

Minutes of the virtual meeting of Fen Ditton Parish Council held on Tuesday, 4<sup>th</sup> August, 2020

Representatives of Anglian Water attended the meeting to answer questions on the relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant – see appendix 1

**Present:** Cllrs Bush; Collett; Dangerfield; Devine; Easterfield; Farrar (Chairman); Jones; Sues.

**In attendance:** Dist. Cllr Daunton; Cty Cllr Bradnam from 20.10; 4 members of the public; the clerk

**2020/63 To receive apologies**

Dist Cllr. Cone.

**2020/64 Open forum for members of the public**

Members asked question and expressed their concerns about the relocation of and consultation for the Waste Water Treatment Plant and specifically regarding proposed site 3, Honey Hill.

**2020/65 To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> July, 2020**

The minutes of the meeting were approved

**2020/66 To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2020**

The minutes of the meeting were approved

**2020/67 To receive declarations from Councillors as to the disclosable pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests in relation to any items on the agenda**

No declarations of interest for matters on the agenda were made.

**2020/68 Clerk's report and matters arising from the Minutes**

- i. Cemetery extension – no further update
- ii. Speed reducing gate on High Ditch Road – no further update, councillors had not reported back that they had visited the site.
- iii. Waste bins – SCDC will be providing 1100litre euro bin at a cost of £13/lift. Fortnightly April to September and monthly October to March. To be sited in cemetery where there was once one.
- iv. High street bin to be emptied 3 times/week – to be monitored
- v. Community/Village Hall - Advice has been received from NALC that the best option would be for a lease between the owner and the working group. ACRE advise that this is the most common way for halls to be run A Zoom meeting with ACRE, the chairman, a member of the group running the hall and clerk is scheduled for 5<sup>th</sup> August
- vi. Church wall - A report has been received on the damage and passed to the PCC by Alun Ford on 29<sup>th</sup> July who considers that the wall belongs to the church who insure it and that the damage may be covered by insurance.
- vii. Tree application, 20/1350/TTCA – 23 Green End: reasons for removal of Deodar Cedar that the roots are lifting the drive, pillar and path and approximately 4metres from a listed building; the Atlas cedar as the tree is only 2,5 metres from the front of the house and willow because they have partial collapse.
- viii. Works on Browns Field – a planning application is to be submitted.
- ix. Roses next to river and on land adjacent to the Barn, Green End – a resident had reported this. Councillors were not aware

**2020/69 To approve payments made during the month and accounts for payment:**

The following payments were approved.

	Cheq.	Amnt
	No	
British Telecommunications	DD	35.05
Haven Power	DD	16.45
Hayden Woodruff – bus shelter	101701	15.00
Mark Sturmev - churchyard	101702	105.00

Buchans – recreation ground, cemetery, village green, verges, churchyard spraying	101703	958.60
Andrew Firebrace Partnership Ltd	101704	387.60
HM Revenue & Customs	101705	29.60
Sarah Smart – July salary	101706	542.40
St Ives Quickprint - newsletter	101707	146.00

**2020/70 To note money received**

none

**2020/71 To receive report from County Councillor**

Cllr Bradnam reported that:

Information as to the completion of the cyclepath along Ditton Lane would be sought.

**2020/72 To receive report from District Councillors**

Cllr Daunton reported on

North East Cambridge action Plan consultation

Community East Forum

Community Land Trust Initiative for Affordable Housing

Covid-19; volunteer support, outbreak control; test and trace; re-opening of the High street; business support.

Police issues

**2020/73 To consider following planning applications and tree works applications**

20/02179/HFUL	7 Wrights Close	Ground floor and rear extension
20/02403/HFUL	1 Horningsea Road	Single storey rear extension with lean to roof, small bay to first floor master bedroom at the rear, bike shelter to north passageway and windows to side elevation The Council commented as follows: concern of impact to neighbouring property to the north; concern that there is insufficient open space/garden area remaining at the property should the development take place. request that SCDC officers consider whether the property has not been extended in the passed and whether or not this is application would therefore constitute overdevelopment of the property. should the application be approved a condition is applied that all building materials and vehicles are kept on site or the Council's green space adjacent to the property is utilised with agreement with the Parish Council and the area made good following use. It was noted that the property, 6 High Street, is vacant and the new prospective owners were unaware of the application.
20/02777/HFUL	Ditton Hall	Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and the erection of a replacement single storey rear extension Noted

20/02778/LBC	Ditton Hall	Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and the erection of a replacement single storey rear extension Noted
20/03116/FUL	8 High Ditch Road	Extension to agricultural building and the construction of a hay barn and storage. Refuse. The Council reiterate the comments made on the original application, S/2003/12/FL, that the building was very high for its stated use and that such a building of the size on green belt land could set a precedent for change of use to residential. The Council do not believe that the building has been used for its permitted use and are concerned that the application is to extend building by a further 50% with an additional barn and storage reinforcing and increasing the concern of the Council to the original application

**2020/74 Planning application responses from SCDC**

None

**2020/75 To receive updated tree survey**

It was agreed that works on the trees on the recreation ground and in the cemetery should be carried out. It was agreed that councillors would review the works to the trees in the churchyard on site and report to the clerk who would apply to South Cambridgeshire District Council for permission to carry out the works as agreed.

**2020/76 To consider quote to carry out work as per tree survey**

It was agreed that the work should be carried out subject to 2020/75 above and an adjusted figure be agreed by the clerk with the tree surgeon.

**2020/77 Financial documents**

- i. To receive report on first quarter figures to 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2020
- ii. Deferred to September meeting
- iii. to receive and approve bank reconciliation to 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2020
- iv. Deferred to September meeting

**2020/78 To consider co-option applications**

No applications had been received

**2020/79 To receive correspondence**

None

**2020/80 To accept notices and matters for the next agenda**

Chairman ..... Date .....

**Appendix 1**

**Q4) Is it correct you have turned down our request for further time to respond to this consultation?**

**ANS:** Correct, AWS will not extend the period as requested and the reasons are mainly as set out in an email of 28/7/2020 to the Parish Clerk.

POST MEETING NOTE: FDPC and Teversham PC understand that the request may be taken up by others.

**Q5)** Will the tallest structures be the anaerobic digestion tanks with a maximum height of 26m above ground level (Stage 3 Report section 2.3.83) or a structure with a height of 16m which was described at the Quy Parish Council Meeting? How many such structures do you expect there to be?

**ANS:** At the current level of design AWS expect these tanks to reach 26m AG and there would be 2 or 3 of these tanks.

**Q6)** Can you explain why the Fen Ditton and Baitsbite designated Conservation Areas are not in the list in paragraph 2.2.1 of Appendix C to the Fine Screening Report? Also, Table 17 in Appendix B omits the Marleigh playing fields that will be adjacent to High Ditch Road?

**ANS:** The Study Area is defined around the Cambridge and Waterbeach WWTW catchments. The two conservation areas queried are omitted but would be considered at the next stage of site selection and subsequently if Site 3 (Honey Hill) is chosen.

**Q7)** Do you agree that Table 18 statement that 'No ProWs cross, or are adjacent to, the site' contradicts the fact that Low Fen Drove byway is part of its perimeter.

**ANS:** AWS policy is to select a site perimeter that avoids the need to divert ProWs. AWS expect that the WWTW fence line would be separated from the ProW by the additional area of land take needed for mitigation works.

**Q8)** Can you explain why you evaluate the Green Belt equally around the 3 sites as RED but only give a score of AMBER at Site 3 under 'Landscape and Visual Amenity' when there are many references to Fen Ditton, Teversham, and High Ditch Rd in the 2002 Study supporting the 2018 Local Development Framework? Do you recognize that for example the Vision Statement in section 7.5 of that Study mirrors the point that many people enjoy easy access (with scope for improvement) to the area of Honey Hill, Quy Fen and the Wicken Fen Vision area in general so they can appreciate the setting of special character of East Cambridge?

**ANS:** All 3 sites are on the Green Belt and therefore score equally as RED. The particular characteristics of each site in each category will be taken into account in making a decision on the site finally selected.

POST MEETING NOTE: At the Stow-cum-Quy PC meeting of Wed 29<sup>th</sup> July, AWS explained the approval process as being one whereby they would have to demonstrate to the Planning Inspector that the incursion into the Green Belt was justified and that they would also have to demonstrate that the mitigation they planned was sufficient.

**Q9)** Can you explain why groundwater impacts are classed as uniformly AMBER across all three sites but Site 3 is in a Zone classed as RED on the Government's MAGIC website?

**ANS:** AWS consider that the RED Zone for groundwater protection shows where the aquifer is not protected by overlying strata. Although the aquifer underlying Sites 1 and 2 is protected by overlying Gault Clay, the tunnels would be constructed partly in aquifers

**Q10)** Do you agree that Quy Roundabout – High Ditch Road route and the A14-Horningsea Road junction are unsuitable for access to Site 3 and should be ruled out? At the Quy PC meeting you said that the traffic management would be sorted out later but do you agree that the use of these routes and junctions, even if modified for safety reasons, would inevitably increase delays for road and cycleway users?

**ANS:** Neither route would be ruled out at this stage since traffic management would be resolved later. Some possible sites have been screened out because the road access passed through communities. On the secondary point raised that the Horningsea Cycleway was used by children going to school and therefore air quality was important, AWS reported that its policy is to switch the vehicle fleet from diesel by 2030.

**Q11** Are you aware that High Ditch Rd is on the line of the ancient and historic Fleam Dyke and is therefore unsuitable for HGVs or for reconstruction to make it suitable? There have been recent archaeological discoveries at Marleigh that may underpin the importance of Fleam Dyke even further.

**ANS:** AWS are aware that Fleam Dyke is a Scheduled Monument and noted the point that there are unpublished investigations nearby.

**Q12** Do you agree the above might affect the RAG scores of Site 3 and that you will correct the scores now as these errors and points are brought to your attention?

**ANS:** AWS will present RAG scores within the report on final site selection.

**Q13** please confirm that the choice of 400 m buffer zone around a works only applies to residential housing and not to offices or industrial uses etc.

**ANS:** AWS apply a buffer zone of 400m for residences and 150m for commercial properties.

**Q14)** Please confirm if the elevation of the Honey Hill site is above that of your Milton Works.

**ANS:** AWS design shows that Honey Hill site is at a similar elevation to the existing WWTP/

**Q15)** Taking on board the complex nature of the storm water management and treatment processes you describe in the documents, please describe how you will manage emergencies outside the design performance. We are particularly concerned whether or not you would have overflow points in the system upstream of any relocated works. Can you confirm that if in the event of an emergency, such as for example, rainfall exceeding your design capacity, power failures, failures in the discharge pipelines etc etc. there will be absolutely no requirement to spill discharges onto land or drains near a relocated works especially if it is at a higher elevation than Milton?

**ANS:** AWS design does not provide for discharges of untreated effluent upstream of the WWTP. The storm design is based on a 1:100 year rainfall event with an increased intensity added to allow for climate change over the next 100 years. There is extra pumping capacity to lift effluent from the tunnels to the WWTP and this is backed up by emergency power supplies. At the point when storm flows exceed the capacity of all the stages of treatment and their storage, the residual flow will be partially treated and blended back into the flow that has received full treatment and the combined flow then returned to the River Cam. There is therefore no emergency condition in which the effluent stream would have to be pumped out to ground or surface drains at the WWTP. FDPC added that this description was understood but it did mean that the pipelines to the outfall would have to be fully functional.

**Q16)** How will you interpret and report the number of answers you get to the questions in your survey and to points raised by different means?

**ANS:** All responses, whether returned questionnaires, emails, letters or other means, would be taken into account. Each point raised in a response would be matched to a topic heading and passed to the appropriate part of the AWS team dealing with that topic.

**Q17)** ADDITIONAL RAISED AT THE MEETING: When would AWS publish the replies to queries made at the Webinars which could not be answered at the time.

**ANS:** AWS were working to publish all the webinar Q&A by Friday 8<sup>th</sup> August.

DRAFT