

Hauxton Consultative Committee Meeting,

**The Jeavons Room, South Cambridge District Council Offices
Thursday 14th July 2011**

Attendance: 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**)
Kate King (**KK**), Health Protection Agency (**HPA**)
Steve Hampson (**SH**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)
Matthew Sharpe (**MS**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)
Mike Hill (**MH**), South Cambridgeshire District Council (**SCDC**)

Apologies: Joseph Whelan (**JW**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)
Cllr Tony Orgee (**TO**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)
Jennie Daly (**JD**), Harrow Estates plc (**HE**)
Cllr Gail Kenney (**GK**), Cambridgeshire County Council (**CCC**)

1. Introductions and Apologies

- 1.1 Apologies had been received from JD, JW and GK.
- 1.2 A response had not been confirmed from TO as to whether he was attending.
- 1.3 MH was introduced to the meeting and round the table introductions made.

2. Review of Actions since the Previous Meeting

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting dated 14th April 2011 had been received by all and accepted.
- 2.2 Previous 2.3 (14/04/11) – an action was recorded against SW that she would speak to the EA regarding trees along the boundary of the site with Mr. Elliot's field. JL asked EY if anything had been received. EY confirmed a report was due from ADAS in this respect.
- 2.3 Previous 3.2 (14/04/11) – an action had been recorded against SE as it had been noted that dates shown on photographs during the presentation were incorrect. SE confirmed these had now been corrected in the new presentation.

- 2.4 Previous 4.14 (14/04/11) – JL had previously requested a copy of the slide used by SE explaining Source-Pathway-Receptor as part of the Conceptual Model. This remained an outstanding action. **Action SE**
- 2.5 Previous 9.5 (14/04/11) – JD was to introduce the proposed developer at the appropriate time. MLN explained this would be covered later in the meeting.
- 2.6 Previous 10.1 (14/04/11) – SH was actioned to speak to the EA regarding Comms support. SH confirmed this would be covered later in the meeting.
- 2.7 Previous 10.3 (14/04/11) – the further Drop-In Session proposed by TA and JL had been held in the period. JL and TA offered the thanks to the meeting and the agencies who supported it.

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.
- 3.2 Photographs were displayed showing the changes to the site on a month by month basis since the commencement of the project up to the present day.
- 3.3 SE provided some facts and figures relating to the remediation works to date as follows:
- 3.3.1 Now 67 weeks into the 80 Week programme
 - 3.3.2 The works are currently 4 weeks behind programme
 - 3.3.3 74,000 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 113,000m³ of soil has been excavated, processed and are in treatment.
 - 3.3.6 Over 50,000m³ of soil has been remediated and is stockpiled on site for re-use in the future.
 - 3.3.7 Over 40,000 m³ of soil had been restored
 - 3.3.8 Over 90 Million litres of contaminated water have been collected and treated.
 - 3.3.9 Over 2850 Soil samples have been taken and analysed.
 - 3.3.10 Environmental conditions have been assessed off-site over 5900 times during the works so far.

3.3.11 Over 6080 PID measurements have been taken off site.

3.3.12 363 24hr air samples have been taken from around the site and at the boundaries.

3.3.13 Over 142 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:

- Reinstatement of materials
- Continued turning of treatment beds
- Continued excavation
- Demolition of the High Bay Warehouse
- Removal of the former effluent sump
- Moving of the crushed concrete stockpile

3.5 SE included a slide of points for further discussion, noting:

- The change in the groundwater monitoring had now been approved at the end of May 2011 from initial discussions in October and submission in November 2010;
- Approval of reports submitted relating to Contaminants Not Previously Identified (CNPI) was still outstanding and that some of these dated from 2010;
- Approval regarding the bentonite wall removal was still awaited and this was now impacting program and as a result a source of material to replace this area with had been lost;
- The Preliminary Post Remediation Model had been submitted in the period and further discussion was awaited.

3.6 SE went on to identify the works to be undertaken in the next period:

- Continuing reinstatement of materials in a southerly direction
- Continued data collection for validation purposes
- Excavation of the former access road
- Continued soil treatment
- Removal of the bentonite wall (once approval is received by the Authority)
- Final phases of excavation in the south of the site
- Continued risk assessment
- Off Site disposal of untreatable material

3.7 TA asked where the material for off-site disposal was from. SE explained it had been accumulated as the excavation work had progressed through the site.

3.8 JL asked what the material for off-site disposal was given that material had been removed from site previously. SE explained this was untreatable material and that preparations had been made for its disposal and that notice boards would be updated in advance of it being

removed from site. JL asked if she could be a copy of the notice in advance. SE agreed to contact JL in advance.

Action SE

- 3.9 TA asked regarding the proposed route of vehicles from the site. SE explained that this would be away from the villages towards the motorway.

4. Matters Arising from Site Operations

- 4.1 MLN raised the issue of the continuing delay in approving the removal of the Bentonite Wall stating this was now impacting the program and would cause further delay and that as a result a source of material for reinstatement had been lost. SH agreed to investigate.

Action SH

- 4.2 JL queried what the 'permeater' instrument (shown in one of the presentation photographs) was used for. SE explained that this was used to prove the permeability of the restored soils to ensure that actual site data is used in the site model.

5. Odour Monitoring of Complaints and Responses

- 5.1 JL asked what the recent odour issues related to. SE explained that this was associated with further excavation works on site and that as previously discussed, this would on occasion occur on a more localised basis. SE went on to explain that the EA had attended site at the time and did not consider the activity to be of concern.

- 5.2 JL felt the wind direction at the time had been a factor. EY agreed.

- 5.3 JL explained that in discussion with individuals, they had commented there was no point in phoning the EA with a complaint regarding odour. JL had stressed this was important. EY agreed as this information was fed back to site to assist in managing the operations.

- 5.4 JL asked when the odour issue had arisen. EY stated 29th June.

6. Site Monitoring and Reporting Progress

- 6.1 MAS reported on behalf of ATK that monitoring activity on site has changed to encompass restoration as well as treatment and that soil materials were also being validated geotechnically as well as chemically.

- 6.2 SW reported that SCDC were continuing to visit site and review records. A recent technical meeting had been held on site which had been attended by the Council's consultant LQM and they had been impressed with the soil management on site.

- 6.3 JL asked what was being done regarding the monitoring of Mr.Elliot's boreholes off-site. EY confirmed that the EA had written to Mr.Elliot to monitor the boreholes but that no response had been received.
- 6.4 TA asked if more testing of the boreholes was to be undertaken. EY stated it was a question of access and that the EA had written to Mr.Elliot's representative.

7. Questions from Residents

- 7.1 JL and TA had had concerns raised regarding the condition of the boundary fence along Church Road. MLN confirmed this would be reviewed at the next site visit. **Action: MLN**
- 7.2 JL and TA had received complaints regarding vegetation growth around the Mill and that vegetation had not been cleared on the public footpath from the bench to the Riddy weir. MLN confirmed these would be reviewed at the next site visit. **Action: MLN**
- 7.3 TA had received a query with regards the future use of the Mill Buildings, and why nothing had been done with the buildings to date. MLN confirmed that proposals for future use would be brought forward, but not in the immediate future.
- 7.4 JL had received a query relating to potential for raised groundwater levels during flooding events causing contamination of soils. Though the query was somewhat vague, MLN explained that proposed finished site levels were to be set above potential flooding issues and SE also added that water would continue to be pumped during the monitoring period for the site.
- 7.5 JL had received a general query that the 'deep contamination was still to be revealed'. SE confirmed that that was not the case and that the most heavily impacted part of the site had already been dealt with.
- 7.6 JL queried the current programme as being 4 weeks behind. SE confirmed this was correct that at present, mid-October was now likely.

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. There was nothing being identified which giving rise to any concern. The HPA have no change in their assessment and their advice remains the same.

9. Communications

- 10.1 SH informed that the SCDC Comms team were linking in with the EA Comms team and were anticipating and being proactive in relation to Comms.

- 10.2 SH commented that the Drop-In which was originally planned to be modestly attended by the Agencies was well supported and that there was value in doing it for those who attended it.
- 10.3 SH asked if some of the photos could be made available from the presentation for use on the website. SE agreed they could be used if required.
- 10.4 SW confirmed that the EA had taken a temporary Comms lead while SCDC appointed a new Comms manager.
- 10.5 JL queried the Further Risk Assessment and whether this again was to be discussed with HauxAir. SH confirmed that on this occasion the decision will be made by officers after communication with members and it was not needed to discuss with HauxAir.
- 10.6 JL noted that the last set of minutes were not available on the website. **Action SH**
- 10.7 SH reported that the next Senior MAG Meeting was to be held on the 19th July and they continue to meet on a quarterly basis.

10. Future Plans and WWTP

- 9.1 MLN confirmed that the preferred developer for the site had met with the Planning Team at SCDC for preliminary discussions. A preliminary sketch for propose development of the WWTP had also been provided at the meeting. It was the intention that the developer would be brought along to the next meeting as it was likely that their involvement would increase once siteworks have diminished into the monitoring period.

11. Any Other Business

- 11.1 No additional business was raised by the meeting.

12. Date of Next Meeting

- 12.1 Next meeting dates were suggest as either the 13th, 20th or 27th October at the meeting. Subsequent to the meeting, SW confirmed that the Monkfield Room had been booked for 2pm Thursday 20th October 2011.