

King's Cliffe Local Liaison Group Meeting

20th July 2011

Present

Phil Watson (PW)
Eleanor Nicholson (EN)
Gene Wilson (GW)
Tony Slipper (TS)
Kevin Burton (KB)
Roy Mantas (RM)
Michael Day (MD)
Felicity Stevenson (FS)
Simon Moyle (SM)
David Burgess (DB)
Chris Leuchars (CL)
John Haddon (JH)

Representing

Northamptonshire County Council (NCC)
Jennings Nicholson Associates (for Augean)
Augean
Tixover Parish Council
Environment Agency (EA)
EA
King's Cliffe Parish Council
Easton on the Hill Parish Council
Augean
Woodnewton Parish Council
King's Cliffe Parish Council
Barrowden Parish Council

1. Apologies

Heather Smith Councillor (NCC – Prebendal)

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting (6th April 2011)

- 2.1 Paragraph 3.5 – Contact at Peterborough City Council is Theresa Nicholl not Christina.
- 2.2 Chris Leuchars (CL) – Asked if the minutes could be put on the NCC web site.
- 2.3 Phil Watson (PW) – Confirmed that this would be done.

3. Operators Update

- 3.1 Simon Moyle (SM) – Explained that engineering work has commenced on Cell 5a and the EA has approved the engineering details. The soil treatment pad is being extended. Some engineering works are also being undertaken at Thornough landfill which Augean also operates.
- 3.2 SM explained that a traffic survey of HGV movements accessing the site has also been undertaken in response to questions raised by the local community. The results are broken down below (total 101%, presumably due rounding):
 - 10% A1 and then through Easton and Collyweston (i.e 6 per day)
 - 51% A14 to the A43 (i.e 33 per day)
 - 39% A47 off the A1 (i.e 25 per day)
 - 1% A47 from Leicester direction (i.e less than 1 per day).
- 3.3 Gene Wilson (GW) – Explained that traffic is contract based and could change. The survey started in June 2011 so this is the first set of data and it will continue to be gathered.

- 3.4 Tony Slipper (TS) – Commented that transportation routes would be more emotive with Low Level Radioactive Waste (LLW).
- 3.5 GW – Explained that Augean will have much more control over LLW routes and they will be controlled.
- 3.6 CL – Noted he was not happy with vehicles through the villages even on the A43 Road (e.g Geddington).
- 3.7 PW – Commented that there would be no justified planning reason to exclude vehicles from travelling along the A43.
- 3.8 GW – Commented that Augean would consider LLW vehicles coming from the A14 being directed along to the A1 as this would avoid Geddington. He will write to inform everyone after considering this further.
- 3.9 Roy Mantas (RM) – Explained that the Department for Transport control movement of radioactive waste and packaging has to be appropriate to the type of waste in case there was an accident.
- 3.10 SM – Informed the group that a new 1.8 metre chainlink fence is being erected at the site and will be completed by the end of next week. SM explained that the County Terrorism Security Advisor from Northamptonshire Police had inspected the site and was pleased with the system of security cameras. The fence is being put up under the initiative of Augean and is not a requirement of the Police. Signs are to be erected on the fence to warn that there is an active landfill site and deep excavations.
- 3.11 Kevin Burton (KB) – Commented that the fence provides health and safety benefits in terms of liability insurance.
- 3.12 SM – Explained that the current engineering works have exposed the full depth of the in situ clay. SM is happy for people to visit the site to see this for themselves.
- 3.13 CL – Asked if the engineering works will be completely down to the limestone.
- 3.14 SM – Yes.
- 3.15 CL – Expressed concerns that this was not in line with current EA policy, although it was in the past.
- 3.16 KB – Explained that the European Landfill Directive (LD) controls current works. EA policy sits at the side of this and any new application will need to comply with the general policy.
- 3.17 GW – Explained that the site standards have to first meet the LD and be risk assessed. This process highlights that it doesn't matter if there is basal clay left so long as the final engineering meets the appropriate specification.
- 3.18 David Burgess (DB) – Commented that the issue of time is relevant as clay differs in its characteristics.

- 3.19 SM – Confirmed he received two complaints in June and that these were circulated to the LLG members. A further complaint was received yesterday (19th July) regarding a vehicle queuing on the highway at the site access for 2 minutes. SM explained plans to move the weighbridge 30 metres further into the site to give more room for vehicles to stand on the site at busy times.
- 3.20 GW – Explained that the Secretary of State issued the LLW planning permission in May but that this is subject to a judicial challenge relating to Environmental Impact Assessment law, not any technical or policy aspects. GW advised that Augean is continuing to prepare for waste importation and that the planning permission is still valid whilst the judicial review is being processed.
- 3.21 Eleanor Nicholson (EN) – Explained that the western extension consultation exercise has been undertaken involving 47 parish councils and others (including this LLG). This has involved distribution of the latest version of the environmental information. In addition three exhibition days were held and consultation responses welcomed. A site open day was also held and well attended. The EA, Health Protection Agency (HPA) and Research Sites Restoration Limited (RSRL) were on site at the open day. Augean will hold open days again in the future. The workshop proposals were not well supported so only one is proposed (23rd July) at Wansford. The subjects to be covered are:
- Design constraints and options
 - The EIA assessments
 - HPA – Radiation health
 - Augean – Reassurance and monitoring
- EN - Explained that about 15 people were booked in per workshop.
- 3.22 EN - Advised that Augean intend to hold some open days between the 5th and 16th of September, including Saturday the 10th of September, and that people were welcome to register to attend. EN explained that there would be lots to see in terms of the engineering controls. Information will continue to be available via the helpline. Feedback from the public consultation exercise will be sent out to the stakeholder group.
- 3.23 DB – Asked if it will be made clear when the application is being made.
- 3.24 GW – Explained that Augean are aiming to submit applications at the beginning of September.
- 3.25 DB – Commented that there is some confusion over the role of the HPA.
- 3.26 GW – Explained that the HPA's function is to advise the government on health matters relating to radiation. The HPA has a consultancy arm which provides a Radioactive Protection Advisor. They have a role in checking radioactivity levels are compliant in respect of health and safety for workers and members of the public.
- 3.27 GW – Provided an update on matters at other nearby Augean sites, namely Thornaugh and Cooks Hole which have been owned by Augean since they acquired Atlantic Waste. GW explained that Cooks Hole is a Review of Mineral Planning Permission (ROMP) site under the 1995 Environment Act, i.e a mineral permission. The site is however allocated in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Framework

(MWDF) for landfill with inert waste. GW explained that Augean will lease the site to a contractor to operate and that it can be restored at a lower level. With regard to the Thornhaugh landfill site, planning permission runs out in late 2013 so there will be an application to extend the life of the site. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough MWDF has the area identified for an extension. The site is permitted to take non hazardous and stable non reactive hazardous waste (e.g. asbestos, gypsum and contaminated soils).

- 3.28 CL – Asked if the site would handle radioactive waste.
- 3.29 GW – Explained that the current permissions only allow exempt waste to be dealt with at the site. If planning permission were applied for and granted in the future it could take LLW (as could other landfills throughout the country).
- 3.30 CL – Asked whether radioactive waste would be brought onto the site while the challenge was ongoing.
- 3.31 GW – Stated that it would depend on how long it took for the legal challenge to be decided.
- 3.32 CL – Asked why Augean would create cells which may not need to be filled.
- 3.33 GW – Noted the permission exists and Augean are preparing the cell for the needs to 2013. Waste will be taken from sources wherever Best Available Technique (BAT) is met (this is the test required by holders of LLW).
- 3.34 CL – Asked if waste could be sourced from further north.
- 3.35 GW – Commented that he couldn't say at this stage.
- 3.36 CL – Asked how Augean will stop vehicles turning right out of the site.
- 3.37 GW – Responded that cameras and signs as well as instructions to drivers were the mechanisms employed.
- 3.38 CL – Asked why the wheel wash is not near the site entrance.
- 3.39 GW – Noted that it is good practice to leave it back from the entrance to allow the internal road to be swept.
- 3.40 SM – Explained that he was willing to respond to any concerns and that people only need pick up the phone.
- 3.41 TS – Asked if there could be other types of radioactive waste received, e.g intermediate.
- 3.42 RM – Explained that there are other types of radioactive waste but that the site is restricted to exposure to workers of 20 mSv per year. There is a technical possibility that other radioactive waste may be accepted.

- 3.43 PW – Explained that planning condition 3 restricts radioactive waste to 200 becquerels per gram (Bq/g) and that this will prohibit any other higher levels of radioactive waste, even within the LLW category.
- 3.44 GW – Commented that the market need is for this level of LLW and Augean have made their application on this basis.
- 3.45 RM – Explained in detail about the different exposure level thresholds of 20, 300 and 500 mSv.

4. EA Update

- 4.1 KB – Explained that the Phase 5 design passed CQA. Two inspections have been undertaken by the EA since the last liaison meeting. The first was an inspection of the surface water management scheme which was being renewed to ensure it was working well and this showed the scheme was working well. The further inspection was of general landfilling operations and waste acceptance processes.
- 4.2 John Haddon (JH) – Raised the issue of a complaint that had been made regarding a consignment of waste arriving from Bath not being checked.
- 4.3 KB – Explained that he spoke to the complainant and the allegation was not true.
- 4.4 KB - Noted that he will be inspecting the site later today to check the work of the independent consultants dealing with the engineering works. He explained that he would also sample some of the waste streams to compare with Augean's assessments. Regarding the water monitoring boreholes, KB explained that consideration is being given to the need to replace some of the boreholes which have silted up. Monitoring of the Horwater spring in King's Cliffe will be included as a routine inspection point by the EA. It will be inspected quarterly and results made available to the public.
- 4.5 KB explained that one odour complaint had been received from someone on the A47. It was an oily odour and was addressed by Augean through expediting the treatment and covering of the waste.

5. NCC Update

- 5.1 PW – Explained that the application for the western extension is expected early September 2011.
- 5.2 DB – Asked when the permit will be reviewed.
- 5.3 GW – Explained that the aim would be to review the permit around 2014.

6. Date of Next Meeting

- 6.1 The next meeting was confirmed for **2pm on Wednesday 7th of December at the King's Cliffe Memorial Hall.**