Dear Sir/Madam

RELOCATED RAILWAY STATION COMPRISING PLATFORMS, PEDESTRIAN BRIDGES, ACCESS ROAD, PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ROUTES, CAR AND CYCLE PARKING, WITH OTHER ASSOCIATED FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

LAND BETWEEN CODY ROAD AND RAILWAY, NORTH OF WATERBEACH, CAMBS - FURTHER DETAIL.

Further to our letter of objection, dated 14 March 2018, we have received revised flood risk information from the applicant.

We have reviewed the breach model and associated model memo and are unable to withdraw our objection to the proposed development for the following reasons:

Insufficient information has been provided to allow us to determine whether the model is fit for purpose. As such, it is unclear whether the flood risk at the site has been adequately assessed.

**Detailed Comments on the Model**

The following information needs to be provided to allow us to undertake a full review of the model:

- A list of the structures included in the model to confirm structure representation.
- All information available on the culverts underneath the railway line.

The following issue should also be addressed:

The 1 in 100 year CC (Breach - 99e) mass balance is outside the recommended -1% tolerance (peak of -1.4%). The mass balance is outside the tolerance range for most of the run. Please either improve the mass balance (if possible) or acknowledge the model limitations in the model memo.
Detailed Comments on Model Memo

It is understood that inflows from the 2012 model have been used and uplifts for climate change applied. Although this is appropriate, no information has been included in the memo regarding how the model hydrology was derived. A paragraph should be included in the memo summarising how the original hydrology was derived.

Please clarify whether the proposed development will require any changes in elevation – i.e. will there be any excavation work which will lower or raise land levels at the site? If there will be any changes in elevation then a separate post development scenario should be modelled.

It is unclear whether a range of storm durations have been tested. Please evaluate the sensitivity of model results to different storm durations or justify why this is not required.

It would be helpful to include a figure showing where node Ca11000 is in relation to breach locations 1e and 2e (as the memo states that this node stage/time was used as inflow for the 2D breach of 1e and 2e). It would also be helpful to include a figure showing the location of Cam9001 in relation to breach points 3e and 4e.

The annotations on Figure 1 stage/time results from Node Ca11000 are beneficial. If possible, clearer naming or annotations of a similar nature would be useful to have on figures 2, 3 and 4.

It is noted that the breach width of 40m was retained from previous modelling. Please clarify how this breach width was decided.

Overcoming our Objection

Our objection can be overcome by providing the information detailed above. The information highlighted in bold is essential in overcoming our objection. Please note that if we consider that the model is not fit for purpose following provision of the information requested, we may be minded to maintain our objection to the application.

Other Environmental issues

In the eventuality that the applicant is able to overcome the Agency’s Objection we may wish to comment upon other environmental issues.

Please forward a copy of this letter to the applicant.

Yours faithfully

(Emily Davies on behalf of)

Tony Waddams
Sustainable Places Planning Advisor

Direct dial 02084745242
Direct e-mail planning.brampton@environment-agency.gov.uk