

It is known that multiple tips of hazardous waste occurred in Cresswell with the western field, that is currently identified as proposed residential dwellings, identified as a site that has risk of toxicity. A report, commissioned by the developer, concedes in Table 22 that 50% of the groundwater tests conducted in the western plot of land gave levels of Cadmium which exceeded safe limits. 100% of tests in that same area demonstrated the presence of pollutants including Benzofluoranthene and Fluoranthene in excess of safe amounts; all of which can be attributed to the tipping of industrial waste from the manufacturing of colours and dyes. SMDC Planning Applications Committee Item 1, dated 22/11/2018, notes that this report does not include the location where the road through the existing business park is proposed furthermore stating that "highly toxic waste was accidentally spilled on the field where the industrial area is to be constructed which has not been taken into account".

Section 6.6 of the developer's report also acknowledges that landfilled areas may be radioactive and hazardous to health.

The correspondence, dated 20/06/1997, between Cookson Matthey and Wardell Armstrong, acting on behalf of the developer, states only a "best guess" as to the chemicals present on the site but lists Arsenic, Silica, Lead and Boron as contributors to the pollution in Cresswell.

Anecdotal evidence from local individuals illustrates a grave picture; cattle that were housed on the land proposed for use suffered fluorine poisoning, their teeth falling out and their knees swelling before some were sadly destroyed.

When considering the harrowing effects that the various contaminants can have upon the health of residents, both existing and of the proposed new dwellings, and the health of those who will be expected to work on the site, all of whom are identified as at risk in Table 12 of the report; one would hope that they could have absolute trust in the developer to uphold any work related to public safety and to conduct it to the highest possible standards.

In reference to the earlier statement, precedent is important. Any dilution of requirements that are designed to protect public safety does not inspire confidence that appropriate resources will be dedicated to managing and remediate what is, by the government's own definition, contaminated land.

If the implication of this variation is that the developer no longer believes that it is financially viable to implement the original plans or that it is simply too difficult for them to achieve, questions must be raised as to whether they possess the suitable competencies to be responsible for the construction on this complex site.

The developer has already demonstrated an inability to meet their own timeframe, specified in Table 6.1 of their indicative programme; phase one would start in 2015, with residential and employment construction beginning in 2016 and 2017 respectively. The concerning lack of adherence to the original plans is an ongoing issue. The existing community cannot be made to suffer a substandard design due to the faults of the developer. Should the developer then indicate that without such a change to the plans the development cannot be completed, the value of this project must be considered against other construction in the area which is proposed for lower risk land and yields higher numbers of dwellings providing greater assets to the economy and housing requirements of the region.