

Submission by Fen Ditton Parish Council

For 2 April 2024

This is FDPC’s submission at D6 with references to ISH5, the DCO (REP5-003), revised Drainage Strategy (REP4-074).

FDPC reaffirms its support to SHH and their submissions.

Reference	FDPC Response	References to Documents
<p>ISH5 and DCO Hedgerows to be Retained</p>	<p>At ISH4 FDPC confirmed that there are hedgerows in the Parish that are not shown on the DCO Hedgerow Plans (REP5-020) despite the notes on the plans stating that hedgerows to be retained are shown. The hedge on the west side of Horningsea Road and the north side of Filly Lane in the field south of Poplar Hall are two examples of hedgerows missing from the Plans. FDPC are willing to work with the Applicant to correct the Hedgerow Plans although are concerned that the need for such correction by the Applicant was not picked up in the Action Points from ISH5. FDPC will review the Hedgerow Plans due at D6.</p> <p>At the end of the hearing, Mr Jones explained that the eastward facing arm of the proposed 4 way junction did not require an ‘opening in a hedgerow’ to be shown on the Plans because the vegetation there had been classed as ‘shrub and trees’. This distinction had been advised to Mr Jones by the Applicant outside the Hearing.</p> <p>FDPC remain concerned about the inaccuracy of the Hedgerow Plans and the overall ambiguity as to which areas of vegetation must be retained whether classed by the Applicant as “Hedgerow” or “shrub and trees”.</p>	<p>Hedgerow Plans (REP5-020)</p>
<p>ISH5 and DCO Limits of Deviation</p>	<p>At ISH4 FDPC expressed concern that raising the outfall structure by up to 0.5m, the LoD, could create additional flooding due to backwater effects. The Applicant confirmed that the flood model was too coarse to predict such an impact. Please refer to SHH’s submission on this topic.</p>	
<p>ISH5 and Water quality assessment and flood risk</p>	<p>At ISH4 FDPC noted that the Waterbeach Pipeline South would, once connected to the existing works, add immediately to the treated discharges from the existing WRC and there was no confirmation that the existing works could achieve the requirements of the future Interim Revised Effluent Permit.</p>	

	<p>FDPC also noted that the impact of the additional flood flows into the River Cam from the Waterbeach Pipeline South in the Interim Condition had not been considered.</p>	
<p>Drainage Strategy (REP4-074) and the Black Ditch</p>	<p>After discussion with SHH, this submission is made by FDPC on behalf of both parties after review of the updated drainage strategy submitted at D4 [REP4-074]. The Applicant has noted that SHH would review the document before responding further.</p> <p>SHH and FDPC note CCoC 's response to ExAQ2 item 21.9 in which CCoC welcomed the changes to the Drainage Strategy. SHH and FDPC accept that the principle of returning all drainage flows from inside the bund through the proposed WRC has been rejected. Instead, the design requires that areas deemed to produce uncontaminated runoff never produce contaminated water under any future circumstances.</p> <p>SHH and FDPC draw ExA's attention to the lack of a failsafe design that would prevent contamination of the Black Ditch and, potentially Quy Fen SSSI. A simple design solution would be to include the potential to temporarily block off the flow from inside the bund while a contamination event is addressed. This could be achieved, for example, by provision of valves on the exit pipes or stoplog grooves in the outlet structures from the balancing ponds. The ExA is requested to direct the Applicant to include a suitable measure in the Drainage Strategy or obtain confirmation from CCoC that the issue would be addressed later as part of Requirement 15.</p>	<p>Drainage Strategy (REP4-074)</p> <p>CCoC response to ExAQ2 (REP5-118)</p>