

REBUTTAL STATEMENT

MATTER 6: TRANSPORT AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE

**North Essex Authorities Shared Strategic (Section 1) Plan –
Further Hearing Sessions**

**SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF L&Q, CIRRUS LAND LIMITED, AND
GATEWAY 120**

December 2019

Contents

1 Introduction..... 5

2 Water Supply / Resources 6

3 Waste Water Treatment..... 7

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This statement has been prepared on behalf of L&Q, Cirrus Land Limited, and Gateway 120, who together form the West Tey Delivery Partners behind the majority landholdings within the Colchester Braintree Borders Garden Community (CBBGC).

1.2 This Statement has been prepared as a rebuttal to specific matters raised within parties Hearing Statements in regards to Matter 6 – Transport and Other Infrastructure.

1.3 This statement has been produced as a rebuttal to CAUSE evidence, specifically with reference to water supply and waste water treatment issues in relation to the West Tey site being promoted by the West Tey Delivery Partners.

2 WATER SUPPLY / RESOURCES

- 2.1 CAUSE has raised issues that there is no certainty that sufficient water can be supplied to the Garden Communities (GCs) proposed in the Section 1 Plan.
- 2.2 Anglian Water (AW) has published a Revised Draft Water Resources Management Plan, which has just been approved by DEFRA. This outlines various methods of increasing supply to the area to meet the planned level of growth, with all measures proposed being funded by AW as part of its standard business planning process.
- 2.3 AW's strategy will involve demand management, recycling and generally improving the efficiency of the network. In addition there are a number of proposals to share water resources with adjoining Resource Zones.
- 2.4 The Integrated Water Management Strategy (IWMS) produced by Aecom states that water demand generated by the garden communities can potentially be accommodated through a combination of water supply options.
- 2.5 During our own discussions with AW, officers have stated that they do not envisage any major constraints which would prevent them from providing the required demand for the GCs given the anticipated delivery programme and lead in time. However, further work is required to finalise the preferred options.
- 2.6 The initial phase of the West Tey site is intended to be served from the existing Great Tey reservoir, which will be provided with reinforcement main to ensure sufficient supply is provided as the development progresses.
- 2.7 It is intended that the development will incorporate the highest level of water efficiency within the residential development, targeting a water usage of less than 110 l/per person/per day. We are also proposing to install various levels of water recycling, including domestic level rainwater harvesting, and grey water recycling from the potential new Waste Water Works, all which will reduce the level of potable water demand required. There are no barriers that would prevent these measures being implementable within the GCs.
- 2.8 In summary we do not believe that there are any major constraints which would prevent a suitable water supply to be provided to serve the full extent of the development proposed at West Tey.

3 WASTE WATER TREATMENT

- 3.1 CAUSE has raised a number of issues in relation to the proposed waste water treatment strategy for the West Tey site, stating that the IWMS recommended option of pumping 13km to Colchester waste water works has not been shown to be feasible, nor has sufficient evidence been provided that the Delivery Partners' proposal of a new Waste Water Treatment Works in addition to improvements to the Coggeshall Waste Water Treatment Works is feasible.
- 3.2 CAUSE is referencing a new article that AW ha posted on its website with reference to a £6.5m investment for a 3km pipeline that has been completed for a water transfer scheme in Norfolk. There are no details or further information in relation to the cost breakdown of this scheme or features that have been included, therefore we feel it is inappropriate without further details of this scheme to use this as a direct comparison.
- 3.3 The budget of £13.3m which Hyas has allowed for the construction of a new 13km long pumped sewer main connection to the waste water works at Colchester, details of which has been taken from the IWMS, would provide a budget allowance of around £1,000 per m. At this stage of the scheme development this figure would seem to be a reasonably robust allowance.
- 3.4 CAUSE has questioned whether our proposal for the initial phases of the West Tey development to be served by Coggeshall works are feasible. Whilst the Coggeshall works will need to be upgraded, there is sufficient operational land available on the site to enable the required upgrade. In addition, the 4km of pumping main will be mainly across farm land with very few constraints, and as this main will be serving the initial development phases of up to 2,500 dwellings, this will be relatively cost effective to construct, as the size of the pipe will be relatively small and will not require any special construction methods. The cost of this rising main has been allowed within our infrastructure costings, which has allowed £3m for the initial connection works.
- 3.5 CAUSE also raise doubts in relation to ability for a new Waste Water Treatment Works to be provided to serve the West Tey site. It is normally AW's responsibility to pay for the cost of any new sewage treatment works, with the developer only responsible for paying for the cost of the main required to reach a suitable connection point in the system. However, in order to ensure that there is no delay in bringing forward the delivery of the GC, a budget allowance of £6m has been allowed for the establishment of a new Waste Water Works, with a further allowance of £6m for an extension, with later phases being funded through the Asset Management Period process as the development progresses. This budget has been taken from a similar scheme of the same size which can be fairly readily extended. The works will either discharge in a controlled manner into Domsey Brook or the River Blackwater.

- 3.6 With respect to the statement of why the IWMS has discounted this option, AW has recently advised that it is keen to investigate alternative options to that outlined in the IWMS, with the construction of a new works in the West Tey area being one of those to be considered further. The benefit of a works being located near to the site allows water recycling and water efficiency measures to be incorporated. AW is also looking at the improvement of some of the other nearby sewage works, such as Eight Ash Green and Coggeshall as ways of potentially providing the capacity required.
- 3.7 The option of pumping into a works that discharges into the River Colne will significantly help the potential water balance equation for the overall development, as this will provide additional resources for water supply abstraction further down the system.