impacts and receptors is set out in the ES Volume 4 chapter 18, Odour Impact Assessment (App Doc Ref 5.4.18.2)

[4.12.34.13.3](#) The assessment is supported by the Book of figures ES Volume 3 Chapter 18 (App Doc Ref 5.3.18).

[4.12.44.13.4](#) A Preliminary Odour Management Plan has been produced at ES Volume 4 Chapter 18 Appendix 18.4 (App Doc Ref 5.4.18.4).

**Table 4.11: details the summary and status of agreement on Odour**

Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	AW Comments	SCDC Comments	Status
<p><u>Assessment Approach</u> The assessment presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2 Chapter 7 Air Quality (App Doc Ref 5.2.7) including the data gathering methodology, baseline, scope of the assessment and the assessment methodology set out is appropriate.</p>	<p><u>Agreed</u> <del>More detailed assessments of the impacts will be undertaken as part of the local impact report</del></p>	<p>In general terms the methodology in respect of odour impact assessment [Doc. Ref. 5.2.18] [APP-050] is considered acceptable in principle.</p>	<p><u>Low</u></p>
<p><b>Mitigation</b></p>		<p><u>Construction and Decommissioning Mitigation</u> The recommended construction related odour mitigation is detailed in Part A and B of the Code of Construction Practice</p>	

		<p>(CoCP) – (Appendix 2.1 – A and 2.2-B of App Doc Ref 5.4.2.1 &amp; 5.4.2.2)[ APP-068 and APP-069] sets out how potential odour impacts arising from activities associated with connecting into and diverting existing sewers and decommissioning will be managed.</p> <p>Odour may be released when connecting the new transfer tunnel to the existing sewerage and when the existing waste water flows are diverted to the ReWWTP during construction. The opening up of existing sewers may result in temporary odour releases, but it is agreed that this is not expected to last for a period of more than four weeks. In order to mitigate this potential impact an air extraction system will be put in place and a mobile odour filtration unit located adjacent to the sewer shafts as noted in [Doc. Ref. 5.2.17] [APP-049]</p> <p><del>To ensure effective odour control, regular site inspections by the person accountable for odour issues on site is proposed to be undertaken during construction to minimise the risk of causing nuisance and/or loss of amenity. An inspection log will be kept and made available to the overseeing authority on request.</del></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>During the decommissioning process as set out in section 4.4 (Decommissioning), subsections 4.4.1–4.14 (Pages 58–60) of Chapter 18 of the ES [Doc. Ref. 5.2.18] [APP-050] tanks will be drained through the existing treatment process as far as reasonably practical. Any residual sludge that cannot be pumped to the sludge treatment process within the primary settlement tanks, aeration tanks or final settlement tanks will be removed via suction pump and either taken offsite for treatment or treated onsite via a temporary pasteurisation process such as a quick lime dosing plant. These processes as the City Council understands it are usually sealed; however, the resulting cake can be odorous. If necessary, this cake will remain on site for as little time as possible. It is stated in Section 4.4.6 (Magnitude of Impacts) of Chapter 18 (Odour) of the ES [Doc. Ref. 5.2.18] [APP-050] that odour suppression equipment will be utilised where appropriate to minimise any offsite impacts. Any further site-specific measures will also be identified in the approved Decommissioning Plan which is currently provided as an outline document as part of the DCO application (Outline Decommissioning Plan, Application, doc</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><a href="#">ref. 5.4.2.3) [AS-051].</a></p> <p><u>Operational Mitigation</u> To mitigate operational odours associated with the proposed permanent 10m high waste water transfer tunnel vent stack (WTTVS) the Applicant proposes a carbon filter (located at Shaft 1) to reduce odour emission and provision for a chemical dosing facility (located on the existing WWTP upstream of Shaft 1) to prevent septicity and therefore odour formation.</p> <p><a href="#">The City Council has no objection to the odour mitigation measures proposed.</a></p>	
<p><b>Requirements</b></p>		<p>The City Council understands that compliance with the measures proposed for the construction and decommissioning stages, set out within the Outline Decommissioning Plan, CoCP A and B [Doc ref 5.4.2.1 and 5.4.2.2] [APP 068 and APP 069] will be secured by requirements contained in the DCO (App Doc Ref 2.1). This will include a requirement for the preparation and approval of a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan(s) (CEMP) which will be supported by a series of topic-based management plans</p>	

		<p>as appropriate. These requirements should in the City Council's view ensure that any adverse negative construction and decommissioning odour impacts will be mitigated and minimised to an acceptable level.</p> <p>For operational odours a requirement is proposed in the draft DCO for a detailed odour management plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority. It is agreed that the detailed odour management plan must be in accordance with the measures in the preliminary odour management plan and the principles and assessments set out in the relevant part of the ES (as reflected in Appendix 18.4 of doc ref. 5.4.18.4 [AS-106]). This includes reference to the proposed 10m high waste water transfer tunnel vent stack (WTTVS) with a carbon filter (located at Shaft 1) and provision for a chemical dosing facility to prevent septicity and therefore odour formation and reduce odour emission.</p>	
--	--	--	--

## 4.134.14 Lighting

~~4.13.14.14.1~~ The Environmental Lighting Impact Assessment (ELIA) has been prepared to assess the potential effects from artificial lighting on sensitive receptors and the surrounding environment for the construction, operation and maintenance phases of the proposed development.

~~4.13.24.14.2~~ The Assessment of the impacts of lighting is set out in ES Chapter 15 (App Doc Ref 5.2.15) and is informed by the Lighting Design Strategy is provided at Volume 4 Chapter 2 Appendix 2.5 (App Doc Ref 5.4.2.5) and the Code of Construction Practice (Appendix 2.1 App Doc Ref 5.4.2.1)

~~Table 4.12: details the summary and status of agreement on Lighting.~~

<del>SoCG ID</del>	<del>Statement/document on which agreement is sought.</del>	<del>Status</del>	<del>Comments</del>
	<del><u>Assessment Approach</u></del> <del>The assessment presented in Environmental Statement Chapter 15 (App Doc Ref 5.2.15) including the data gathering methodology, baseline, scope of the assessment and the assessment methodology set out is appropriate.</del>	Low	<del>More detailed assessments of the impacts will be undertaken as part of the local impact report</del>

## 4.144.15 Noise & Vibration

~~4.14.14.15.1~~ Noise and vibration impacts have been assessed during the construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning phases of the proposed development.

~~4.14.24.15.2~~ The Assessment of noise and vibration is set out in ES Chapter 17 (App Doc Ref 5.2.17) together with supporting figures and appendices.

~~4.14.34.15.3~~ The Noise and Vibration Guidance Policy is set out in the Environmental Statement Chapter 17 Volume 4 (Ap Doc Ref 5.4.17.1) and the outcomes of the assessment are produced at Environmental Statement Volume 3 Book of Figures Noise and Vibration (App Doc Ref 5.3.17).

~~4.14.44.15.4~~ An outline [ noise management plan is provided at as part of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan CEMP [App Doc Ref) this is secured in Requirement [ ] of the draft DCO (App Doc Ref )

~~4.14.54.15.5~~ The Outline Operational Noise management plan has also been produced to demonstrate how noise and vibration would be managed during the operation of the proposed development. This is secured in Requirement [ ] of the draft DCO (App Doc Ref).

**Table 4.13: Details the summary and status of agreement on Noise and Vibration**

Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	AW Comments	SCDC Comments	Status
<p><u>Assessment Approach</u> The assessment presented in Environmental Statement Volume 2 Chapter 17 Noise and Vibration (App Doc Ref 5.2.17. including the data gathering methodology, baseline, scope of the assessment and the assessment methodology set out is appropriate.</p>	<p>The Approach has been agreed within TWGs.</p>	<p>The City Council is generally satisfied with the scope, methodology and conclusions derived as set out in (Chapter 15) of the ES [Doc ref.5.2.17] [AS-036].</p> <p>However as raised previously with the Applicant, at the pre application consultation stage the City Council takes issue with the ‘Table 2-7: Receptor sensitivity criteria’ [Doc. Ref. 5.2.17] [APP-049] – please refer to the City LIR Doc ref XXXX]</p>	<p><b>low</b></p>
<p><u>Assessment conclusion</u> Subject to the implementation of agreed mitigation measures there will be no likely significant noise and</p>	<p>Agreed</p>		<p><b>Low</b></p>

<p>vibration effects during the construction, operation or decommissioning of the proposed development. Xref mitigation section of App Doc Ref 5.2.17</p>			
<p><u>Construction and Environment Management Plan (CEMP)</u>          The CEMP refers to consent being sought pursuant to section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1961. The preference is to disapply this provision and for the CEMP to provide the regulatory framework to operate.</p> <p>Regular monitoring of any complaints should be dealt with via SCDC Environmental Health Department. Complaints received should be recrded and notified within the Community Liaison Plan or notification mechanism secured through the draft DCO requirements.</p>	<p>Applicant to review CEMP and disapplication of section 61</p> <p>Applicant to review securing mechanism for reporting to SCDC of any complaints. The recommendation is within the Community Liaison Plan</p>	<p>The City Council recommends that the CEMP provides the primary regulatory framework for the developer to operate within rather than utilising the S.61 consent through the Control of Pollution Act 1974.</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>
<p><b>Mitigation</b></p>		<p><u>Construction / Decommissioning Mitigation</u>          Additional secondary mitigation measures during construction are to be implemented as set out in the Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES [Doc Ref. 5.2.17] [AS-036], which includes the provision of solid site hoarding/acoustic barriers around construction compounds in select areas close to receptors, restriction of working hours to avoid sensitive times of the day and application of</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>

		<p>measures and Best Practicable Means (BPM) in accordance with BS 5228. These measures are reflected in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP Part A and B) [Doc. Ref. 5.4.2.1 &amp; 5.4.2.2] [APP 068 and APP 069]. This will include a requirement for the preparation and approval of a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan(s) (CEMP) which will be supported by a series of topic-based management plans.</p> <p>The City Council agrees that, with the implementation of construction / decommissioning noise mitigation measures as proposed, moderate adverse noise and vibration impacts would be avoided or reduced, and the resulting effects would not be significant.</p> <p><u>Operational Mitigation</u> Within the City no operational noise mitigation is proposed as no adverse impacts are envisaged. However, in the City Council's view, the Applicant should provide further operational noise information and impact assessment for the WWTTVS</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>chemical dosing facility as noted above. Until this is provided for consideration it is not possible to conclude that no operational noise mitigation will be required.</p>	
<p><b>Requirements</b></p>		<p>During the construction and decommissioning stages, compliance with the measures set out within the Outline Decommissioning Plan, CoCP A and B will be secured by the requirements contained in the DCO (Doc. Ref. 5.4.2.3) [AS-051]. It is noted that this will include a requirement for the preparation and approval of a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan(s) (CEMP) which will be supported by a series of topic-based management plans e.g., decommissioning and noise and vibration management plans as appropriate.</p> <p>The City Council considers that the CEMP or alternatively a separate requirement imposed through the DCO should also ensure that any</p>	<p><b>Low</b></p>

		<p>adverse construction and decommissioning noise impacts will be mitigated and minimised to an acceptable level.</p> <p><del>The City Council notes that the CoCP Part A CEMP [APP 068] [DOC ref 5.4.2.1] makes reference to the consideration of S.61 consent notices under the Control of Pollution Act (CoPA) being sought. This should be clarified owing to the potential dual regulation through both the planning and environmental health legislation (section 61). The City Council recommends that the CEMP provides the primary regulatory framework for the developer to operate within rather than utilising the S.61 consent through the CoPA.</del></p>	
--	--	---	--

#### 4.154.16 ~~Traffic & Transport~~

~~4.15.14.16.1~~ The Assessment of traffic and transport is set out in Environmental Chapter 19 (App Doc Ref 5.2.19) together with supporting figures, plans and appendices. The Assessment has considered the effects of the Proposed Development on the local transport infrastructure in year 3 of construction (currently assumed to be 2026) which is the expected peak year of vehicle movements, in Year 4

(assumed to be 2028) for decommissioning of the existing Cambridge WWTP and operation of proposed WWTP in the expected year 1-1 of operation and then for year 1 plus five and ten years (expected to be 2028, 2033 and 2028 respectively).

~~4.15.24.16.2~~ The Assessment is supported by the Book of Figures at App Doc Ref 5.3.19 and the Traffic Regulation Order Plans at App Doc Ref 4.7.

~~4.15.34.16.3~~ In addition a series of management plans have been produced to demonstrate how Traffic and Access would be managed during the construction and operation of the proposed development including; Construction Traffic Management Plan App Doc Ref 5.4.19.7, Operational Workers Travel Plan (App Doc Ref 5.4.19.8) and Construction Workers Travel Plan (App Doc Ref 5.4.19.9).

**Table 4.14: Details of the summary and status of agreement on Traffic and Transport**

SoCG ID	Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	Status	Comments
	<p><u>Assessment Approach</u> The approach and structure of the Traffic Assessment (Appendix 19.3 App Doc Ref 5.4.19.3) to include; Policy review, baseline transport conditions, collision data analysis, development proposals, trip generation, distribution and assignment, junction capacity modelling and impact assessment and mitigations measures is appropriate.</p>	Low	Agreed
	<p><u>Temporary Road Closures</u> Temporary Road closures in the ownership of CCC are set out in Schedule 5 of the dDCO Streets to be temporarily closed. Such closures must be mitigated to ensure safe flow across junctions and across links.</p>	Medium	
	<p><u>Access to works</u> Access to works across roads in the ownership of CCC are set out in Schedule 7 of the dDCO Access to works. Effective control of arriving and departing vehicles, particularly HGV's alongside monitoring process for enforcement is required. The mechanism for implementing this process will form part of</p>	Medium	Further review of proposed management plans required for agreement.

discussion regarding the management plans.		
<u>Assessment of Access options</u> CCC has raised concerns about the choice of access in comparison with a direct vehicle access from the A14.	High	Not Agreed
<u>Public Rights of Way</u> Public Rights of way to be temporarily closed for which a substitute is to be provided are set out in Schedule 6 Part 1 of the dDCO. The impact of these closures must be minimized through the CEMP to ensure the safety of users of the rights of way and access to key infrastructure such as the Fen Ditton Primary School.	Medium	Further review of draft CEMP to confirm alternatives and mitigation presented is appropriate and agreed.

## 4.16.17 Waterbeach New Station Development

4.16.14.17.1 The order limits and the layout of the Waterbeach long pipeline section are set out in the Design Plans (App Doc Ref 4.14).

**Table 4.15: Details of the summary and status of agreement on development plan for Waterbeach New Station**

SoCG ID	Statement/document on which agreement is sought.	Status	Comments
	-CCC is aware of and has been engaged in discussions regarding the development of the Waterbeach New Station and the proposed change to the Order limits to reduce conflict during the installation of the Waterbeach rising mains and the overlap with the CWWTPR order limits and those submitted by SLC Rail, as the design developer of the Waterbeach New Station for and on behalf of the Greater Cambridge Shared Partnership. Ongoing engagement is agreed to manage planning and delivery timings particularly around access.	Medium	Review and on going engagement



## 5 Agreement on this SoCG

5.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground has been jointly agreed by:

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Position:** \_\_\_\_\_

**On behalf of:** **Anglian Water Services Limited**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Position:** \_\_\_\_\_

**On behalf of:** **South Cambridgeshire District Council**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 1 Summary of Pre-Application engagement.

SoCG ID	Matter	Record of agreement
<b>Engagement Process</b>		
	<p>The parties accept the need for pre-application engagement to minimise risk of abortive or unnecessary pre-application submission work or the need for additional assessment post application submission and are willing to attend <a href="#">TWG Technical Working Groups</a> when available and one to one meetings, if needed.</p>	<p><a href="#">TWG Technical Working Group</a> 11 March 2021</p>
<b>Agriculture and Soil Resources</b>		
	<p><del>Anglian Water and CCC agree the need for and the proposed scope of the Agricultural Land Classification and Soil Management Plan and the adequacy of the Land Quality Assessment, Guidance to be followed in assessments to include; land contamination, sensitivity criteria and magnitude of impact.</del> <del>Anglian Water and CCC agree the mitigation measures proposed in the CoCP to ensure works do not cause contamination of soils or impact upon human health.</del></p>	<p><del>Biodiversity TWG dated 26 April 2022</del> <del>Environmental Health TWG dated 29<sup>th</sup> April 2022</del></p>
<b>Air Quality</b>		
	<p>The Applicant and CCC agree the methodology applied to the Air Quality Assessments, the guidance to be followed in assessments and maximum design</p>	<p>Environmental Health TWG 29<sup>th</sup> April 2022. [email Kathryn Taylor to</p>

scenarios and assessment criteria.

Officers 29<sup>th</sup> April 2022  
and follow up e-mail  
dated [24/06/22 ]

### **Biodiversity**

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree the approach to the EIA, the proposed Species for detailed ecology surveys for 2021 and scoping assessment, the potential impacts to statutory designated sites and the potential impact to non-statutory designated sites.~~

~~Technical Working Group  
meeting 11 June 2021~~

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree the methodology and assessments used for the EIA in advance of submission of the EIA scoping report~~

~~Technical Working Group  
18 August 2021~~

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree Proposed approach to the PEIR and topics for the Environmental Information Papers~~

~~Technical Working Group  
18 November 2021~~

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree what was presented at Consultation Phase 3 and mitigation summary presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and LERMP.~~

~~Technical Working  
Group 3 February 2022~~

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree that Biodiversity Metric 3.0 will be used to calculate and evidence the Biodiversity Net Gain (“BNG”) requirements for the project. It is also agreed that Anglian Water will share the full details of the calculations including annotative drawings showing the classification, condition and size of each parcel of land for CCC to assess and comment upon.~~

~~Technical Working  
Group 3 February 2022~~

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree the commitment to maintain BNG habitats for a minimum of 30 years and accept the Biodiversity Assessment scope.~~

~~Technical Working  
Group 26 April 2022.~~

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree that a minimum of 20% BNG will be delivered by the project.~~

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree the mitigation proposals for water voles and badgers and the management through Natural England Licences. the Wildlife Management Plan.~~

~~Workshop meeting 14 June 2022.~~

### Carbon

The Applicant ~~Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree the assessment of Carbon presented within the PEIR and how it has been addressed at decommissioning and the wider carbon implications of the project and the link to the North East Cambridge AAP.

Meeting 20<sup>th</sup> June 2022

### Climate Resilience

The Applicant ~~Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree the design and proposals for storm management and that the process are flexible for adaption to climate change.

Technical Water Meeting with CCC consultants 17<sup>th</sup> May 2022

The Applicant ~~Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree the need for a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to be submitted with the DCO. The assessment will cover the NPA's<sup>1</sup> requirements and the NPPF <sup>2</sup>guidance, the design flood standard will be 1:100 and will consider climate change.

### Historic Environment

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree that the collation of available heritage data, archaeology and built heritage surveys, setting assessments and geophysical~~

~~Technical Working Group 7 December 2021~~

<sup>1</sup> National Planning Statement for Waste Water section 4.4.4 and 4.4.7

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/69505/pb13709-waste-water-nps.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69505/pb13709-waste-water-nps.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> NPPF section 160 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1005759/NPPF\\_July\\_2021.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf)

~~surveys are adequate.  
 Anglian Water and CCC agree the LVIA viewpoints proposed for Consultation Phase 3 and Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV's)~~

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree the proposed approach to assessing impact upon the historic environment/heritage assets and the historic characterisation exercise.  
 Anglian Water and CCC agree the Archaeological Investigation Strategy and approach to PEIR~~

~~Technical Working Group  
 1 February 2022~~

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree the lighting strategy proposed as part of the Environmental Statement will mitigate the visual impact on heritage assets.~~

~~Environmental Health  
 SoCG Meeting 15 June 2022~~

**Landscape and Visual**

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree the mitigations proposed within the Landscape masterplan, CTMP, CoCP adequately minimise the impacts of visual impact during construction.~~

~~Workshop 15 June 2022~~

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree the LERMP responds to the guidelines in the Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment (2021).~~

**Noise and Vibration**

~~The Applicant Anglian Water and CCC agree the proposed overview of the noise, odour and air assessments in the PEIR as presented in Consultation Phase 3 and the overview of the noise, odour and air impacts mitigation commitments and proposed Community papers.~~

~~TWGechnical Working Group  
 1 February 2022~~

~~The Applicant Anglian Water and CCC agree the guidance to be followed in noise~~

~~Environmental Health~~

and vibration assessments, maximum design scenarios, assessment criteria, significance construction and operational noise and proposal for Environmental Statement.

~~The Applicant Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree the tunnelling and pipeline impacts and assessments and the need for Community Liaison Officer.

TWG 29<sup>th</sup>-April 2022.  
[email Kathryn Taylor to Officers 29<sup>th</sup> April 2022 and follow up email dated 24<sup>th</sup> June 2022 ]

### Odour

~~The Applicant Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree the Odour Assessment to be undertaken in accordance with best practice guidance IAQM's *Guidance on the assessment of odour for planning* Version 1.1 – July 2018, Emission rates – as measured at existing WWTW for comparable processes or UK Water Industry Research (UKWIR) Odour Control in Wastewater Treatment emission rates, Mitigation measures considered in line with the NPS Statement for Waste Water and that the objective will be “Negligible” impact at receptors (as defined in IAQM's guidance)

~~The Applicant Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree the assessment methodology for the odour management plan, the guidance to be followed in assessments and the mitigation measures relevant to Odour. Maximum design scenarios and qualitative assessment.

~~TWG Technical working Group~~ 12 May 2021

Environmental Health  
TWG 29<sup>th</sup>-April 2022.  
[email Kathryn Taylor to Officers 29<sup>th</sup> April 2022 and follow up email dated [ 24<sup>th</sup> June 2022 ]

### PROW

~~Anglian Water and SCD agree that there is unlikely to be an increased impact of anti social behaviour as a result of the project and the Environmental Assessment that anti social behaviour is likely to diminish.~~

~~PRoW TWG 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2022~~

### Recreation

~~Anglian Water and CCC agree the scope and assessments undertaken to inform the Landscape, Ecological and Recreational Management Plan (LERMP) and the measures set out in the CoCP and CTMP. (scope and assessments agreed but topic remains under discussion)~~

**Traffic and Access**

~~The Applicant Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree the approach and structure of the Traffic Assessment to include; Policy review, baseline transport conditions, collision data analysis, development proposals, trip generation, distribution and assignment, Junction capacity modelling and impact assessment and mitigations measures. April 2021

~~The Applicant Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree the assessment work carried out on the site access options to determine a single option to take forward to the Environmental Impact Assessment and Traffic Assessment. ~~TWG Technical Working Groups~~ 26 April 2021  
28 May 2021 and  
17 September 2021

~~The Applicant Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree the results of the optioneering assessment and junction capacity assessment and assessment proposed to inform final decision on access option. ~~TWG Technical Working Group~~ 6 October 2021

~~The Applicant Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree with the scope of traffic surveys undertaken to inform the traffic Assessment and environmental assessment work together with the Junction capacity Assessment methodology, and junctions to be assessed. ~~TWG Technical Working Group~~ 22 January 2022

~~The Applicant Anglian Water~~ and CCC agree the update to the Traffic Assessment Scoping note and the scope of the proposed checking surveys. 12 April 2022

The Applicant Anglian Water and CCC agree the proposed management plans included in the PEIR, CoMP, CTMP, Application of Best Practicable Means (BTM) and the CTMP and CEMP for Consultation Phase 3. TWG Technical Working Group  
28 April 2022

Anglian Water and CCC agree that the TTRO's required for Traffic Management will not be included in the DCO. Meeting 13 May 2022

The Applicant Anglian Water and CCC agree the scope of the 2021 traffic data checking surveys and Junction assessment summary to inform the Traffic Assessment. TWG Technical Working Group  
30 June 2022

### Water Resources

The Applicant Anglian Water and CCC agree the scope and assessment of Hydrological Impact assessment and agree that the risk of contaminant movement through the ground water is unlikely to move through the groundwater at sufficient concentrations or speed to impact any sensitive receptors. Technical Water Meeting  
17<sup>th</sup> May 2022

## Get in touch

You can contact us by:



Emailing at [info@cwwtpr.com](mailto:info@cwwtpr.com)



Calling our Freephone information line on **0808 196 1661**



Writing to us at **Freepost: CWWTPR**

You can view all our DCO application documents and updates on the application on The Planning Inspectorate website:

[https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/cambri  
dge-waste-water-treatment-plant-relocation/](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/cambri<br/>dge-waste-water-treatment-plant-relocation/)