

Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation Project
Anglian Water Services Limited

Applicant's Response to ISH5 Action Points

Application Document Reference: 8.31
PINS Project Reference: WW010003
APFP Regulation n/a

Revision No. 01
12th April 2024

Action points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 5 (ISH5)	2
Action Point 1.....	2
Action Point 2.....	2
Action Point 3.....	3
Action Point 4.....	3
Action Point 5.....	3
Action Point 6.....	3
Action Point 7.....	3
Action Point 8.....	4
Action Point 9.....	5
Action Point 10.....	5
Action Point 11.....	5
Action Point 12.....	6
Action Point 13.....	7

Action points arising from Issue Specific Hearing 5 (ISH5)

Action Point 1

Update Noise and Vibration [REP6-033] and Air Quality [REP6-013] Environmental Statement (ES) chapters relating to traffic and transport changes and provide a note to explain no updates needed to other ES chapters which draw on traffic data or the conclusions of the transport assessment (such as Biodiversity, Community, Health, Historic Environment, Landscape and Visual and Cumulative).

The Applicant has updated ES Chapter 7 Air Quality (App Doc Ref 5.2.7) and ES Chapter 17 Noise and Vibration (App Doc Ref 5.2.17), as well as Table 1-5 within ES Appendix 17.3 Construction Noise Assessment (App Doc Ref 5.4.17.3) to incorporate the minor difference in assessment numbers as a result of the updated construction vehicle numbers and provided this update at Deadline 7.

The Applicant has amended Chapter 7 Air Quality (App Doc Ref 5.2.7) in section 1, Introduction, to include a paragraph 1.1.4, which setting out that some of the values presented in this Chapter and Appendices have been superseded but that the changes in vehicle movements, for both the construction and operation phase, are of a marginal and non-material quantity with respect to the air quality assessment and that there is no requirement to update the quantitative assessment and there is no change to the conclusions presented in Section 5 of the ES Chapter 17.

No other ES Chapters or associated appendices require updates or amendments.

The Review Note of Chapter 19 Updates Implications for other ES Chapters (App Doc Ref 5.4.19.14) provided at Deadline 7 provides a full explanation of the impact of the changes to vehicle movement numbers on the ES Chapters.

Action Point 2

Update Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part A [REP6-049] para 3.1.10 to accord with the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the Emergency Services [REP6-106]. Check for other instances of agreed positions not being reflected in mitigation plans.

As set out in the Applicant's Response to Rule 17 Request for Further Information PD-014 (App Doc Ref 8.30) Question 9, the Applicant has updated paragraph 3.1.10 of the Code of Construction Part A (App Doc Ref 5.4.2.1) provided at Deadline 7 to reflect the wording agreed with the Emergency Services in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).

The Applicant has reviewed the SoCGs for the remaining stakeholders and made revisions to the Statement of Common Ground for the Cambridgeshire County Council (App Doc Ref 7.14.4), Code of Construction Practice Part B (App Doc Ref 5.4.2.2), Outfall Management and Monitoring Plan (App Doc Ref 5.4.8.24) and Design Code (App Doc Ref 7.17) for Deadline 7 to ensure they accurately reflect the agreed positions.

Action Point 3

Landscape, Ecological and Recreational Management Plan (LERMP) Figure 3.12 [REP6-065] – update to show 4.3km walking route (pink).

The Applicant can confirm that the 4.3km walking route on Figure 3.12 of the LERMP (App Doc Ref 5.4.8.14) is an omission and should have been removed from the key as part of the amendments to the Figure at Deadline 6. Figure 3.12 has now been updated to remove this from the key to the figure, this is reflected in the version submitted at Deadline 7.

Action Point 4

Operational Workers Travel Plan (OWTP) [REP5-079] – update to reflect any commitments that might be made in relation to future travel behaviour / sustainable transport measures (as outlined by Mr Axon).

ES Appendix 19.8 Operational Workers Travel Plan (App Doc Ref 5.4.19.8) has been updated to include an appendix that reflects the commitments made by the Applicant to future travel behaviour/sustainable transport measures. This is reflected in the version submitted at Deadline 7.

Action Point 5

CoCP Part A [REP6-049] – include specific reference to Sundays and bank holidays being excluded from non-exceptional working patterns in Table 5-1.

The Applicant has updated Code of Construction Practice Part A (App Doc Ref 5.4.2.1), Table 5-1, Winter and Summer Core working hours to make specific reference to the exclusion of Sundays and Bank Holidays from these working hours. This is reflected in the version submitted at Deadline 7.

Action Point 6

Review Save Honey Hill Group (SHHG) comments [REP6-134] regarding traffic and transport matters raised.

The Applicant has reviewed the response from Save Honey Hill on the traffic and transport matters provided at Deadline 6. The Applicants response to this can be found in the Applicant's Response to Deadline 6 Submissions (App Doc Ref 8.29) provided at Deadline 7.

Action Point 7

ES Chapter 19, Table 5-1 [REP6-037] – check all potential effects are captured and update as necessary, also clarifying matters around Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) during operation.

Revision 8 of the ES Chapter 19 (App Doc Ref 5.2.19), provided at Deadline 7, has been updated to show that during operation, abnormal and hazardous loads would not be expected as part of normal operation of the proposed WWTP. Abnormal and hazardous loads may only ever be required in exceptional events such as during maintenance of critical infrastructure or plant replacement, which is expected to happen very infrequently. If

required, they would be dealt with through the normal ways in which statutory undertakers deal with such matters, for example discussions with the police.

Action Point 8

ES Chapter 19 [REP6-037] – include an explanation as to why driver delay at Junction 34 is no longer an issue when impacts had been identified in previous iterations of the ES.

The IEMA assessment guidance 'Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic' (GEART) (IEMA, 1993) notes that delays are only considered significant when the road network in the vicinity of development is already operating at or close to capacity. For signalised junctions, this is considered to be where the Degree of Saturation (DoS) exceeds 90% in keeping with the definition of Practical Reserve Capacity (PRC) in the LinSig 3.2 User Guide (JCT Consultancy Ltd, March 2021).

In Revision 04 of ES Chapter 19 Traffic and Transport (App Doc Ref 5.2.19), junction 34 of the A14 was assessed as operating with a maximum DoS of over 90% during construction and operation of the proposed WWTP. Consequently, an assessment of driver delay was undertaken and a major effect on driver delay, which is significant, was reported on the B1047 Horningsea Road during construction and operation of the Proposed Development before mitigation. With the mitigation included in the various management plans, this effect was reduced to a slight effect, which is not significant.

However, a review of the traffic modelling and its reporting was carried out after ISH3, which uncovered an over-estimation of background traffic flows, leading to an over-assessment of the level of congestion on junction 34 of the A14. This issue was corrected in Revision 06 of ES Chapter 19 Traffic and Transport (App Doc Ref 5.2.19), submitted at Deadline 6, and as a result the assessment indicated that junction 34 of the A14 would operate well within capacity during construction, decommissioning (of the existing Cambridge WWTP) and operation of the Proposed Development. Consequently, the unmitigated major effect on driver delay at junction 34 of the A14 was removed.

Paragraph 4.2.96 in Revision 8 of ES Chapter 19 Traffic and Transport (App Doc Ref 5.2.19), provided at Deadline 7, explains why an assessment of driver delay at junction 34 of the A14 is no longer required during construction of the proposed WWTP. This cross refers to Table 9-8 in the Transport Assessment (TA) Part 1 (App Doc Ref 5.4.19.3) which demonstrates that junction 34 of the A14 would operate within capacity in both the 2026 Future Baseline and during the Combined Construction Peak with a maximum DoS of 59% and 79% respectively. As junction 34 of the A14 operates with a maximum DoS below 90%, a detailed assessment of driver delay is not required during construction of the proposed WWTP.

Paragraph 4.3.25 in Revision 8 of the ES Chapter 19 Traffic and Transport (App Doc Ref 5.2.19), provided at Deadline 7, explains why an assessment of driver delay at junction 34 of the A14 is no longer required during operation of the proposed WWTP. This cross refers to Table 9-17 in the TA Part 1 (App Doc Ref 5.4.19.3) which demonstrates that the junction would operate within capacity in both the 2038 Future Baseline and in the operational phase, with a maximum DoS of 66% and 74% respectively. As junction 34 of the A14 operates with a

maximum DoS below 90%, a detailed assessment of driver delay is not required during operation of the proposed WWTP.

Action Point 9

ES Chapter 19 [REP6-037] – address / clarify SHHG concerns regarding what constitute 'local junctions' in paragraph 4.3.20.

ES Chapter 19 Traffic and Transport (App Doc Ref 5.2.19) paragraph 4.3.20 bullet 1, sub bullet 1 has been amended to replace the reference to 'local junctions' with 'junction 34 of the A14'.

Action Point 10

ES Chapter 19 [REP6-037] – review Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movement limitations in Waterbeach and consider whether restrictions between the hours of 0930 to 1330 should be expanded to all times rather than just school term times.

The restrictions agreed with CCoC in respect of the construction routes in Waterbeach are 09.30 to 15.30 from Monday to Friday during school term times. The Applicant made this commitment in response to requests made by local stakeholders not in response to a need to mitigate traffic impacts. To apply this restriction year round would impact upon the Applicant's ability to carry out programmed construction activities, which would potentially prolong the construction phase for the Proposed Development. Therefore, the Applicant does not believe it appropriate to extend these restrictions to outside of school term times.

Action Point 11

Review wording of the outline Operational Logistics Traffic Plan [REP6-082] and Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP6-080] (and any references in ES Chapter 19) as per second to fourth bullet points under section 2(d) of the ISH5 agenda [EV-009a]. Consider signage in conjunction with geofencing. Would provisions during construction and operational phases relate to sub-contractors' vehicles as opposed to just Anglian Water Services Limited's HGVs?

The Applicant has updated the Construction Traffic Management Plan (App Doc Ref 5.4.19.7) to change the references from construction deliveries to construction vehicles over 3.5 tonnes.

The Applicant has considered the inclusion of signage in conjunction with geofencing and has consulted Cambridgeshire County Council for its opinion as the managers and maintainers of road signage however at the point of Deadline 7 submission had not received a response.

The Applicant is of the opinion that signage is not necessary because a geofencing system will be used to monitor HGVs at the site to ensure they are adhering to the approved routes. Once the proposed WWTP access is operational (subject to approval by Cambridgeshire County Council as the Local Highways Authority and any other relevant stakeholder

Section 8.2 of the OLTP (App Doc Ref 5.4.19.10) has been updated to confirm that for any HGV movements that are not subject to geofencing, the wording within contractual documents that the Applicant may enter into with third party contractors shall notify the contractor of the requirement to adhere to routing restrictions in relation to journeys to and from the proposed WWTP.

The Applicant considers that the provision of additional signage is unnecessary and would add to street clutter.

Action Point 12

Clarify necessity of 'general' equestrian measures in s106 [REP6-098] rather than just signage as in previous version.

The [Cambridgeshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan \(ROWIP\) Update April 2016](#) was first adopted in 2006 in line with the requirements of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2002. The 2016 update summarises the progress made since 2006 and sets out future challenges for rights of way and countryside access to 2031 in the form of updated Statements of Action. It includes Action SOA1 'Making the countryside more accessible' which under Guiding Principle 1 states that "*countryside access provision should be physically accessible to the widest possible range of people. Management and improvement of the existing Cambridgeshire Rights of Way network should aim to increase that accessibility, while new countryside access provision should generally be planned to avoid imposing restrictions*". Action SOA3 '72,500 new homes' under Guiding Principle 3 states that "*where appropriate, development should contribute to the provision of new links and/or improvement of the existing rights of way network*". Action SOA5 'Filling in the Gaps' Guiding Principle 5 states that "*countryside access provision should build on the platform of the historical network to meet the needs of today's users and land managers*" and that the Council "*will continue to work with colleagues and developers to ensure equestrian needs are considered during scheme development*".

In response to requests from the County Council and National Highways, the Applicant amended the Proposed Development to include works to raise the parapet height on the bridge over the A14 to 1.8m to allow safe equestrian use of the shared cycle/footpath which forms part of the Horningsea Greenway from Cambridge to Horningsea (and links to other PRoW in the area). Mounting and dismounting blocks have been provided on either side of the A14 overbridge for equestrian users and the contribution is targeted at signage associated with this and for the provision of measures to support increased use by and safety of equestrian users within the vicinity of the Proposed Development. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, signage, crossing, junction and surface improvements within the highway, and will serve to enhance the amenity of the new equestrian access across the A14 and the new bridleway created by the development.

This contribution meets the requirements of paragraph 3.1.7 of the National Policy Statement for Waste Water insofar as it is considered by both the Applicant and CCoc to be relevant to planning, necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning

terms, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the Proposed Development, and reasonable in all other respects.

Action Point 13

Clarify position on section 106 (anti-social behaviour) [REP3-052] and Applicant's position that it is not to be finalised.

The Applicant has responded to this matter as part of the response to Q13 in the Applicant's Response to Rule 17 Request for Further Information (App Doc Ref 8.30) provided at Deadline 7.

Get in touch

You can contact us by:



Emailing at 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/cambridge-waste-water-treatment-plant-relocation/>