

Thornhaugh Liaison Committee Meeting

Minutes

Friday 22 November 2013 at ENRMF

Present

Theresa Nicholl (TN)	Peterborough City Council
Alan Jones (AJ)	Peterborough City Council
Kevin Burton (KB)	Environment Agency
Helen Silk (HS)	Environment Agency
Martin Witherington(MW)	Thornhaugh Parish Council
Hally Hardie(HH)	Leicester Road Thornhaugh
John Gough (JG)	Mick George
Gene Wilson (GW)	Augean
Simon Moyle Augean (SM)	Augean
Eleanor Nicholson (EN)	Jennings Nicholson for Augean

1. Matters arising

SM reported that the litter protocol which had been established was now working well. There had been an issue with litter in April which was immediately resolved; the majority of the litter picked was fast food packaging. A clear up will take place as routine every 6 months. **HH** was satisfied that everything looked tidy.

SM announced that **Jennie Argent** had been promoted to Deputy Manager with specific responsibility for Thornhaugh. If there are any concerns about the site Jennie can be contacted on 07803 016015 or by email: JennieArgent@augeanplc.com as well as **SM**.

2. Site Update

The leachate levels that had been above permitted levels due to the high levels of rainfall experienced in 2012 were now in compliance. A leachate management plan had been agreed with the Environment Agency with a target date of September which had been achieved.

A temporary cap to help maintain acceptable leachate levels had been installed along the western flank of the site.

The issue concerning the adequate covering of asbestos waste that had been noted by the Environment Agency in their January 2013 inspection had been resolved. The site had been inspected by both KB and AJ with no significant issues arising from those visits.

It had been hoped that the footpath to the north of the site would be completed this summer, however a number of issues had arisen concerning bridging the surface water ditch and creating a fence that would segregate the footpath from operational areas. It was likely that the same contractor would be employed to both complete these works and plant trees

on phases 3 and 6 in autumn/winter 2014/15 once the new planning permission for the site had been implemented.

It had not yet been confirmed whether construction of Cell 7a would be scheduled to take place in 2014. The new cell would be on the Eastern boundary alongside Cooks Hole.

3. Thornhaugh Planning Update

GW reported that since The Planning Committee of Peterborough City Council had approved the application to extend the operational life of the site to 2029 in early November 2012, detailed schemes for restoration and noise monitoring had been submitted as Reserved Matters which now had been approved. **GW** would shortly be writing to Peterborough City Council to confirm implementation.

GW explained that implementing the planning permission implements the new restoration scheme. Under the consent Phases 1 and 2 are to achieve a final domed profile by overfilling the existing worked area. However it was necessary to understand what materials had been disposed of underneath before placing further waste on top as the weight of overfilling may result in problems. The phases had been worked using the practice prevalent in the 1990's of 'Disperse and Attenuate'. This practice had been superseded by the modern landfill principle of engineered containment. There were indications of contamination around the phases.

Augean were in the very early stages of considering how best to manage Phases 1 and 2 in the long term. The company were considering and exploring options for potentially digging out the waste deposited thereby removing the polluting potential. The phases would be re-engineered to modern standards before re-filling with waste to achieve the contours approved in the restoration plan. In the near future some trial pits would be dug in Phases 1 and 2 in order to better understand the waste deposited there. It was thought that there was very little putrescible waste that would cause odour. Odour had been identified as a key issue in whether digging waste out would be a viable option. It would be necessary to look at all of the implications; planning, environmental and economic before any decision would be made. As the company had a liability for the management of the site until the surrender of the Environmental Permit, re-engineering may be the best long term solution.

MW raised concerns about asbestos fibres being released if Phases 1 and 2 were dug out. He recalled a previous event, before Augean were operators, when asbestos dust from brake drums had escaped due to poor handling but the emissions had never been confirmed by the Environment Agency.

GW said that as far as he was aware there had never been an incident on the site that had resulted in the exceedance of permitted levels. Any emissions must have been below the trigger levels which are set conservatively so that there is negligible risk to human health or the environment. Monitoring always shows no detectable levels of asbestos fibres.

KB said that the Environment Agency was committed to being open to provide any information requested. The safe and appropriate handling of asbestos was a key concern; and the Agency was vigilant and diligent to ensure it was handled correctly. The inadequate cover incident at the site in January was a prime example of how careful they are in their approach. Although the asbestos had been covered immediately, the depth of soil covering

had not been quite enough to give **KB** confidence that in the event of a vehicle moving over the covered area, the soil depth was sufficient to be sure that any bags containing asbestos products would not be accidentally ripped.

MW was concerned about asbestos being loose tipped. **SM** reassured him by explaining that all bonded asbestos sheets are double wrapped and that fibrous asbestos was double bagged. During transportation asbestos waste is enclosed.

MW noted that digging out Phases 1 and 2 would potentially result in a longer lifetime for the site and that the front of the site nearest to the A47 and Home Farm would be opened up. Home Farm had had the benefit of the site working behind finished phases. However he could see that there would be a long term benefit to ensuring that any contaminants were properly contained.

GW further explained that Augean would keep all in the locality informed over the coming months and would be interested to hear the views of local residents and the Liaison Group which would be taken into account. In the event of a formal planning application a consultation programme would be undertaken. The scheme, if viable, would be taken forward during 2014.

4. 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. There was an increasing level of chloride detected on the northern boundary. Commonly elevated chloride levels occur due to seasonal factors such as road salt however this did not appear to be the case in this instance; there was no clear reason for the results but **GW** was confident that it was not to do with the landfill. Typical indicators of problems at landfill sites are ammoniacal nitrogen and chloride being detected together and while chloride levels were raised those of ammoniacal nitrate were not.

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:** Elevated levels of dust had been detected at the collection point on the northern side of Phase 7 this was attributed to lorry movements from Cook's Hole. **JG** confirmed that work in this area had now been completed.

MW and **HH** raised the issue of periodic odour in the valley area between Thornhaugh and Russell Hill that was particularly noticeable when the air was still. **SM** and **GW** encouraged both **MW** and **HH** to ring the site immediately if odour was noticed so that the leachate caps and the gas flare which may be potential sources of fugitive emissions that may cause the odour could be checked as soon as possible.

SM reported a new gas flare was now in operation at the site which was proving more efficient since its installation about 3 months ago. The ring main that feeds the flare would be replaced next year.

MW wondered if gas was finding its way out through the cap and was a source of the odour. **KB** explained that it was extremely unlikely that landfill gas would migrate through the bentonite cap which is designed to create a seal to prevent emissions.

5. Peterborough City Council Update

TN reported that two applications had been submitted by Mick George since the last meeting. An application to vary the working hours of the site was going to the Planning Committee on December 3rd. This would be discussed further under item 7.

6. Environment Agency Update

This year, **KB** had made three visits to the site; 24 January, 15 May and 21 November. In January the site had been checked in a general visit before the liaison meeting. Unfortunately some asbestos had not been adequately covered as discussed previously in the meeting. **KB** was satisfied during subsequent inspections that the cover was good and that there was plenty of soil available to achieve this near the tip face. In May the surface water run off had been checked. Phase 6 had been covered quickly so that there was less potential of contaminated run off. There was no indication of any problems in the perimeter ponds. The new newt lagoons had been created according to plan. The litter regime that had been agreed was clearly working. As reported by **SM**, leachate had been reduced to permitted levels in the agreed timeframe. The site was regarded as being a low risk site and there were no significant concerns about its operation.

KB introduced Helen Silk (**HS**) who is the Landfill Closure Programme Officer.

HS explained that the Landfill Directive requires a documented management system before surrender of an Environmental Permit. The Landfill Closure Programme is a national project which is designed to ensure that old landfill sites meet certain standards and can be effectively managed in the long term through monitoring and maintenance programmes. At a local level **HS** is looking at 11 sites in the area. The EA are very interested in Augean's proposals to remove waste from Phases 1 and 2 and will be working with the company to ensure compliance.

7. Cooks Hole

JG explained that Mick George had applied for permission to revise the original phasing plan which had been approved. Stone was now being quarried at a good rate.

The footpath was about to be diverted but was subject to a final meeting with the footpaths officer.

The wheelwash had been reviewed and seemed to now be working more efficiently. **HH** and **MW** confirmed that it was felt that the road was now kept in good condition.

JG said that a temporary planning permission to vary the hours of working at the site had been issued on a 6 month trial basis. There had been no complaints about the extended

hours. Mick George had now applied for a permanent permission but with further extension of hours solely for the purpose of loading lorries. A decision would be made by the Planning Committee of PCC on 3 December.

MW said that the residents at Home Farm were extremely concerned about noise levels, which they had felt were acceptable until 6.00pm because of the background traffic noise at that time but that to extend the time until 7.00pm was felt to be a step too far. **MW** reported that he had been at home and had been seriously disturbed from time to time by horrendous crashing noises coming from the site. The prospect of having the peace and quiet of the evening disturbed by such events was unacceptable.

JG explained that the further extension of time was only for loading lorries and not for quarrying or other operational activities and that he was confident that the noises heard were not attributable to loading activities. **AJ** reported that he had made an unannounced site visit and in general the noise levels were not unacceptable and possibly would be further improved once the quarrying had gone further below ground level.

MW proposed that he and **HH** come to the site to try and identify the noise source that was causing the Home Farm residents such concern. It was felt that some reassurance about the noise levels of lorry loading would be helpful before the determination meeting. If it was demonstrated that the levels were acceptable, consideration would be given to withdrawing objections. **JG** agreed to arrange a visit for 27 November.

MW proposed that an option to apply the permission solely to Mick George should be considered.

GW explained that such a permission would cause some considerable difficulties for Augean. The permission if granted would relate only to the activity of loading aggregate and would not apply to any other purpose or function of the site. Although the site had been identified as an inert landfill in the Peterborough and Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Plan, further working of the site would be subject to a brand new consent with new conditions. The conditions of working hours would not roll forward.

TN commented that permissions tend to run with the land and not with an individual or company. If a planning permission was limited to an individual it could result in having to apply for new permissions if for any reason Mick George was unable to complete quarrying at the site with consequent cost and other implications for Augean.

JG said that a ROMPP application would be necessary at Thornhaugh II and that it would probably be applied for before August 2014.

8. Any other business

None

9. Date of next meeting

It was proposed that a meeting should be arranged to take place once Augean had decided whether to pursue the Phases 1 and 2 scheme.

