

<b>Attendees:</b>		
Matt Eaton, Chair	Emmi Nicholl, Councillor,	Claire Daunton, SCD Councillor
Ray Jakes, Vice Chair		Tracey Thorby, Parish Clerk
<b>Members of the Public:</b>		
Don Fleet		
Viv Fleet		

No	Agenda Item	Action
1.	<b>Welcome:</b>	
2.	<b>Apologies:</b> Geoff Hall, Councillor, David Hurrell, Councillor, Donna Lynsey, Councillor	
3.	<b>Members' Declaration of Interest for items on the Agenda</b> None	
4.	<b>Anglian Water's Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation:</b>	
	<p><b>A Review Response from Parishioners for Consensus of Opinion:</b></p> <p>Responses received from parishioners:            "We will respond using the consultation form, but I thought we should let you know that we will be <u>opposing</u> the option of Honey Hill site on the basis of the objections raised during the recent Zoom meeting and specifically</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Traffic implications:</b> Junction 25 is already noted as an "accident cluster" and the proposed HGV movements can only make the situation worse. I also think the turn into High Ditch road could cause further congestion, especially during busy periods and pose a safety risk as it crosses the cycle lane. Further congestion will exacerbate the tail-back into Quy from commuter traffic and make the air pollution from this even worse.</li> <li>• <b>Impact on wildlife:</b> The Honey Hill site had the more issues flagged than the others in the RGB assessment that was circulated.</li> <li>• <b>Building on the green belt:</b> I know all the remaining potential sites could object on the same basis, but the importance of need protecting of the green belt has featured on the news quite a bit recently.</li> </ul> <p>I did think quite carefully about Bill's argument that the relocation of the WTP could prevent the spread of housing into that area, whilst it is probably true that it would prevent it, I am not convinced it is a major risk since</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any building there would be in the green belt and an application for housing development is less likely to be approved than the "need" to find an alternative site for the WWTP (once it is accepted the current site has to be vacated).</li> <li>• Unfortunately I suspect that the most likely areas for development/in-fill would be the land between Newmarket road and Church Street/Stow Road/Main Street/Albert Road.</li> </ul> <p>I must admit that I am quite worried by this proposal as the Honey Site seems to be the cheapest option (if you ignore the non-financial implications)"</p> <p>Comment posted on Facebook:            "I hope it's ok to post this here. Whilst people may have different views on the waste water treatment plant locations, and the extent to which it might affect us, I thought I would share some of the arguments I've made in my consultation response for it not to be site 3.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I understand site 3 is an important area for wild bees (I saw a notice on the village shop), which are in decline and threatened by urban bee farming bees according to Cambridge University (The Telegraph, 25 May 2018, 'Urban beekeeping is harming wildlife bees, says Cambridge University')</li> <li>2. Air pollution through unpleasant smells would affect the enjoyment of the landscape</li> <li>3. Weatherspark.com 'Average weather in Cambridge' says that 11 months of the year the average wind direction is from the West, which means we would be most affected in terms of smell on windy days (I don't know to what extent we would experience smells though)</li> <li>4. Archaeology and heritage - the site is part of an area that is of important historical and scientific interest as it was where ancient 170 million year old fossilised 'coprolites' were discovered in the 1840a, which played an important role in creating fertiliser for the country for the country during the industrial revolution which</li> </ol>	

was much needed due to many people moving to cities and towns for work. Source: 'The Fossil Diggings of Quy Fen' (2011) Bernard O'Connor.

5. More population in Milton and north Cambridge would naturally vote for site 3 as its further away from them, so then need to develop a site 4, such as north West of site 1: this would affect the least number of people.

6. What will they do to minimise smells, eg could they cover the treatment pools?"

Confirmed Game Keeper of Quy Estates and Farmer of Alicky Farm are against it being relocated to site 3. Comments to Parish Councillors from Parishioners who are against the proposal of site 3.

Viv is arranging to visit the current site.

When this consultation came from Anglia Water (AW), Ray advised having attended the Webinar, discussion with AW and contact with Fen Ditton Action Group he felt he was better informed. Concerned about the traffic, odour. AW have advised the odour should not be such an issue as is with the current site due to how old planation is.

Viv

#### **B Parish Council Decision and Response:**

Vote taken, 3 voted against Site 3.

Known two Parish Councillors were also clearly against proposal of Site 3 who were unable to attend tonight and one Parish Council was indecisive.

Fen Ditton, Horningsea and Teversham Parish Council have written for an extension. SCDC and CCC have also written to seek an extension. Parish Council agreed that six-week consultation and response required by Wednesday 19 August 2020 is a very tight timeframe for such a consultation, the Parish Council could also write a letter to seek an extension.

Parish Council agreed to prepare a response in anticipation in case it is not extension. Concerned at lack of response to Parish Council by parishioners as concerned parishioners will not have individually responded.

Able to provide feedback online as a individual or representative of a group. Provide feedback on site option, site process, tunnel and consultation process.

Feedback suggesting which site is the best option. Option nearer the A14, near 'dump' would potentially be the better site of the three proposed.

#### Points/Suggestions to include in feedback against Site 3:

##### Traffic:

- Increased traffic
- Reduced air quality due to lorries, congestion leading to delays, reduced air quality due to lorries and idling vehicles
- J35 already 'accident cluster'
- Joining Highditch Road to Newmarket Road
- Cyclists crossing Highditch Road on route 51

##### Visual Impact:

- 26m buildings will be eyesore in area of outstanding natural beauty, area of special interest
- Area used for exercising
- Impact on Quy Mill Hotel

##### Ecology:

- Within Quy Fen and Wicken Fen corridor
- Earmarked for rewetting
- Extra traffic will have negative impact of wildlife
- Night-time lighting effect on bat population

##### Archaeology:

- Fleame Dyke
- Archaeology found on Marleigh Site nearby

	<p>Air Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Westerly wind blow odour and noise towards Stow-Cum-Quy</li> <li>• Extra traffic</li> </ul> <p>Question raised as to where they will be distributing the waste. Some waste will be going to some farms.</p> <p>If they do place at Site 3, what do we want to see them produce to help with placing at this site:</p> <p><u>Mitigations:</u></p> <p>Traffic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Junctions on both sides of the A14 (dedicated junctions) as the local roads are not up to regulations and would require extensive work and at the junctions at Highditch Road to Newmarket Road, railway bridge to Fen Ditton not big enough</li> </ul> <p>Visual:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How deep can it be planted to try and obscure from view</li> <li>• Species of trees, restricted due to height and density planting of trees</li> </ul> <p>Ecology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower lighting during the evening/night</li> </ul> <p>Archaeology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taken full account of archaeology area, including significance of Highditch Road</li> </ul> <p>Air Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct access on and off the A14 using 'Honeyhill' bridge, (preferably not using J35 as turnaround if possible)</li> </ul> <p>Parish Council oppose the site. Ray suggested obtaining some of the poster from Fen Ditton now the Parish Council had decided opposed, Parish Council agreed was good idea.</p> <p>Do we write another letter to parishioners to advise the Parish Council's response, itemising the response, might encourage parishioners to response? The Parish Council does not wish parishioners to feel that the Parish Council not communicate fully, and a further letter drop would confirm and hopefully encourage any parishioners to complete the feedback form.</p> <p>Matt will draft a response and e-mail around to Parish Council for approval and printing.</p> <p>Viv – Stow Road, Orchard Street and Stow Road          Emmi – Vicarage Meadows          Tracey – Herrings Close, Bungalows at top          Ray – Albert Road, Station Road, Main Street, Wheelwright Way and Minter Close</p> <p>Still need Newmarket Road and Quy Waters to receive flyers once agreed.</p>	<p>Ray</p> <p>Matt/ Parish Council</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>A Integrate powers with other local organisations:</b>                  20/1705/TTPO                  T1 Ash Reduce height by 3m, shorten laterals by 2m to rebalance crown and thin by 20%                  44 Vicarage Meadow Stow Cum Quy CB25 9AL</p> <p>Not able to review, more for information.</p> <p>20/1713/TTCA                  T1, Norway Maple. Reduce and reshape the North-west side of the Maple tree located in the front garden of the property, removing approximately 1.5mtrs, Crown lift to 4mtrs from ground level.                  T2, Lime. Reduce and reshape the crown of the Lime tree by removing approximately 3mtrs from the North-west side and crown raising to 4mtrs above ground level.                  Both these trees have only minimal growth on the South-east sides of their crowns due to the proximity of overhead electrical wires and equipment. Utility pruning has and continues to be severe and as such the trees are heavily weighted towards the dwellings. This pruning work is necessary to address some degree of balance and to restrict the growth towards the house.                  46 Vicarage Meadow Stow Cum Quy CB25 9AL</p> <p>Not able to review, more for information.</p>	

**6. Date of next meeting:**

Wednesday 16 September 2020 at 19:30hrs

Wednesday 18 November 2020 at 19:30hrs

DRAFT