

Thornough 1 Quarry Liaison Group - Notes of Meeting held on 13 September 2007

Attendees

Gene Wilson (GW) – Group Technical Director, Augean
Susan Marsh (SEM) – Minerals and Waste Planning Officer, PCC
Cllr Diane Lamb (DL) – local councillor
Mr R. Ballam (RB) – Home Farm Residents Group
Sam Cowan (SC) – Thorey's
Karen Chebatoris (KC) – Environment Agency
Simon Moyle (SM) – Augean, Site manager at Quarry/Landfill site
Martin Withrington (MW) – Thornough Parish Council and Home Farm Resident

Apologies for Absence

Cllr John Holdich – local councillor

This was the inaugural meeting of the group.

The meeting started with Mr Ballam presenting a list setting out the parameters he felt that the group should be operating under. He asked that these be considered and agreed before the meeting commenced. The matters of concern were as follows:

- **The venue.** Mr Ballam stated that the meeting should be held at either Thornough or Wansford village hall. GW raised no objection to a different venue but said that the company had made available their offices for that purpose. It was agreed that Hubert Warren, the parish clerk, should be approached concerning the availability and booking of one of the halls.
- **Time of meeting.** RB considered that 2pm was not a convenient time for those interested in attending that were working. GW commented that this time had worked well with the Kings Cliffe Group but he would attend whatever time the meeting was held. It was agreed that the next meeting would be held at 6.30pm – or earlier if it was convenient for the attendees who would be canvassed beforehand.
- **The purpose of the meeting.** RB suggested that the remit of the group should only be to discuss the completion of the landfill site at Thornough by 2013. MW said that the group should be able to discuss anything that affects residents in that area. It is only a consultative body and not decision making. DL suggested a compromise, which was agreed, that the group should be able to discuss any matters relating to the landfill site at Thornough.
- **Chairman of the Group.** RB said that the chairman should be independent and it could not be a councillor has a responsibility to local residents and their role would be compromised. MW suggested that there should be a revolving chair with all members taking a turn. This was agreed.
- **Minutes of Group.** RB said that these should be taken by a Council officer. SEM was already taking these and so it was agreed.
- **Cooks Hole.** RB considered that there should be a separate group set up to discuss this site. MW felt that two committees with the same people would be unproductive. DL said that if Augean trying to be transparent then it would be

against local interests not to have the information made available. It was agreed that if there was information on Cooks Hole then GW would ask the group if they wished it to be made known.

Augean Update

GW said that there had been significant changes to the company and to personnel over the last year or two.

The company owned landfills at Kings Cliffe and Port Clarence near Middlesbrough together with treatment works at Hinkley, Cannock and Worcester.

Augean consider themselves to be a treatment company to recover value and to recycle. It specialises in the more difficult to manage wastes – hazardous and non hazardous.

Augean will continue to acquire businesses specialising in waste treatment. New techniques and facilities are being developed at other sites. There are proposals for soil treatment at Kings Cliffe (basically washing to get rid of contaminants to leave sand/gravel). There is already a similar plant at Port Clarence.

There is an application in preparation for a wide range of treatment operations at Port Clarence. At Hinkley there is a waste stabilisation facility.

Personnel changes – John Huntingdon has been replaced by Peter Worledge.

Paul Blackler is now the commercial director.

GW joined in 2005 as Group Technical Director.

Simon Moyle joined as site manager (Kings Cliffe and Thornaugh) and replaces James Wathen (now technical).

Carol Earp is administrator for the technical department.

In 2006 IMS was implemented and certified. (Systems for environmental, health and safety and quality management.)

Report by Simon Moyle on quarry/landfill operations at Thornaugh

In phase 5 there are 4 cells (non hazardous, asbestos, gypsum and contaminated soils). The non hazardous and asbestos cells are full and there are small amounts of gypsum.

Phase 3 is capped and seeded. RB commented that part had been cut. (SM said to 10cm to retain grass cover)

Landfill Gas. There is the possibility of a small turbine on site to generate electricity to go into the grid. Only a small amount of gas is currently generated due to the nature of the fill material but it is a renewable energy source.

Two wheelwashers – sunken bath and jet wash. These were installed in 2006. RB said that the road was not in good condition even though they were in operation. SM said that there was also a road sweeper. RB said that the access road was being swept but mud was coming out on to the A47. SC said that there have been issues with the wheel washer not operating properly.

MW said that there had been a strong smell of landfill gas near the site and into Home Farm. Had the trial finished on the flare stack as otherwise could this be the cause?

GW agreed to have the flare stack checked immediately to see if this was a source of the smell that was reported. He gave instructions for this to be done during the meeting. GW said that trials had started but had been delayed. The gas technologists could not continue the trial and it had been delayed 4 months. There is less gas than

anticipated and it cannot support a standard engine but it may support a micro turbine. This is being assessed and seems to make economic sense. The decision to take this forward will be determined at a board meeting at the end of October. The planning permission for the flare stack expired in June and a further application is being made to continue with the stack.

SM said that if there were issues with the running of the site then he should be contacted in the first instance. He circulated business cards with his no. on. (mobile no. 07917 348090)

SM said that there was a south west face to the water lagoon. This will connect to the headwall and to Thornaugh Beck next month. It is clean water. There are discharge limits.

MW asked what the results were from the testing stations around the site and if there were any trends. Was there anything that should alarm the residents of Home Farm? GW said that monitors around the site checked for leachate levels, gas quality, gas ambient air quality, dust including asbestos and there were groundwater monitoring boreholes. KC indicated that the boreholes in phases 1 and 2 had picked up elevated levels. The dust points at the front of the site covers emissions from the site as a whole and there are downwind of the prevailing wind. There are 4 dust receptors. RB felt that they did not pick up the dust entering his garden. GW explained that the position of the dust monitoring equipment will detect dust moving towards the property of RB but was happy to move the equipment opposite his property.

MW sought confirmation that the movement of gas is measured. KC confirmed that this was the case and that there was a current record. There is no methane detected but there are elevated concentrations of carbon dioxide consistent with the limestone geology. KC confirmed that there was no environmental risk to residents.

Hydrogen sulphide is measured in the air.

Groundwater boreholes in the front of the site are designed to pick up contaminants. There is no contamination detected except near Phase 1.

Planning Update

SEM set out the current position in respect to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste DPD. She mentioned the consultation that had taken place on the Preferred Options in November/December 2006. The representations had been inputted into an electronic system and all the comments that had been made were available for public inspection. The link is:

[www.peterborough.gov.uk/environment and planning/Environment & Planning](http://www.peterborough.gov.uk/environment%20and%20planning/Environment%20&%20Planning) > [Planning](#) > [Statutory Development Plan](#) > [Local Development Framework and the New Statutory Development Plan](#) > [Minerals and waste plan](#) This brings you to the point where you can read the comments on the different documents (Core Strategy, Preferred Sites and Earith/Mepal). It's page 4047.

Officers at Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City council were currently reviewing the sites that had been previously put forward as 'preferred' in the light of the comments made and were also having new sites that had been put forward

in the Preferred Options consultation assessed by consultants to see whether they were any better than the sites that had already been put forward.

There were no current planning applications outstanding at the site though the gas flare stack should be submitted shortly.

Other Matters

MW said that Toll Cottage was immediately adjacent to infill at the site. Restrictions should be put in place. If there is no risk then no restrictions should be required.

MW tabled a consultation response that GW had made to a planning application by RB for a dwelling on his land. GW had objected to the proposal on the basis that it was within 250m of a landfill site. GW said that he stood by his comments. GW said that the monitoring shows that management of the site is working. It does not demonstrate that there is no risk.

SEM said that the MW DPD was proposing a 'consultation area' of approx. 250m around each quarry/ landfill or waste management site and that no sensitive development should be permitted within this area that would prejudice the future operation of the site. Quarries and waste management sites were difficult to identify and should be protected once they are designated or permitted.

Quarrying at Thornaugh 1

Sc said that there was no mineral left and that crushing had ended. The stockpiles remain and will be sold as market forces allow.

It was acknowledged that the height of the stockpiles was an issue and had been discussed with SEM. They will seek to reduce the height/impact of these stockpiles.

SC said that if pockets of limestone were found in phase 7 then they would be extracted. RB said that he would not find any.

Future Proposals

GW said that the planning application for the gas turbines would be submitted once financial approval had been given for the project.

An application was also being worked up for the Bradshaw land where there was currently permission for mineral extraction but not landfill. SEM indicated that this area was in the Preferred Options of the MW DPD for landfill of stable non reactive hazardous waste.

GW said that there were problems with Phases 1 and 2 not being lined as they had been constructed on the basis of 'disperse and attenuate'. This is the cause of the contamination found in the borehole by the road. RB said that household waste had been put in phase 2 and he did not want the area to be touched. GW said that something would have to be done with phase 2 as it was not lined. KC indicated that when the new permitting regime came in the entire site except phases 1 and 2 was covered. Phases 1 and 2 were still covered by the Waste Management Licence. There were problems with contaminants getting into the groundwater. Auegan need to demonstrate remediation.

DL asked that was being done to remedy the situation and GW said that options were being explored.

Phase 4c would go beyond 2013. RB would object. GW said that there would be a presentation when proposals were finalised.

MW asked that if the access could be looked at when the planning application was being put together. Could it be moved to the east so that it has less impact on Home Farm residents getting in and out of their entrance? GW said that this would be examined.

MW asked for a copy of the plan of the quarry that had been tabled.

DL asked that the monitoring results be made available and KC agreed to send a copy of the annual report to members of the Group.

Environment Agency Matters

KC is the primary contact. She circulated a card with her contact details on.

If there is an incident then dial the freephone no. so that it will be logged.

Most of the Agency issues had already been dealt with.

Any Other Business

MW said that there were motor bikes on the site at weekends and wanted to know who to contact out of hours. GW and SM expressed surprise at this as there was no evidence on the site. It was suggested that SM mobile no. be used.

RB raised the issue of the appearance of the entrance to the site. He felt that it should be made more presentable to the public. GW said that he would give this matter some consideration.

Time and Place of Next Meeting

Wednesday 9th January 2008 at Thornaugh village hall (to be confirmed) at 6.30pm (unless attendees can make it earlier)