

Environment Agency representations

*Q1. In order to accommodate the proposed growth, improvements are required to several Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) to ensure that the increased waste water flow discharged does not impact on the current quality of the receiving watercourses, their associated ecological sites and also to ensure that the watercourses can still meet with legislative requirements.*

*The Stage 2a assessments have shown that improvements beyond conventionally applied technology are required in Whittlesey (due to physical constraints in the Middle Level drainage area).*

*What implication, if any, is this likely to have on the deliverability and phasing of planned growth in Whittlesey?*

### **Waste water Infrastructure**

The Environment Agency did not raise any soundness issues regarding policy CS11.

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.

Whilst discharge consent flows may be exceeded for Whittlesey in scenario 1 of the 2011 Stage 2a Water Cycle Study (page 20), 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 we recommended 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. Pumped outfall issues remain.