

Attendees:

Matt Eaton, Chair
Ray Jakes, Vice Chair

Bill Watts, Councillor
Donna Linsey, Councillor

John Williams, CCC Councillor
Tracey Thorby, Parish Clerk

Members of the Public:

Vince Farrar, Chair Fen Ditton PC
Charles Jones, Vice Chair Fen Ditton PC
Laurice Suess, Fen Ditton PC
Margaret Starkie, member of Horningsea
Action Group
Clare Le Breck, Mott MacDonald

Karen Barclay, Anglia Water
Mike Cook, Anglia Water
Kathryn Tay, Anglia Water
Zac, Anglia Water

Don Fleet
Viv Fleet
Jo Bell
Ellen Francis
Lynda

No	Agenda Item	Action
1.	Welcome: Karen Barclay, Anglia Water and team.	
2.	Apologies: Emmi Nicholl, Councillor, Geoff Hall, Councillor, David Hurrell, Councillor, Claire Daunton, SCD Councillor, Graham Cone, CD Councillor	
3.	Members' Declaration of Interest for items on the Agenda None	
4.	Anglian Water's Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant Relocation:	
	<p>A Open forum for members of the public (Consolidate Stow-Cum-Quy's views): Webinars held last week, Anglia Water (AW) project members who are attending meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why has Honey Hill been considered at all as it is all green belt? AW advised all sites in the greenbelt. Initially sites were considered outside of the greenbelt, but these have been discarded. The best performing sites are the three sites states in the consultation, even though all in sites are in greenbelt. Refer to the 'Non-Technical Summery to be r The greenbelt study of 2002 which was used in developing the 2018 Local Plan said the Eastern Fen Edge was an important feature which should be safeguarded. Also the latest City Plan says protecting green belt is a priority. Doesn't the new sewage works completely disregards these principles? AW advised plan is not in force but was used. The greenbelt is priority but there is provision that utilities can build within the greenbelt if has adequate landscaping. The sites are in the outer rural area of the greenbelt, as a lesser contribution to the distinctiveness of Cambridge. It in the least damaging position within the outer greenbelt and it will be important for landscaping to be put in place to help blend the infrastructure into the landscape. AW confirmed they architects will be used. AW advised if adequate landscaping, the relevant site will be approved by the Inspector. <p>Is it because Cambridge wants to access State money for building? AW advised the Action Plan is the provision of providing 8,000 homes. The operations need to move but due to greenfield build on brownfield. Building on current treatment site will releasing pressure of building on the greenbelt.</p> <p>Site land for current treatment site is owned by AW. AW are liaising with the landowners for the three potential sites.</p> <p>AW informed cooperation sought with landowners of the three sites. Landowners served notices telling them they are going on to their land to carry out relevant surveys. Majority of landowners have cooperated. AW advised there are statutory provision that allows the land to be survey. If the landowners do not want to sell the land of the site chosen, AW confirmed that the landowners could have an 'order' placed on them to force the sale of the land.</p> <p>Comment regarding lesser contribution to the distinctiveness to Cambridge, green lung to North East Cambridge. Outer rural area as a lesser role of distinctiveness to Cambridge. Reiterated that 2002 Greenbelt plan is not longer in force. That plan was the 1992 which is also now not in force. AW advised that each city has a different distinctiveness, none are the same.</p> <p>Current Local Plan 2018 study done into the greenbelt by request from Inspector, from AW understanding there was no change from Honey Hill from the previous study. Secretary of State ruled against Honey</p>	

Hill in 2017 and one of the decisions for that was due to the greenbelt at Honey Hill. Planning Inspector needs to make the decision in due course. AW will be securitised by Inspector, and it will be judged again the National Policy as well as Local Policy.

- The additional 100 plus HGV lorries on a daily basis will have a very detrimental effect and the current infrastructure is not suitable. How is this to be resolved?
If Honey Hill is going to be selected, they will require to look at potential access route. This will have to be completed with Highway Authority with a proper access plan. There are no concrete proposals.

AW advised they will develop the proposals from comments pre the application point, they will be engaging with everyone at an early stage.

AW confirmed they have an online interactive channel and feedback form. AW stated the feedback forms have been mailed out and 15,000 homes, in the 'core zone'.

Tracey to put poster on noticeboards with contact details for AW and feedback form.

- Prevailing winds will bring any smell directly over Quy. How will this be prevented?
AW advised the current/old site has grown from Victorian times and has been in place for over 100 years and it is a critical service. They cannot guarantee no odour occurring but with the new build this is a clear priority of the project. 400m boundary around the plant so away from residential areas on all three sites. Prevention of odour occurring is a priority. Stow-Cum-Quy is 1.2km away from site, asked about Quy Waters but distance was not confirmed.

AW confirmed there is a high stand of engineering going into building the new plant as it is exceedingly rare to build a plant from the ground up.

Implement wildlife strategy taken into account, Environmental Impact Assessment will be undertaken. Landscaping and habitat creating are important

- Why siting the sewage works at Honey Hill would be a red danger area for Quy Fen SSSI
Pointed out that Quy Fen is right next door to this area. Sites Constraints Mapping mentioned. Habitat potential through drainage.
AW confirmed discussions with Natural England, mitigation measures.
Red rating as potential impact but from viewing this may not be quite as it seems.
- What does a modern treatment plan going to look like and what will happen to the rest of the site?
AW informed there would be landscaping, banking, trees, screening. Spacing and layout considered. Footprint of about 22 hectares and may be able to build at a lower level. Start looking at design and architects coming on board in next couple of weeks. Tallest building is 16m. Will find out what the site will look like more as AW go through the design process and AW will be taking us through it. Some sections in particular will be built at a lower level.

Are AW allowed to have 16m structure due to airport. AW advised they are in discussions with Marshalls.

It was raised that screening 16m builds will be difficult and a challenge.

- Can we put a height limit on any structures?
Please see above, AW advised tallest building 60m.
- Can we get most of it set ground?
Please see above, AW advised some sections will hopefully be built at lower level but designing will commence shortly with architects.
- Will the rest of the site still be farmed? Turned into nature reserve? Absorbed into Quy Fen?
The plant is based on 22 hectares, the part of the land they do not require will go back to the original landowners to continue to be farmed.
- What about public access and the byway? Will the access to the site be direct from A14?
Site 3 is not the overall area that has been mapped, they are much bigger and around 40 hectares, the site will require to be 22 hectares. AW cannot foresee that any footpaths or byways will be affected.

It was noted that Bio Net gain, the site will be able to be added to in the future, if required. The part of the land AW do not require will go back to the original landowners

Tracey

Access has not been discussed or confirmed but access to take under the A14 is an option. It was not confirmed who would pay for a junction onto the A14.

- Horningsea, grant licenses for their land and the are on the West side of B47, environmental impact. Who decided how far west Wide corridor

Total survey area 250meters between the site corridors.

Walk over survey of the sites to carry out habitat survey and recording of types of species found. More valuable habitat or protected species would be taken into account. Protected species of bats at Honey Hill and nocturnal insects and much more prevalence to the other two sites.

Underground sewer pipe brings flow of water from Waterbeach. Installation of that sewer pipe

- How well-lit the site will be and volume and hours of transport in and out.
AW has written response to FDPC and will send response shortly.

FAQ questions on the website. AW putting document together from webinar.

It will be a 24/7hr site, HGV peak traffic times 08:00hrs – 18:00hrs but there is Out of Hours so could vehicles still during this time.

- Legislation 1992 that residents have lived in Quy for a lot longer
New Planning Policy should echo and update the old legislation. Local Plan is published on Cambridgeshire County Council. Greenbelt study completed in 2017.
- Webinars held, AW attending PC meeting, attending Action Groups
- 400m area around water treatment plant, does that effectively stop any housing development between treatment plant?
AW advised it would be unlikely due to the buffer zone and they would resist if any planning applications were put forward in these areas. AW advised it would be unusual due to the size of the plant and who the area it is already serving. If it went to appeal it would be down to the Planning Inspector (Local Council) to make that decision.
- Noise, it can be relatively noising at the old plant. Noise levels of plant and HGVs.
The noise levels are relatively low and AW welcomed anyone to come and visit the current site to see noise levels and learn more about the treatment plant. HGV will be peaking between 08:00 – 18:00hrs but it is a 24/7 site so there will be some during Out of Hours and if there. Traffic Management Plan will take this into assessment.

To arrange visit, processing and how it works e-mail: info@cwwtpr.com.

- Corridors, 1m in diameter and dual piping, these would not be boarded, these would be trenched and run 14-18m underground and 3m wide. Inspection Hatches if anything goes wrong. How are you going to compensate the landowners?
Divert the drainage bored tunnel 18-22m deep, access points will be at ground level at the existing site and the new site. It is buried. Pipes 30in pipe and 2m levels in trenches, 3m deep for water supply and drainage. If there is a tunnel to cross the river, the pipe would go underneath the river.
- Considered the effect from the landowners that the land that has been left/returned to them?
AW advised the rest of land would be returned to landowner for agriculture. If the landowner is not able to use the land, then there is compensation for the landowner.
- Red risk for Ground Water?
AW avoids any contaminations getting through to the ground water system. This is included in the design to make sure there is no contamination.

Matt encourage all Parishioners to response directly to AW. Parishioners encouraged to e-mail Tracey at parishclerk@stowcumquy.co.uk. Tracey suggested holding a further meeting to discuss the comments and collate a response from the Parish Council.

	<p>Discussed trying to get the word out to parishioners. Suggestion that the Parish Council need to put flyer through ever door with some points of view. Agree the information should be neutral, the Parish Council should not be steering the parishioners.</p> <p>When this consultation came from AW, Ray advised having attended the Webinar, discussion with AW and contact with Fen Ditton Action Group he felt better informed. Concerned about the traffic, odour. AW have advised the odour should not be such an issue as is with current site due to how old planation is.</p> <p>Parishioner commented to bypass the Parish Council, does not believe in the Parish Council. Matt advised, as a Parish Council, the Parish Council wish to represent the people of Quay, this is first opportunity to asking parishioners. Individual Parish Councillors do have their own opinions and can vote directly/individually as a parishioner of the village.</p> <p>First open meeting for public for the Parish Council as only six-week consultation and response required by Wednesday 19 August 2020.</p>	
<p>B</p>	<p>Parish Council Decision: No outcome as first public meeting.</p> <p>Raise awareness with parishioners: Public Flyer with contact details</p> <p>Ray suggested knocking on door with questionnaire as do not feel parishioners will respond to flyer.</p> <p>Decided Flyer with information and encouraging to all parishioners to respond directly to AW and any comments to the Parish Council, e-mail Tracey at parishclerk@stowcumquy.co.uk.</p> <p>Matt kindly volunteered to produce flyer and it will be e-mail to Parish Council for comments/approval.</p> <p>Delivery of Flyer: Matt, Orchard Street Donna, Herrings Close and Stow Road Ray, Albert Road, Station Road, Wheelwright Way and Minter Close Bill, Church Road and Quay Waters (if Geoff unable to do Church Road) Tracey, Newmarket Road?</p> <p>Will clarify delivery once flyer agreed by Parish Council.</p>	<p>Matt/ Tracey</p> <p>Parish Council</p>
	<p>C Integrate powers with other local organisations: No further comment.</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Date of next meeting: Wednesday 16 September 2020 at 19:30hrs Wednesday 18 November 2020 at 19:30hrs</p>	