

Q11. Policy CS3 contains a note that relates to development at Wimblington and Doddington.

(a) In light of the possible constraints in relation to the capacity of the sewage network referred to, is the inclusion of these villages as 'Growth Villages' justified having regard to all reasonable alternatives?

(b) (b) By what means will the Council be satisfied that capacity is available to accommodate a development in Wimblington or Doddington?

Waste water Infrastructure

The Environment Agency did not raise any soundness issues regarding policy CS3.

We are not aware of any reasons why upgrades to waste water networks cannot be dealt with adequately through the Water Industry Act and developer requisition process. The Environment Agency regulates sewer overflows and would take appropriate action for any significant increase in spill incidents recorded.

Whilst discharge consent flows may be exceeded for Doddington, the Fenland Stage 2a Water Cycle Study (WCS) did not identify a Water Framework Directive limitation for a new consent. However, before development is approved, developers should demonstrate this with 'present time' evidence in consultation with Anglian Water (AW) and the Environment Agency.

We propose that this is dealt with via a policy criteria in policy CS16 similar to that for March – see Matter 9.

We are keen to prevent an occurrence of non-mains drainage, including tankering, which could proliferate if there were non-delivery of mains drainage.

Proposed Solution:

We propose that, in line with our representation to Matter 16 [CS16] on water quality, that developers are required by CS16 to address water quality.

Developers should demonstrate, through application submissions, that there is uncommitted capacity within waste water discharge consents. Any possible exceedance of the consented flow (as a result of proposed development) should be phased with infrastructure provision without water body deterioration or resource intensive treatment methods.

This could form part of CS16 as could be covered in Matter 16 and a joint EA, Anglian Water and Fenland DC position statement.

Volumetric Discharge to IDB Drains

As regards the volumetric discharge issues (from Water Recycling Centres) being negotiated between Anglian Water and the Middle Level Commissioners, the Environment Agency does not have a role to play given that related *main river* capacity is not a significant issue in this location. The discharge into a receiving drain appears to be an issue.

The inspector may be referred to a situation where the Environment Agency helped enable a solution to delivering 20,000 homes in South Cambridgeshire (Uttons Drove catchment). This involved works to a main river channel. At the time of writing, no solution has been reached for the pumped outfall, around ten years on.