

Hauxton Consultative Committee Meeting,

Swansley Room, South Cambridgeshire District Council Offices

Thursday 21st October 2010

Attendance: Jennie Daly (**JD**), Harrow Estates plc (**HE**) (**Secretary**)
Mark Nicholls (**MLN**), Harrow Estates plc (**HE**)
Mark Smith (**MS**), Atkins (**ATK**)
Steve Edgar (**SE**), Vertase FLI (**VFLI**)
Cllr Janet Lockwood (**JL**), South Cambridgeshire District Council

(SCDC) (Chair)

Tony Allison (**TA**), Hauxton Parish Council (**HPC**)
Susan Walford (**SW**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)
Eileen Young (**EY**), Environment Agency (**EA**)
Cllr Gail Kenney (**GK**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)
Kate King (**KK**), Health Protection Agency (**HPA**)
Steve Hampson (**SH**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)

Also in Attendance: Emma Lowther (**EL**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)

Apologies: Cllr Tony Orgee (**TO**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)
Joseph Whelan (**JW**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)

1. Introductions and Apologies

- 1.1 Apologies had been received from JW and GK was attending in place of TO. EL notified the meeting that GK was delayed.

2. Review of Actions since the Previous Meeting

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting dated 18th August had been received by all and accepted.
- 2.2 JL noted two actions against VFLI to update the notice boards with additional FAQs and Photographs. SE confirmed that this had been done.

3. Progress on Site

- 3.1 SE undertook a brief PowerPoint presentation to refresh understanding and to demonstrate progress on the site in the period. JD distributed aerial photographs taken of the works a few weeks earlier.

- 3.2 SE showed a plan of the site with the completed areas of excavation shaded. The plan also showed the planned works to be completed by the end of October. SE further identified that the current area of excavation at the southern extremity approaching the former high-bay warehouse appeared to be contaminant and odour free.
- 3.3 Using the plan, SE identified two areas of the site which were likely to be impacted and may cause odour during future phases of excavation. Notably an area of the site where a historic diesel spill had occurred and another area identified as impacted with solvents. However, SE was confident that the main area of odorous excavation was now coming to an end and whilst odorous material was present in treatment beds, this was far easier to control than excavation works from an odour perspective.
- 3.4 SE explained that odours reported recently were in all likelihood due to relocation of material which had been relocated from a covered stockpile to the Force Ventilated Treatment Beds as the material was better suited to this form of treatment and it would mean the material could be kept covered and the air extracted.
- 3.5 JL queried why the pesticides and herbicides smell if they are not volatile. SE explained that these are not volatile but still exhibit an odour.
- 3.6 SE outlined further works to be done in the next couple of weeks including the movement of some of the odorous material currently stored in the High Bay warehouse to the excavated area (now a deep depression in the site) for treatment. This was to be undertaken when weather conditions permitted.
- 3.7 SE confirmed that the concrete crusher was currently off site but would return when a suitable stockpile was available for crushing.
- 3.8 SH stated that there is a need for forward planning in the communication to local residents and that planned works need to be communicated to the regulators to allow this to happen. MLN and SE explained that this already occurs in that the planned works for any particular day are communicated to the EA as they regulate the works on site and have to respond to complaints.
- 3.9 SE provided some facts and figures relating to the remediation works to date and confirmed that these have been shown on the notice board updates. It was agreed to include these as part of the minutes as follows:

- 3.9.1 We are 30 weeks into our 80 Week programme.
- 3.9.2 The first phase of excavation works is nearing completion and we remain on programme.
- 3.9.3 We have worked over 35,000 Man hours on site since we started in March 2010.
- 3.9.4 We have completed the excavation of the main factory and manufacturing areas.
- 3.9.5 So far over 65,000m³ of soil has been excavated, processed and are in treatment.
- 3.9.6 Over 20,000m³ of soil has been remediated and is stockpiled on site for re-use in the future.
- 3.9.7 Over 50 Million litres of contaminated water have been collected and treated.
- 3.9.8 Over 650 Soil samples have been taken and analysed.
- 3.9.9 We have assessed off site environmental conditions over 400 times during the works so far.
- 3.9.10 We have taken over 2400 PID measurements off site.
- 3.9.11 We have collected and analysed 243 24-hour air samples from the site and at the boundaries.

3.9.12 We have collected and analysed over 80 long term (28 day) air samples from locations around the site and in the community.

3.10 GK joined the meeting.

3.11 SE continued to show several slides where the 24 hour monitoring was displayed graphically for two of the most commonly detected compounds namely Toluene and Tetrachloroethylene (PCE). The graphs showed the 24 hour concentrations over the period since the commencement of the project at three locations namely, the northern boundary, the centre of the site (adjacent to the excavation works) and the southern boundary. The northern boundary monitoring identified that the highest concentrations of Toluene had not exceeded the World Health Organization (WHO) levels. For PCE two marginal exceedances had occurred but it was noted by all that the comparison level used was for a lifetime of exposure i.e. the level at which exposure could occur every day for life with no increase in appreciable risk. The southern area of the site for both Toluene and PCE were at levels well below the WHO guideline level for lifetime exposure whereas the centre of the site where works were being undertaken had much higher concentrations.

3.12 In conclusion, it was evident from the graphs that levels of Toluene and PCE at the southern boundary in the direction of Hauxton and Harston were well below those in the centre and north of the site and the WHO guideline level for a lifetime of exposure. This demonstrated the effective management of the works to make best use of favourable weather conditions.

4 Matters Arising from Site Operations

4.1 TA queried the use of the term 'Top Ten' in the context of the 28 day monitoring tubes. SE explained that the lab identifies the top ten compounds with the highest concentrations and this is not dictated by VFLI. Generally the 10th compound is near to the limit of detectability. SE further explained that if the concentration of the 10th compound gave concern that an 11th compound may be at a level which could give concern then further review would be undertaken.

4.2 JL asked whether the different type of monitoring tube had shown any difference. SE explained that the Tenax tubes which have been used since the commencement of the project have been picking up similar compounds to the Unicarb tubes which have been trialled though the evidence to date suggests that the Tenax tubes show higher concentrations. SE was confident that the Tenax tube is the right tube for the monitoring. SW added that the HPA have reviewed both sets of data and there is no change in their advice.

4.3 JL and TA raised several questions which had been put to them, namely:

- 4.3.1 Lately the smell from the site has been rather worse, what is the likely cause of the odour? SE responded that this was probably associated with the construction of the Force Ventilated beds which were impacted with Trichloroethylene (TCE) and Trichlorophenol (TCP).
- 4.3.2 Is the remediation working? SE replied that it was.
- 4.3.3 Is there any remediated material ready for backfilling? SE explained that no backfilling has been undertaken to date though there is material which is nearly at target in stockpiles.
- 4.3.4 Will levels of all known contaminants be published prior to backfilling? SE explained that all testing will be included in the Validation Report which will be submitted for review at the end of the project.
- 4.3.5 Given the groundwater direction and spread of contamination beyond the boundary, is it wise to stop pumping groundwater? It was agreed this question was somewhat vague in its construction. The predominant groundwater direction is toward the Riddy and this is intercepted by the bentonite wall. MLN explained that the purpose of the remediation work is to treat the contamination to a level which no longer poses a significant risk to groundwater so that pumping would no longer be required.
- 4.3.6 Could excessive rainfall contaminate the river? SE explained that this was highly unlikely given that there was a large excavation in the middle of the site from where rainfall was pumped to the treatment works and the remainder of the site was still surfaced with concrete and rainfall collected from there in the site drainage system.
- 4.3.7 When will the bentonite wall be investigated? SE replied that this work would be undertaken shortly and the findings discussed with the regulators.

4.3.8 Have the windrows undertaken the treatment successfully? SE explained that the period for treatment is generally 8-20 weeks and this was proving successful.

4.3.9 What monitoring of the original site workforce was undertaken by Bayer? TA was not aware of any monitoring or correlation undertaken other than standard medicals and that there was an Occupational Health Department based on site. SE spoke for VFLI and explained that they regularly check the workforce for contact dermatitis.

4.4 SW raised a question by one of the Members who had asked for the health monitoring of workers on site to be made available publicly. It was agreed that there may be a Data Protection Act issue in this respect but perhaps a general statement could be provided. SE to consider.

Action

SE

4.5 JL asked what monitoring HauxAir had been undertaking. SW stated that HauxAir had not confirmed what monitoring they were undertaking though it had been suggested that a PID was being used similar to those used on site.

5 Odour Monitoring of Complaints and Responses

5.1 SW reported that SCDC have been undertaking visits and inspections of the site at regular intervals during the period and that work had been progressing well on site with no major issues.

5.2 EY reported that the EA are continuing to monitor complaints and whilst these were generally decreasing it was noted that there had been an increase in the previous week.

5.3 SW showed a graph of complaints recorded on a monthly basis which showed that complaints had dropped off overall since the summer period.

6 Site Monitoring and Reporting Progress

6.1 KK reported that their recent efforts had been in relation to validating the monitoring results in relation to the different tubes being trialled and that from this work, nothing has changed the view of the HPA and their advice remains the same.

- 6.2 MAS reported that ATK had been independently monitoring the work during the period and were happy with the working practices and progress made on site. ATK continue to monitor the independently and jointly with VFLI.

7 Communications

- 7.1 It was noted that the notice boards had recently been updated with progress information and photographs and that the FAQs had also been updated.
- 7.2 SW noted that the email inbox relating to the site was not getting the same volume of queries as previously and these were now infrequent.
- 7.3 JL asked to have the notice boards updated regularly. SE confirmed that realistically this could be done on a 3-4 week basis to allow sufficient progress to have taken place.

8 Future Plans

- 8.1 JD indicated that HE and ATK would be undertaking investigation works on the WWTP site area. Discussions would take place with officers and the community at the appropriate time.
- 8.2 JD explained that it would soon be appropriate to bring forward the developer for the Main Site to commence work on the detail of the future development proposals.
- 8.3 JD reported that the pre-examination meeting began in October for the Minerals and Waste Plan for Cambridge County Council and that detailed examination would not be until the Summer next year. It was likely that HE would be bringing forward the development proposals for the WWTP area at the same time.
- 8.4 TA asked if there had been any approaches made in respect of the Mill. JD indicated that HE were in dialogue with a specialist agency though the market at present was uncertain and works were ongoing still on the adjacent Main Site.

9 HauxAir

- 9.1 JL indicated that she had been lobbied on several occasions by HauxAir for them to attend the Consultative Committee. JL had explained that attendance was by agreement with all parties. JD stated that EL had issued a query from the press in this respect and that HE had issued a press statement in explanation.

- 9.2 JD explained the purpose of the Consultative Committee as constituted by the Section 106 Agreement and which would cover the two Applications, one for the remediation and one for the development of the site. It was reiterated that the attendance is for those directly related to or engaged with the remediation or development and for the forum to remain productive it needed to remain as such.
- 9.3 It was further suggested that there are other methods of communication open to HauxAir and that they are party to all publicly available information including the minutes of this meeting.
- 9.4 SH had spoken with a representative of HauxAir and asked if there is any other forms of communication that is not being employed but had not heard back. SH was keen to extend an offer to HauxAir for some form of dialogue and that some thought should be given to how that might work as a process.
- 9.5 It was agreed by all that it was not appropriate for HauxAir to attend this forum but that a separate discussion should be had outside the meeting to explore alternative forms of communication.

Action

ALL

10 Any Other Business

There being no further business, the meeting concluded.

11 Date of Next Meeting

It was agreed to meet again at 2pm on Thursday 16th December 2010.