South Cambridgeshire Hall Cambourne Business Park Cambourne Cambridge CB23 6EA

t: 03450 450 500 f: 01954 713149

dx: DX 729500 Cambridge 15 minicom: 01480 376743

www.scambs.gov.uk

19 July 2010

To: Chairman – Councillor Charles Nightingale

Vice-Chairman - Councillor Tony Orgee

All Members of the Council

Quorum: 15

**Dear Councillor** 

This is a supplement to the previously-published agenda for the meeting of **COUNCIL** on **THURSDAY, 22 JULY 2010**, containing those public questions received between the publication of the Council agenda and the deadline for receipt of public questions at noon on Monday 19 July 2010.

Yours faithfully **GJ HARLOCK**Chief Executive

#### **AGENDA**

**PAGES** 

### 5 (b) From Trisha McCrae, resident of Hauxton, to the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder

The day to day checks and monitoring are being done on site by the contractor, who is working for the developer and are then overseen by Atkins who are also financially involved with the developer.

With the present problems in mind this is hardly seen as a true independent and transparent process.

In order to give the public some sort of confidence will South Cambridgeshire District Council now order the developer to pay for an objective independant expert in this field to be employed to do the required testing.

Can this also include analysing the minor chemicals and components on site because as at present only the top 10 are being done.

# 5 (c) From Linda Bland, resident of Hauxton, and Rob Thomas, resident of Harston, to the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder

It appears that at the end of all this aggravation South Cambridgeshire District Council and the Environment Agency will sign the job off .

If some years down the line, remembering that know one to date will give a 100 % guarantee that everything here is OK, if we were to experience another Corby like scenario will the responsibility not be fairly and squarely down to South Cambridgeshire District Council and the Environment Agency?



South
Cambridgeshire
District Council

# 5 (d) From Dr Charles Turner on behalf of the Cam Valley Forum to the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder

In their Remediation Method Statement discussing "Contaminants of concern" Vertase noted:

- (A) The recommended targets produced by Atkins are certainly protective of all identified receptors .... However, for the avoidance of doubt we do not believe these targets are achievable through the use of readily available and commercially viable remediation technologies or without significant export of contaminated materials off site. (Page 60, Section 18.1)
- (B) It does mean that some material will be replaced at the site that does not meet the present generic criteria (Page 14, Section 6.4).

Which are, and what is the nature of the chemicals that cannot be remediated - or not to the target levels - and so will be replaced and, more importantly, what measures will be taken to isolate them to ensure the safety of humans and groundwater?

### 5 (e) From William Garfit, resident of Harlton, to the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder

As the owner of the old gravel pit site opposite the former Bayer site at Hauxton, I have serious concern for those who work here. They are exposed all day to the obnoxious smells and volatile chemicals in the air since remediation commenced in March.

My daughter, Jackie Williams, proprietor of the Organic Health shop on our site, has had to be rushed to hospital on three occasions with severe breathing difficulties. She has never suffered breathing difficulties in her life before but occupational asthma has now been diagnosed and I am very concerned about her future health. She has had to close her shop as she is advised by the hospital doctors to keep away from the area.

Mr and Mrs Noble run Cambridge Farm Machinery Company. They and their employees suffer symptoms such as sore throats and dry coughs, headaches, tingling lips and numb tongues. Much work on modern agricultural machinery needs to be done outside. However they are driven to operate in the workshop with the roller doors shut.

At home in the village they, like so many residents of Hauxton, have to keep windows closed and are unable to sit in the garden.

They are expected to exist like this for another 15 months.

Would members of the South Cambridgeshire District Council tolerate these living and working conditions for themselves and their families?

#### 5 (f) From Martin Goldman, resident of Great Shelford, to the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder

The council has said and written much about working to ensure its residents have a good quality of life by looking after them, and their environment.

Its constitution claims that it is "committed to ensuring that South Cambridgeshire continues to be a safe and healthy place for you and your family".

It has powers to stop this nuisance to its residents' quality of life. Why is it not doing so?

# 5 (g) From Linda Whitebread on behalf of the South Cambridgeshire Green Party to the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder

I was surprised to see that the Council and other public bodies are sharing a website with the contractors carrying out the remediation work, rather than taking a more detached and regulatory stance. It also appears that the contractors are doing their own monitoring. Are these normal practices, and if so, how do the public bodies confirm that the measurements made by the contractor are done correctly?

## 5 (h) From Jackie Williams, resident of Little Eversden, to the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder

As the owner of an organic food business in Church Road, Hauxton who has had to go to A&E twice in May and be seen by paramedics on a third occaision with breathing problems confirmed by A&E Doctors as being due to chemical inhilation, I would like S.C.D.C. to tell me if they consider the cocktail of chemicals being released from the Bayer Site to be safe for a pregnant woman to breath in approximately 48 hours per week? I am particularly concerned about research that shows that in some instances two toxic chemicals mixed together can be one thousand times more toxic than one of the original chemicals. Please bear this in mind before commenting on the safety of an unborn child.

