

Hauxton Consultative Committee Meeting,

The Jeavons Room, South Cambridge District Council Offices

Thursday 14th April 2011

- Attendance:** Jennie Daly (**JD**), Harrow Estates plc (**HE**)
Mark Nicholls (**MN**), Harrow Estates plc (**HE**) (**Secretary**)
Mark Smith (**MAS**), 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**)
- (Part)**
Matthew Sharpe (**MS**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)
- Apologies:** Joseph Whelan (**JW**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)
Cllr Tony Orgee (**TO**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)

1. Introductions and Apologies

- 1.1 Apologies had been received from JW and MS was attending in his place.
- 1.2 GK was unsure whether TO would be attending.
- 1.3 JL commenced the meeting and stated her concern that sufficient advanced warning of the recent Revised Risk Assessment submission had not been provided and felt this had caused concern among residents.
- 1.4 TA added that the application to vary the condition regarding the frequency of water level monitoring had also been a surprise.
- 1.5 JL and TA requested a further Drop-In event to allay concerns among residents and wished to have further discussion during the meeting.

2. Review of Actions since the Previous Meeting

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting dated 16th December 2010 had been received by all and accepted.
- 2.2 An action was noted against SE in relation to item 2.3 of the previous minutes regarding the monitoring of workers and consideration to be given to the reporting of the health of workers on site. SE confirmed that he was happy to generalise regarding the health of workers and confirmed that there were no health issues reported among workers relating to the site.
- 2.3 TA referred to previous minute reference 8.1 regarding Mr Elliot's concern for trees along his boundary and asked whether and further investigation was proposed. SW responded that she was to speak to the Environment Agency.

Action
SW

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 starting with a plan of the site showing that excavations had been extended in the New Year to the northern boundary and that the compound had been relocated to facilitate this.
- 3.2 Photographs were displayed showing the changes to the site on a month by month basis since the commencement of the project. KK noted that that the year was still shown as '2010' on the January to April progress photographs. SE to amend on future presentations.

Action
SE

- 3.3 SE provided some facts and figures relating to the remediation works to date as follows:

- 3.3.1 Now 54 weeks into the 80 Week programme

- 3.3.2 The works are currently 4 weeks behind programme

- 3.3.3 60,000 Man hours have been worked on site since we started in March 2010.

3.3.4 Excavation of the main factory, manufacturing areas and northern area have been completed.

3.3.5 So far over 86,000m³ of soil has been excavated, processed and are in treatment.

3.3.6 Over 30,000m³ of soil has been remediated and is stockpiled on site for re-use in the future.

3.3.7 Over 85 Million litres of contaminated water have been collected and treated.

3.3.8 Over 2400 Soil samples have been taken and analysed.

3.3.9 Environmental conditions have been assessed off-site over 460 times during the works so far.

3.3.10 Over 5040 PID measurements have been taken off site.

3.3.11 363 24hr air samples have been taken from around the site and at the boundaries.

3.3.12 Over 130 long term (28 day) air samples have been taken from locations around the site and in the community.

3.4 The main activities undertaken in the period included:

- Moving the site compound
- Trial Pitting in the Access Road
- Excavating some deeper hotspot areas

- Preparation for backfilling and restoration
 - Further treatment and turning of windrows to dry material
 - Construction of new force ventilated beds
 - Diverting the public footpath
- 3.5 KK asked what sort of chemicals were being encountered in the deeper hotspot areas contained around buried underground structures. SE indicated typically the same as previous notably chlorinated solvents and phenols.
- 3.6 KK asked if it was likely that other structures could still be present in the Gault Clay. SE answered that this was not possible and that this was the main reason for undertaking the works in an ex-situ manner to ensure that buried structures capable of hiding contamination were removed. SE went on further to explain that this was the advantage of the ex-situ method over in-situ techniques as in-situ methods would not address buried structures and the contaminants within and around them.
- 3.7 SE identified the position of the bentonite wall on one of the slides to the meeting.
- 3.8 JL asked why there was a need to dry soil material. SE explained the need to make the soil geotechnically suitable so that the site could be built upon afterwards.
- 3.9 SE explained how the Force Ventilated beds were constructed.

4. Matters Arising from Site Operations

- 4.1 SE continued his presentation to address the recent Revised Risk Assessment (RRA) submission and explained that revising the risk assessment had always been intended and the procedure for doing this was included in the Remedial Method Statement Revision 6 (RMS) which formed part of the remediation consent.
- 4.2 SE showed a slide of paragraphs 6.3 and 6.4 of the RMS and identified these two paragraphs to demonstrate that this was an expected process the site would go through as part of the remediation.
- 4.3 MLN explained in relation to earlier concern raised by JL, that the submission of the RRA was identified in the planning consent and in that respect not considered by HE to differ from the regular submission of the Monthly Monitoring Reports or risk assessment work undertaken in relation to Contaminants Not Previously Identified, where such attention has not been

attributed to these by SCDC. JD added that SCDC had its own reasons for dealing with the submission in the way it did.

- 4.4 TA asked if the results were proving the model. SE explained that the model is designed to match the reinstated site as much as possible based on actual information available which is continually improving.
- 4.5 SH explained the reasons why SCDC chose the route taken for the RRA and had tried to reflect a balance in planning terms between the technical nature of the submission and transparency. It was accepted that this had created expectations by the public that this could be commented upon but as this was a technical submission, the appropriate bodies had been consulted and Planning Officers had made a delegated decision to approve it.
- 4.6 JL and TA reiterated that it would be beneficial in future if advance notice could be given to them of any future submission in this respect.
- 4.7 JD explained the process of building the RRA commenced in March 2010 as understanding steadily improved and actual data received. SE explained the RRA is not a subjective document and it is appropriate that it is dealt with by the relevant officers at SCDC and the EA.
- 4.8 SH felt the way future submissions are communicated needed to be addressed
- 4.9 JD explained her concern in relation to the delay incurred to the remediation which is now running at four weeks behind which it is hoped can be recovered.
- 4.10 GK asked whether the works would now complete on time. JD and MLN explained that this would depend on the weather conditions encountered during the year.
- 4.11 GK queried why the works did not continue anyway. JD explained that this was considered in the interests of the completing the works this year and was discussed with SH at the time but it was agreed to allow the submission to be approved first.
- 4.12 SE explained that the risk assessment process will continue throughout the remainder of the works. As a result, targets on site can increase, decrease or

remain the same though the target at the receptor, the Riddy Brook remains unchanged. The model has built in conservatism with factors of safety used and will continue to be revised as data from the site emerges. This is normal practice and this should re-assure everyone that the work is constantly being re-assessed in this manner.

- 4.13 SE showed a slide of the Conceptual Model (CM) for the site and explained that Human Health (HH) models are different to groundwater and derive a different set of targets. The lowest target derived from either the Human Health or Groundwater Risk Assessment is used to ensure it is protective of both.
- 4.14 SE showed a slide explaining Source-Pathway-Target used as part of the Conceptual Model. JL asked if a copy could be provided.

Action SE

- 4.15 JL asked whether there was a need for the break layer above the remediated soils given the soil remediation. SE explained that this layer was vital in being protective of human health as the soils while remediated still had residual contamination and the break layer along with the imported 1m layer of surface soils would form part of the cutting the pathway between site occupiers and the soils beneath.
- 4.16 SE moved onto the proposed works in relation to the bentonite wall. Photographs of the wall were shown and explanation provided as to how and why it was constructed. The wall had been investigated along its length. The southern section had now been removed following approval from SCDC as it entered the site and was not along the boundary.
- 4.17 SE explained that bentonite would adsorb contaminants and that this had been identified in the site investigation. It was further identified that under laboratory conditions an aggressive leachability test identified the potential for contaminants to leach out of the bentonite. On that basis, it was decided that the wall should be removed and this was the proposal in a report to be submitted shortly under Condition 5 of the Remediation Consent.
- 4.18 JK asked what would happen to the bentonite wall material once excavated. SE explained that it would go through the same treatment train as the soils on the site. Some may be treated and re-used on site anything untreatable would be disposed off.

- 4.19 SE went on to explain the methodology. The public footpath along the boundary would be diverted. As the bentonite wall runs close to the existing boundary wall, a new temporary fence would be erected on the opposite bank of the Riddy Brook. The excavation work would be done in slices.
- 4.20 SH felt there was a need to communicate the proposed works. TA felt another Drop-In Session would be useful in this respect. JD explained that a large amount of resource and preparation went into the previous event and while it was successful it was less likely to be beneficial as there remain individuals who are not prepared to listen and that a further Drop-In would not resolve that. JD was reluctant to undertake a further event stating that the focus should now be on the works and completing the project. JL stated her concern that more for residents who are misled by misinformation. TA agreed these individuals were in a minority. GK expressed concern about public perception about the site and the future development of it. SH felt that timing and seasonality play a part in the issues and that something positive should be offered to avoid things turning negative which happened last year.
- 4.21 SE continued to explain the reason for request to amend the planning condition relating to groundwater level monitoring and that this change was not to do with the frequency of chemical testing which appeared to have been misunderstood and was due to an absence of groundwater on site as evidence by photographs making it unnecessary. It was further noted by the meeting that consent for this change had not been yet been received.
- 4.22 SH left the meeting at this point.
- 4.23 JL asked if pumping is still continuing to the Treatment Plant. SE confirmed that it was albeit in much reduced volumes given the lack of rainfall.
- 4.24 SE went on to explain future works proposed at the site. The former access road is to be excavated, part of which is expected to be odorous as it abuts the heavily impacted area which was excavated last year.
- 4.25 JL asked if the material in the High Bay warehouse had now been moved into treatment. SE explained that approximately half of this material had been moved into the Force Ventilated beds and the other half would be removed within the next 4-6 weeks which would be an odorous activity.
- 4.26 JL asked about the validation submission. SE explained that validation information is available on site for officers to review. JD added that it was a requirement of the planning consent that a Validation Report be submitted at the end of the remediation works which would be publicly accessible.

5. Odour Monitoring of Complaints and Responses

- 5.1 EY commented that complaints started to come in during March with a flurry of complaints over a few hours on one particular day which had been discussed with VFLI but there had been few since.
- 5.2 GK asked whether the complaints were of a serial nature. SW indicated this was general the case that no new complainants were noted.
- 5.3 SE explained that the vast majority of odorous material was now excavated. JL asked about the procedure for notifying potentially odorous material to the regulators. SE explained a daily communication took place with the EA outlining the planned works and identifying any potentially odorous activities.

6. Site Monitoring and Reporting Progress

- 6.1 MAS reported on behalf of ATK that activity on site had been reduced since the previous meeting with a slow ramp up in the works since the beginning of the year. Validation was progressing in the newly excavated areas and monitoring was continuing. To date 8 reports had been submitted to SCDC relating to Contaminants Not Previously Identified (CNPI). Comments had been received back on all of these and targets were agreed.
- 6.2 TA enquired as to whether any obscure compounds had been identified. MAS reported that 19 new compounds had been reported in the 8 reports provided and that no change to remediation techniques were required.
- 6.3 SW reported that site visits by officers were continuing. The Revised Risk Assessment had also been reviewed by a further independent consultant appointed by SCDC who had commented on the report but not raised any major issues with it.

7. Questions from Residents

- 7.1 JL had read out some questions received which she put to the meeting:
 - 7.1.1 Why are the rows of material further from Church Road not covered? SE answered that only odorous beds are covered
 - 7.1.2 Puddles around the site are a nasty brown colour – where is this going? SE explained that these are collected with the rainwater and pumped to the Treatment Plant.
- 7.2 SH rejoined the meeting at this point.

7.3 TA commented that he only had the enquiry from Mr. Elliot regarding his tree foliage which had been discussed earlier in the meeting and a letter from Mr. De'Ath which SCDC had responded to.

7.4 SW had prepared a response to the technical questions raised by Mr Goldman and these had been distributed to those councillors she was aware had received the e-mail. She offered that if such letters were e-mailed to councillor's in future she would be happy to prepare a technical response.

7.5 TA also reported that Mrs De'Ath had made a complaint to him regarding communication that the work on site had recommenced and requested a further Parish Meeting. TA had explained that the remediation work was ongoing and had not entered a new phase.

7.6 JL and TA informed the meeting that the Annual Parish Assembly was to be held on April 27th 2011.

8. HPA Report

8.1 KK reported that they had continued to receive the monitoring data over the period for review and this information had been processed. Following their review, the HPA have no change in their assessment and their advice remains the same.

8.2 The Primary Care Trust have reminded local GP surgeries to communicate any new cases reported. No new cases have been reported by GPs to date.

9. Future Plans and WWTP

9.1 JD confirmed that HE had been meeting with the likely developer for the redevelopment of the site. JD was not able to provide a timetable at present but a further meeting was being held later in the day. It was likely that the developer would want to bring forward a scheme below the 380 dwellings for which Outline consent was granted and include more family homes.

9.2 For the WWTP area, it was proposed to progress an application to bring forward a small residential development.

9.3 MAS confirmed that ground investigation works had been undertaken on the WWTP area. TA noted that the material forming the bunds around the WWTP had come from the excavation of the High Bay Warehouse on the Main Site.

9.4 TA and JL enquired as to what the intention for the field meadow which had historically been planted adjacent to the WWTP. JD assured that HE would look for a positive use for any residual land not required.

9.5 JD would seek to arrange a meeting with the developer to introduce them at the appropriate time.

Action JD

10. Communications

10.1 SH informed the meeting that EL had now left SCDC and that there were two Communications Officers at SCDC who would now assist. SH would be speaking to the EA to ask for further support in this role.

Action SH

10.2 A Senior Multi Agency Group Meeting was scheduled for the 6th May at which the Communications Strategy would be further discussed.

10.3 JL and TA again raised the potential for a further Drop-In event. JD was reluctant given current resource and site workload levels. SH could not commit SCDC either at this stage. It was agreed that any such event would need to be attended by all agencies to be of any value. It was agreed by all that further discussion was needed between agencies to see if adequate resources could be provided.

Action SCDC/HE/HPA/EA

11. Any Other Business

11.1 SW enquired whether the site would be closing over the Easter period. SE confirmed that the site would only close on the Bank Holidays themselves.

12. Date of Next Meeting

12.1 It was agreed to meet again at 2pm July 14th 2011. Subsequent to the meeting SW confirmed that the Jeavons Room had been booked at South Cambridgeshire District Council Offices at Cambourne.