

Hauxton Consultative Committee Meeting,

South Cambridge District Council Offices

Thursday 14th November 2013

Attendance: Mark Nicholls (**MN**), Harrow Estates plc (**HE**) (**Secretary**)
Cllr Tony Orgee (**TO**) (in part), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)
Steve Edgar (**SE**), Vertase FLI (**VFLI**)
Cllr Janet Lockwood (**JL**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**) (**Chair**)
Eileen Young (**EY**), Environment Agency (**EA**)
Jennie Daly (**JD**), Harrow Estates plc (**HE**)
Steve Caldwell (**SC**), Redrow Homes (South Midlands) (**RHSM**)
Peter Ord (**PO**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)
Jane Ward (**JW**), Hauxton Parish Council (**HPC**)

Also Present: Tony Allison (**TA**), Former **HPC** Chair
Andrew Winter (**AW**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)
Vincent Fairclough (**VWF**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)
Clare Gibbons (**CG**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)

Apologies: John Mann (**JM**), Redrow Homes (South Midlands) (**RHSM**)
Mark Smith (**MAS**), Atkins (**ATK**)
Cllr Gail Kenney (**GK**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)
Susan Walford (**SW**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)

Introductions and Apologies

Apologies had been received from JM, GK, MAS and SW.

1. Review of Actions Arising from the Previous Minutes

- 1.1 Previous Minutes Item 1.1: JD reported that she was still struggling with CCC regarding the Section 278 and had been making extensive enquiries. CCC resources remained stretched and there were many developments struggling in Cambridgeshire as a result. JL queried the problem and JD indicated it was administrative. TO to assist if possible.

Action JD / TO

- 1.2 Previous Minutes Item 1.2: SC reported that the boundary with Mr.Elliot had been resolved in writing. Pegs had been set out and the hedge cut back and fenced.

- 1.3 Previous Minutes Item 1.3: JL and JW commented that the fencing on Church Road looked much better and favourable comments had been received. JL reported that some fencing had blown down at the rear of Mill House.

Action MLN

- 1.4 Previous Minutes Item 1.4: SC reported that "Hauxton Meadow" was the chosen development sales name.

- 1.5 Previous Minutes Item 1.5: The Flood Mitigation Works had been put on the Agenda for separate discussion.
- 1.6 Previous Minutes Item 1.7: (To remain on the minutes as a standing item for discussion) SC reported that the strategy for the River Corridor was at an early stage and had not yet been formulated. The priority had been to address planning condition discharges but further consideration would be given. JD explained that the Management Company would need to be accountable for this part of the site once appointed. JL wished to see integration with HPC.

Action SC

2. Site Validation Reporting Progress

- 2.1 MLN reported on the progress made since the last Consultative Committee Meeting.
- 2.2 In relation to Controlled Waters; following on from the meeting held with the Environment Agency at the end of April, further information was provided informally to the EA at the end of May. After this had been reviewed by the EA, the EA subsequently confirmed at beginning of July by email that they had no outstanding queries on the reports for the Main Site but were still in technical discussion in relation to the report on the Riddy Brook. Subsequently, at the beginning of August, the EA confirmed that they did not require any further risk assessment work to be carried out in relation to the Riddy Brook.
- 2.3 On this basis, documentation was formally submitted to Planning at the end of August. The EA confirmed to the Planning Department in mid-September that they required no further work in the area of the Riddy but also highlighted some information they had been provided that had not been formally submitted in relation to the Main Site. This information was submitted at the end of September and at the beginning of October to the Authority and a formal response is currently awaited from the EA. In the interim, a letter has been received from LQM (acting on behalf of the Planning Department) with comments which concluded that in their opinion that subject to the Environment Agency confirmation the conditions can be discharged in relation to Controlled Waters.
- 2.4 In relation to Human Health; a meeting was held with Public Health England (PHE) at the beginning of June to discuss the areas of the Human Health Report which they felt didn't sufficiently address their areas of concern. We agreed a way forward at that meeting.
- 2.5 There subsequently followed a lengthy process of discussion between the PHE Toxicology Team and the Toxicology Team at Atkins. At the beginning of August, PHE agreed the approach proposed by Atkins and a revised Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) was issued to them informally for review.
- 2.6 At the beginning of October, PHE responded with some minor comments on the HHRA but concluded that the report was "much improved" and "will provide evidence that the levels of contaminants in the soil gas are very unlikely to present a significant risk to health"
- 2.7 The HHRA was formally submitted to the Authority and was acknowledged as received on the 21st October and is currently under review by statutory consultees and regulators.

- 2.8 A revised formal extension has been mutually agreed with the Authority until the 2nd December 2013 and this has keeping the appeal position live.

3. Development Progress

- 3.1 SC reported that the technical team at Redrow were progressing the discharge of planning conditions but were finding the process protracted. AW commented that he was assisting to try and balance the comments made and that some comments were interlinked.
- 3.2 SC commented that Redrow were still receiving lots of requests on previously agreed items resulting in a substantial number of items still to address. AW suggested a meeting to discuss.
Action AW/ SC
- 3.3 AW summarised the conditions outstanding relating to surface water discharge which also impacted on landscaping and ecology, the condition relating to Japanese Knotweed, the foul water drainage scheme was under review and noted that other reserved matters conditions were almost there.
- 3.4 JL queried the significance of the 2nd December date. JD responded that this was the expiry of the last formal extension in relation to the conditions relating to the remediation and separate to the conditions noted above.
- 3.5 JL asked when development was likely to commence and SC suggested it was likely to be early in the New Year.
- 3.6 SC also noted that the River Corridor Ecology Management Plan (RCEMP) had not yet been approved. AW would check.
Action AW

4. WWTP Progress

- 4.1 JD reported that baseline assessments were being gathered and a Pre-Application discussion was to be held with the Authority in December with Public Consultation in the New Year and a Screening request had been submitted to the Authority.
- 4.2 JD indicated that the proposal was for a modest form of development in and around the Plant.
- 4.3 TA queried if the issue of the Waste Recycling Site would re-occur. TO confirmed that CCC were still looking for a suitable site but that the situation was vague due to budgetary issues.

5. Complaints

- 5.1 EY reported that she was not aware the EA had received any complaints in the period since the last meeting.
- 5.2 PO reported that one complaint had been received from Harston but this could not be verified as attributed to the site.

6. Questions from Residents

- 6.1 JL commented that the sale of the Mill buildings was unexpected and queried the intentions regarding future public access to the Mill 'Pool' and green space in front of the Mill. TA noted that the site had been marketed in Lots.
- 6.2 JD responded that this was currently marketing and not yet a disposal and that the separation into Lots was a suitable marketing tool to ensure there was suitable interest in the buildings. JD commented that interesting propositions had been received from bidders and that future owners will still need to undertake public consultation and planning application. The timing was now felt right to progress these buildings as the subject had been discussed on a number of occasions in the Consultative Forum over the past few years.
- 6.3 JL raised that a number of residents were anxious about future access to the Mill Island. It was noted that HPC had submitted an Asset of Community Value application to the Authority. CG reported on the deliberations following the meeting held that morning. It was concluded that after consideration, the Mill Island falls in the definition of an exception under Schedule 1 and was connected to a residence and owned by a single owner and will therefore be removed from the register.
- 6.4 JW reported that residents had asked for it to be listed though there was concern that in doing so, this might jeopardize the Mill. JD explained that these were complicated buildings and needed to be given their best opportunity and that it was likely to be the New Year before offers were considered fully.
- 6.5 TA and JL raised the Public Footpath markers which had been installed by CCC and were unclear as to where this had come from. There followed some discussion regarding the correct alignment of the footpath and there was concern that suggestion had been made this was to be amended to a Cycle Path by CCC which HPC oppose. It was noted that that difficulties were currently being experienced with CCC in relation to footpath diversions but that the markers placed on site would be reviewed. **Action SC / MLN**
- 6.6 JL raised the repair undertaken to the Mill tailrace. MLN explained that this had been done in concrete to ensure longevity and prevent further scour damage occurring.
- 6.7 JL raised that a number of trees had been felled on the Church Road boundary. MLN understood this had been done by Redrow to allow the access point to be formed once the site commences and ensure the trees were removed outside of the bird nesting season.
- 6.8 JL asked if Redrow will be building the Extra-Care element of the site. SC indicated that this would be done by the end user and was likely to be Sanctuary.
- 6.9 JL queried what the treatment was likely to be for the Japanese Knotweed. MLN explained that the likely strategy would involve a suitable herbicide spray treatment undertaken over a period of time given the access difficulty and proximity to the River Cam.
- 6.10 JL queried whether there was to be any rectification of damage to the Tennis Courts. JD responded that she would need to review the s106 Agreement in this respect but noted that

there were generous funding contributions provided for in the s106 to assist HPC with future management of the Playing Fields. **Action JD**

6.11 JL asked what the latest position with the Bus Provision was. JD reported that information had been submitted and SCDC Officers had requested additional information. Stagecoach consider the alternative proposal to be better and more sustainable. **Action JD**

7. Communications

7.1 There were no Communications activities to report in the period.

8. Flood Mitigation Works

8.1 JL commented that the works are not as the Entec drawings as a bund isn't shown. MLN explained that the bund is present to be protective of the neighbours land and that the Entec report allowed for excavated material to be retained for this purpose. EY confirmed from colleagues that the bund is present to be protective of Third Party land and had been modelled.

9. Any Other Business

8.1 There was no further business to discuss.

10. Date of Next Meeting

9.1 JD suggested it would be sensible to see how condition discharge progresses before organising a further meeting and this was agreed.