

Thornhaugh Liaison Committee Meeting

Minutes

Friday 20 March 2015

East Northants Resource Management Facility

Present

Alan Jones (AJ)	Peterborough City Council
Kevin Burton (KB)	Environment Agency
John Stannage (JS)	Wansford Parish Council
Hally Hardie(HH)	Leicester Road Thornhaugh
John Gough (JG)	Mick George Ltd
Gene Wilson (GW)	Augean
Simon Moyle (SM)	Augean
Jennie Argent (JA)	Augean
Eleanor Nicholson (EN)	Jennings Nicholson for Augean

- **Matters arising**

- It was agreed that any matters arising would be dealt with under the other points on the agenda.

- **Site Update**

SM reported that:

- The excavation for the new cell Phase 7a had been started in mid-February. Augean were using Moldings as the contractors. There had not been any dust issues during the excavation so far. The committee and anyone else interested would be welcome to come and see progress – particularly once the excavation had been completed in about the next five weeks – to observe the clay and plastic liners being put in place. The clay would be transported to the site from ENRMF. **SM** explained the meticulous process of producing a CQA plan and testing the clay and plastic liner for permeability at each stage of construction before the EA would permit use of the cell for emplacing waste.
- Augean were currently operating in Phase 5 but hoped to have Phase 7a available by July. The site had been quiet so as to eke out the remaining void space.
- Both **AJ** and **KB** had visited the site to monitor progress.
- The footpath and bridge to connect A47 to Bedford Purlieus had been installed and woodland planting of the restored area of landfill had taken place.

- Due to high rainfall leachate levels were high at the site but **JA** was working hard to get it back into compliance. Currently about 8 tankers of leachate per week were being removed for use in the soil treatment plant at ENRMF.
 - Jennie Argent had settled into her new role as Deputy Site Manager and had liaised with **HH** with regard to odour and dust problems.
 - **HH** Asked whether the footpath could be upgraded with a surface suitable for cyclists
 - **GW** said that Augean had been advised by ecologists not to surface the path. At present the path is permissive and will not be adopted until the end of the site's life in the aftercare period.
 - **HH** and Martin Witherington had drawn to **JA**'s attention an odour problem in the "valley". **JA** had responded by ensuring that extra cover had been placed on waste soils in the landfill and had checked with Martin that there were no further problems.
 - **AJ** commented that he was happy with the actions taken by **JA**
- **Thornhaugh Planning Update**
 - **GW** reminded the committee of the background to the need for the planning application: under previous ownership of the site, Phases 1 and 2 were largely not engineered and had been filled with non-hazardous waste using old methods of landfill management called 'Disperse and Attenuate'. This practice no longer complies with the Landfill Directive and has been superseded by the principle of engineered landfill containment.
 - The site investigations had taken place in late 2013 in consultation with the Environment Agency. These investigations in the form of digging a number of trial pits and boreholes had allowed the company to fully understand the emplaced wastes, which were principally non-hazardous wastes which had been backfilled with mineral waste some of which was clean mineral and some contaminated. There was very little odour and any litter was compacted.
 - Augean had concluded the best solution was to remove the old waste deposited in Phases 1 and 2 and to place it in properly engineered landfill cells elsewhere in Thornhaugh Landfill.
 - The area that is now Phases 1 and 2 would be engineered to modern standards and landfilled in accordance with the currently approved final restoration levels and an amended overall phasing plan.
 - The proposed solution required planning permission and a variation of the Environmental Permits. A consultation had been conducted in September 2014 before finalising and submitting the planning application.

- The planning application had been submitted to Peterborough City Council in February and a variation to the Environmental Permit had been submitted to the Environment Agency in September 2014.
 - In response to requests the frontage of the site would be restored first. Assuming planning permission and the variation to the Environmental Permit were granted the material from Phase 1 would be removed to the newly constructed Phase 7. There would be an increase to the lifetime of the site which was currently calculated at 6 years.
 - Quarry materials will be excavated and taken off-site to provide additional void space to which will generate revenue needed to make the scheme economically viable. Clean quarry materials that were excavated would be used to restore Cooks Hole. A planning permission to vary the restoration plan for Cooks Hole had also been submitted in addition to that for Thornhaugh Landfill.
 - **HH** felt that it was important to maintain the frontage to the A47 so the site is screened off from Home Farm.
 - **JS** said it was important to have a discussion about the overall restoration scheme for the different sites in the area. A number of people locally felt very strongly about the matter and it would help if there was a coherent end objective for all of the nearby sites.
- **Monitoring**
 - **GW** presented a summary of the most recent monitoring results.
 - **Groundwater** : Boreholes were tested on a monthly basis and samples analysed for a range of parameters including salts, organic compounds and metals. Typical indicators of problems at landfill sites are ammoniacal nitrogen and chloride. Ammoniacal nitrogen is an indicator of materials with a high organic content that is breaking down. Chloride levels are commonly low in summer and raised in winter; usually due to road salt run off leaking into the boreholes. The combination of high levels of both ammoniacal nitrogen and chloride would be a typical indicator of leachate escaping from the site. The groundwater monitoring results show there is no such problem at Thornhaugh. There was no trace of lead.
 - **Air Quality:**
 - **Gas:** Methane levels have not been exceeded. Carbon dioxide is commonly present in limestone but the levels are low.
 - **Asbestos:** no fibres have been detected.
 - **PM 10 dust levels:** the monitoring results show no values of these breathable particles.
 - **Deposited dust:** There are peaks in the data but probably due to operations at Cooks Hole. There had been a peak in March but not above limits

Mick George update

- **JG** reported that Mick George had now been operating at Cook's Hole for 2 years. They had been operating in a previously excavated area that when historically worked for ironstone limestone often was discarded. They had estimated that they would find about 30% of recoverable material but it had only been about 5% so they had abandoned this working area.
- Pending an archaeological investigation they soon would be starting work in Phase C.
- Mick George had recently been given a discharge consent and had an ecology monitoring scheme in place along the Thornhaugh Brook.
- **AJ** commented that there was an intention to use lagoons for water management and the lagoons would shortly be in the process of construction.

• **Peterborough City Council Update**

- **AJ** reported that PCC were in the process of carrying out their consultation on the recently submitted planning application. The requirement at Thornhaugh was relatively straightforward. It was very positive that there would be proper engineering throughout the site. Cooks Hole was rather more complex particularly in terms of achieving a pleasing restoration scheme.
- **AJ** said that PCC had received an application from Bullimores for Thornhaugh 2B. At first they had been considering blasting but this had now been removed from the proposals. There are three owners of the site who could not come to a joint arrangement as to the future of the site, therefore Bullimores were applying for planning permission solely for their area of ownership.
- **JS** felt that it was very confusing for people locally with 5 sites in such close proximity. Concerns about applications at one site were being muddled with others. He suggested that it might be helpful to arrange a meeting with Wansford Parish Council through the clerk Wendy Gray. **GW** thought it would be positive to help local understanding of the different schemes. **EN** agreed to undertake the arrangements.

• **Environment Agency Update**

- **KB** explained that the EA had received the variation applications. There were two permits in place one for the closed part of the site and one for the operational part of the site. Moving forward there was some discussion whether to combine the two permits to one encompassing the whole site. There were some detailed technical points to resolve but the EA expected to be in a position to issue a permit in due course.
- He had visited the site to observe the excavation of Phase 7 and will oversee the process over the coming months. The contractors were doing well.

- In respect of the monitoring data all parameters were in compliance or there were reasons for occurrences. Although the levels of leachate are up there is no environmental risk because the threshold limits are kept low. It is a very typical problem of landfills and can be difficult to keep under control because of the variability of rainfall.
- **Any other business**
 - **HH** reported a build-up of dust on the left of the site entrance and stressed the importance of ensuring that gulley and culverts were free of debris as large puddles were created especially after heavy rainfall. **JA** would liaise with him over this matter.
- **Date of next meeting**
 - Not determined