

## **Hauxton Consultative Committee Meeting,**

**The Monkfield Room, South Cambridge District Council Offices  
Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> October 2011**

**Attendance:** Mark Nicholls (**MN**), Harrow Estates plc (**HE**) (**Secretary**)  
Cllr Tony Orgee (**TO**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)  
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**)  
Kate King (**KK**), Health Protection Agency (**HPA**)  
Steve Hampson (**SH**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)  
Cllr Gail Kenney (**GK**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)  
Jennie Daly (**JD**), Harrow Estates plc (**HE**)  
Mike Jones (**MJ**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**) (part)  
John Mann (**JM**), Redrow Homes (South Midlands) (**RHSM**) (part)

**Apologies:** Joseph Whelan (**JW**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)  
Mike Hill (**MH**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)  
Mark Smith (**MAS**), Atkins (**ATK**)  
Matthew Sharpe (**MS**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)

### **1. Presentation by Redrow Homes**

- 1.1 JM was introduced to the meeting and was welcomed by JL.
- 1.2 JM gave a presentation giving the background to Redrow as a company and the Redrow housing range known as the New Heritage Collection which is based upon an Arts & Crafts style.
- 1.3 JM went on to discuss the existing Outline Planning Consent and displayed the illustrative layout from the Outline which showed density and storey heights. The higher density approach at Outline stage was noted.
- 1.4 JM ran through the contributions being made by the proposed development including the £1.6m in Section 106 contributions. The development once completed may also lead to the payment to SCDC and CCC a New Homes Bonus to a combined value of £2.45m over a period of six years.
- 1.5 JM discussed the RHSM approach to the evolving layout. Due to the noise issues from the A10, dwellings can only 'front on' to ensure noise is reduced to a sufficient level in rear gardens. The Extra-care units were indicated fronting the A10 at a higher storey height than

the rest of the development. The Commercial development area was also shown closer to the A10 and would act as a further noise buffer. Properties were shown fronting towards the Riddy Brook to maximise the aspect to the Cam corridor.

- 1.6 The current layout proposed shows 275 dwellings including the 70 Extra-care and has a range of dwellings from 1 bedroom apartments up to 5 bedroom dwellings. This was noted to be a large reduction from the 380 dwellings proposed on the Outline consent.
- 1.7 JM displayed some of the housetypes and elevations likely to be incorporated in the scheme.
- 1.8 The outline programme for the development was indicated as:
  - Consultation with Parish/County/Public/Neighbours – November 2011
  - Reserved Matters Application – January 2012
  - Site Commencement Autumn/Winter 2012
- 1.9 TA queried the provision for a Retail Unit. JM responded that at present a Retail Unit had not been indicated as commercial viability for the unit of the small size proposed was an issue. JD indicated that there was viability for a retail unit beyond the size of that currently permitted.
- 1.10 GK asked what was provided for in respect of Education contribution. JD indicated this had already been specified and agreed. MJ reviewed and indicated that £474,000 was payable prior to first occupation followed by a further payment which would bring the total to in excess of £700,000 (this was checked subsequent to the meeting and is identified as £762,933 in total prior to indexation). MJ went on to say that this contribution reflected a higher number of units than currently proposed.
- 1.11 TO asked what the anticipated build out time was for the development given the number of sites around Cambridge which had started and stopped. JM responded that the development period would be sales led but anticipated that a 4 to 5 year timeframe was likely.
- 1.12 TO noted that the layout was different to other schemes. JM agreed that the layout reflected what the market needs at present in respect of family housing.
- 1.13 JL asked whether it would be possible still to fit in a small convenience store. JM suggested that one could be accommodated at groundfloor level in the Commercial or Extra-Care areas but that servicing for deliveries would be an issue and that really it was the market for such a small unit that was making the viability an issue.
- 1.14 JL and TA both noted that they felt a shop is needed and wanted and would be dismayed to see it withdrawn. JM indicated that he would take that feedback away with him.

**Action JM**
- 1.15 MJ queried the phasing of the proposed submission. JM confirmed the intention was to submit the Residential element and follow this with the Extra-care and Commercial applications.

- 1.16 JL asked whether the intention was to present to the Parish Council and hold the Public Consultation in November. JM confirmed that was the intention. JD indicated the preference would be to meet with the Parish Council first and then follow with the Public Exhibition.
- 1.17 TA asked TO about the proposals at Trumpington Meadows. TO explained these were set out and agreed. GK ran through the list of elements relating to Trumpington Meadows.
- 1.18 JL thanked JM for his presentation. JM and MJ left the meeting.

## **2. Review of Actions since the Previous Meeting**

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting dated 14<sup>th</sup> April 2011 had been received by all and accepted.
- 2.2 Previous 2.4 (14/07/11) – It was noted that JL had not received the slide from the presentation given by SE at the 14/04/11 meeting explaining “Source-Pathway-Receptor”. JL confirmed this was no longer needed.
- 2.3 Previous 3.8 (14/07/11) – JL had been informed by SE prior to the removal of material from the site.
- 2.4 Previous 4.1 (14/07/11) – The bentonite wall has now been removed.
- 2.5 Previous 7.1 (14/07/11) – MLN confirmed the boundary fence had been reviewed and repairs would be effected prior to site vacation.
- 2.6 Previous 7.2 (14/07/11) – The vegetation clearance around the Mill had been undertaken in the period. JL asked about proposals for the listed buildings, JD confirmed there had been interest but a viable use for the level of restoration needed was the issue.

## **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. SE explained that in one week the site will be substantially complete and that crushed concrete was now being placed on the second half of the site.
- 3.2 SE provided updated facts and figures relating to the remediation works to date as follows:
  - 3.2.1 The works were now in week 82 (two weeks beyond the original anticipated timescale)
  - 3.2.2 90,000 Man hours have been worked on site since we started in March 2010.

- 3.2.3 The excavation of the site has been completed.
- 3.2.4 So far over 130,000m<sup>3</sup> of soil has been excavated, processed, treated and re-compacted.
- 3.2.5 Over 110 Million litres of contaminated water have been collected and treated.
- 3.2.6 Over 3500 Soil samples have been taken and analysed.
- 3.2.7 Environmental conditions have been assessed off-site over 722 times during the works so far.
- 3.2.8 Over 7500 PID measurements have been taken off site.
- 3.2.9 444 24hr air samples have been taken from around the site and at the boundaries.
- 3.2.10 Over 174 long term (28 day) air samples have been taken from locations around the site and in the community.
- 3.2.11 A report collating all this information will be prepared and issued to the regulators.
- 3.3 Instead of the monthly progress photographs, SE ran a brief film taken by the time lapse camera installed on site since the site began which demonstrated in an accelerated time frame the amount of work undertaken on site.
- 3.4 The main activities undertaken in the period included:
- Placing materials in Zone 1 (adjacent to the Riddy Brook)
  - Final compaction across the site
  - Crushed concrete being placed
  - Geotechnical testing
- 3.5 SE also included a photograph of a historic pipe discovered within the bed of the Riddy Brook and explained that this had been discovered during excavation works on site and was found to exist below water level in the Riddy Brook. There had been an obvious pathway to exist as a result of its existence so this was removed up to the boundary and plugged. It was noted that such a potential pathway could not have been discovered or dealt with by an in-situ technique.
- 3.6 SE explained that there were now only two areas of excavation now being progressed and these were nearing completion. One area relates to the former Anglian water main which had now been diverted and would result in a small treatment bed being left on site over the Winter.
- 3.7 TA queried whether there was much contamination under the former high-bay warehouse. SE explained that no contaminative issues had arisen there.

- 3.8 SE stated that boreholes would commence installation as soon as the monitoring positions had been agreed and that only ancillary works remained thereafter on the site.
- 3.9 GK asked what would now happen in Spring. SE explained that monitoring of boreholes would be undertaken for a minimum of 6 months and these results would be compared with the Risk Assessment model.
- 3.10 JL asked how many boreholes were to be monitored. SE identified currently 13 boreholes though this was still to be agreed and the monitoring activity would probably take 2 days each month.

#### **4. Matters Arising from Site Operations**

- 4.1 TA queried plans for the WWTP. JD explained that the WWTP was currently still needed for surface water control in the interim but that an application for a residential development on the WWTP site was to be progressed.
- 4.2 GK asked how many dwellings would be proposed on the WWTP. JD suggested that approximately 20 dwellings were proposed and that this was something to be progressed given the uncertainty surrounding the proposed Waste Recycling Centre.
- 4.3 JL asked when an application was likely. JD responded that ideally a submission alongside the Redrow Reserved Matters Application was preferable.
- 4.4 GK mentioned the suggested extension to the Park and Ride. TO noted that he had an action from the Parish Council meeting to review. JD confirmed that she was aware of the potential from the Jesus College land adjacent.
- 4.5 JL asked about the likelihood of odour and noise from the remediation of the WWTP. MLN responded that site investigation undertaken to date had identified the area to be far less contaminated than the Main Site and the WWTP was also further away from residences than the Main Site.

#### **5. Odour Monitoring of Complaints and Responses**

- 5.1 It was reported that there were no odour related complaints in October. One complaint had been recorded in relation to dust and another relating to a piece of concrete damaging a vehicle on the A10. Both complaints were unsubstantiated.

#### **6. Site Monitoring and Reporting Progress**

- 6.1 MLN passed on apologies from MAS as he had been called away at the last minute.

- 6.2 SW noted that they had undertaken probably their last visit to site in full PPE and could verify the progress on site.
- 6.3 EY stated there was nothing to add to the report given by SW.
- 6.4 TA queried reports of a Beech tree in the Churchyard which was allegedly suffering from herbicide damage. SW was aware of the report and Euan Simpson from the EA was reviewing. **Action: SW/EA**

## **7. Questions from Residents**

- 7.1 JL asked who is responsible for the site fencing and security in the interim? MLN indicated that arrangements for the fence to be monitored and repaired had been put in place.
- 7.2 JL asked whether the fence could now be moved back following the completion of the bentonite wall. MLN explained that there was currently a need to leave the fence where it is in order to avoid the need to move it again to undertake the works to the Riddy Brook bank required as part of the development ecological works.
- 7.3 JL asked about the maintenance of the footpaths in the interim. MLN confirmed that this had been undertaken as a courtesy by HE while in occupation of the site but an alternative needed to be found in the interim until the site was handed over to Redrow.
- 7.4 JL asked if this also applied to the emptying of the dog bins. JD explained that this would be harder for HE to manage now that there was no longer a site presence. TA indicated he would review and provide a proposal to JD. **Action TA**
- 7.5 JL produced a newspaper cutting relating to the footpath diversion. It was explained that this referred to the extension to temporarily divert footpath number 5 from along the old Mill Lane.
- 7.6 TA noted that a Cracked Willow had come down near Mill House. MLN would review and action. **Action MLN**
- 7.7 JL asked what had been agreed regarding groundwater monitoring outside the site within Church Meadow and Packhouse Field. EY explained that the EA had corresponded with Mr. Elliot's advisors and that agreement had not been reached for the EA to undertake monitoring.

## **8. HPA Report**

- 8.1 KK reported that in total there were 3 people reported by local GPs with symptoms suggested as possibly related to the site. It was also reported that air monitoring was continuing for one month after the site completion. It was further noted that the HPA would be a consultee to the application on the WWTP.

**9. Communications**

- 10.1 SH informed the meeting that Gareth Bell (GB) had now joined SCDC as Communications Manager filling the role previously undertaken by Emma Lowther and that GB would now undertake future Comms co-ordination work on behalf of SCDC.

**10. Any Other Business**

- 11.1 SW noted that a Fish and Invertebrate Survey Report had been provided by HE to SCDC and this had been reviewed by the Council's Ecologist Rob Mungovern (RM) and shared with the EA Fisheries Team. The report had identified pollution sensitive invertebrates and fish in the Cam and Riddy Brook indicating good water quality and that RM was particularly pleased with the findings.

**11. Date of Next Meeting**

- 12.1 JD suggested contacting JL in January 2012 with a view to a meeting in the Spring as there would be little to discuss until the site had achieved validation though it was likely there would now be a greater input from Redrow to the Forum. This was agreed.