

# THORNHAUGH LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETING

## MINUTES OF MEETING

Thursday 15 December 2011 – Christie Hall, Wansford

### Present:

Theresa Nicholl (TN)	Peterborough City Council (Minerals & Waste)
Steve Horner (SH)	Peterborough City Council (Rights of Way)
Cllr Diane Lamb (DL)	Peterborough City Council
Kevin Burton (KB)	Environment Agency
Martin Witherington (MW)	Wansford Parish Council
Hally Hardy (HH)	Leicester Road, Thornhaugh
Gene Wilson (GW)	Augean
Simon Moyle (SM)	Augean
John Hollister	URS (For Augean)
Ian Campbell	URS (For Augean)
Eleanor Nicholson	Jennings Nicholson (For Augean)

### 1. Site Update

### ACTION

**SM** gave the committee an update on current site activity.

**Engineering** - Phase 5 had been engineered since July and was due to be complete this week. It would accept non-hazardous waste and asbestos. Infilling of the cell would start from the east.

**Leachate** - The leachate wells were elevated out but should be reduced by February. It had been agreed with the EA that excess leachate could be removed by tanker to ENRMF for use in the Soil Treatment Plant.

**Litter** - The litter fence had been moved and extended. Blown litter had also been cleared from the road. **HH** had photos of litter on the A47 and at Bedford Purlieus. He thought that the fence was not adequate and a rethink was needed around the site perimeter. **SM** agreed to address this, in particular litter in Bedford Purlieus.

**SM**

**Gas Turbine** - This had been reviewed with potential contractors and was still not thought to be viable with the current waste inputs. **GW** commented that the matter would continue to be periodically reviewed but the principally soil wastes of industrial origin produce very little gas unlike domestic landfills which produce large quantities because of the organic content of the waste. **SM** reported that there was a need for a permanent gas flare.

The relatively small amount of gas generated at Thornhaugh was discussed in comparison to other sites, as well as the viability of a gas turbine and the cost / financial implications.

#### 4. Peterborough City Council Update

**TN** said that the Peterborough City Council Site Specific Proposals would be put before committee members in February to adopt as policy. This forms part of the Core Strategy and is a joint Cambridgeshire and Peterborough allocation, which includes where potential landfill and quarrying could take place.

**HH** asked whether this included incinerators. **TN** confirmed this and added that not all wastes can be incinerated and provision had to be planned for landfill capacity as well.

**MW** asked about the restoration of Cook's Hole and Thornhaugh 1. Could the restored site operated by Mick George be contoured in? It was generally agreed that a holistic approach was needed, and ideally all the sites would be contoured together. **GW** stated that no plans for the eventual restoration of Cooks Hole had been formulated at the present time but Augean would support a holistic approach to the matter. The difficulties of this in relation to planning so far in the future and the involvement and agreement of third parties was discussed further.

#### 5. Environment Agency Update

**KB** confirmed that he had inspected the site three times in recent months

- In June the litter fences were moved further up the site face to catch more litter. **KB** acknowledged **HH's** concerns and agreed to call in and see **HH**. Further monitoring of footpaths could be undertaken by **SH**, PCC footpaths officer.
- Boreholes were all in good condition.
- Surface water ditches were clear and in good condition.
- The flares on Phases 3 and 6 were working fine. Pipes had been raised to drain water.
- The recent engineering had been checked to make sure it was constructed as per the approved plan. The EA were pleased with the construction and design.
- Leachate levels were above the permitted threshold, but a management plan had been agreed with **SM** to bring the wells back into compliance.

**KB**

**KB** confirmed that he was satisfied that the site was operating well and was compliant with the site permit.

#### 6. Monitoring

**GW** presented a summary of the most recent monitoring results.

Test results for Lead, Electrical conductivity (salt), Chloride, Ammoniacal Nitrate, Methane, CO<sub>2</sub>, asbestos and breathable dust did not indicate any problems.

There was small peak in dust levels in April / May due to a dry period. **HH** reported a dust problem in his garden in September. **GW** confirmed that anyone experiencing problems with dust need only call the site to raise

any concerns.

**KB** added that in the older parts of the site, Phases 1 and 2, there was a small percolation of contaminants. These were trace amounts and barely detectable, but higher than the rest of the site.

## **7. Cook's Hole Quarry**

**GW** gave an update and confirmed that planning permission had been granted in April. Reserved matters on the conditions were approved regarding access and the operational processing area.

Augean would not quarry the site itself; the contract for an operator was currently out to tender. An operator would be appointed in the New Year and it was anticipated that work would start in mid-2012.

No objections had been received on the temporary diversions of footpaths. The deadline for comments was 23 December. **MW** confirmed that the Parish Council had looked at the proposal and had no objections.

## **8. Low Level Waste (ENRMF)**

**GW** gave an update on the legal challenge to LLW waste acceptance at ENRMF. This had been dismissed, but the Court of Appeal had given leave for a hearing in mid-January 2012 to allow for a clarification on a narrow point of planning law.

Augean had voluntarily undertaken not to accept LLW to date, but would seek to do so if no injunction is granted to the appellant. Following the protest the police have asked that Augean does not make public in advance any dates of LLW acceptance.

## **9. Western Extension (ENRMF)**

**GW** explained that changes in legislation meant Augean was obliged to apply to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) and not Northamptonshire County Council for a time and void extension. The process was different and certain aspects of the application would have to be redone. A number of consultation events, workshops and site open days had been undertaken from May onwards. An application to the IPC was expected to be submitted in the New Year.

## **10. Thornhaugh 1**

**GW** stated that Augean had been very frank about the completion of the site and the need for a time extension and the intentions for the Bradshaw land, which has permission for mineral extraction but not landfill. The consultation event was an opportunity for the liaison committee and the local community to comment on the proposals and respond with their thoughts.

The addition of white lines on the A47 was with the Highways Authority, who were agreeable, and who would also need the agreement of the Police. Augean were considering what financial contribution to make towards this but were waiting for PCC to come back with some costs.

In relation to traffic **MW** had been trying to set up a meeting but his enquiries had not been responded to. He asked whether **TN** could ask Alan Jones to get Highways to respond?

**TN**

**11. Any other business**

None.

**12. Date of next meeting**

No date was set for the next meeting.

