

THORNHAUGH LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETING

NOTES OF MEETING

Wednesday 9 September 2009 – Kings Cliffe Landfill

Present: Nick Simmons(NS) Environment Agency
Susan Marsh (SEM) Peterborough City Council
Martin Witherington (MW) Thornhaugh Parish Council
Hally Hardie (HH) Leicester Road, Thornhaugh
Gene Wilson (GW) Augean
Carol Earp – Note taker Augean

1. Apologies

Sam Cowan	P J Thory
Simon Moyle	Augean
Francis Joseph	Home Farm
Bunny Guinness	Thornhaugh

ACTION

1. Approval of previous minutes

SEM advised that the previous minutes had not been updated with reference to “housing ban” and disagreed with MW recollection of discussion at the meeting and believes she called it “sensitive development”.

MW voiced concerns of housing application embargo at Home Farm due to the possibility of complaints being raised against the landfill. MW states policies mention about putting residents next to waste facilities but in this case, a waste facility was put next to residents.

SEM advised that consultation areas had been identified around waste sites and quarries in the emerging DPD's, are the same. This has been done throughout the plan area and seek to limit inappropriate development near waste management facilities and quarries that might prejudice the ongoing operations at these sites. The consultation around Thornhaugh 1 which affects Home Farm is no different from that identified around other sites in Peterborough and Cambridgeshire and Home Farm is not being ‘picked on’ Home Farm is also subject to potential countryside planning limitations which would restrict development whether or not it was sited near a landfill site/quarry. The boundaries to settlements/village envelopes will be reviewed as part of the Development Plan process and the representations made by residents in respect to Home Farm will be considered at that time (see below on this point).

MW advised had contacted Council with regards its papers on countryside development but has still to receive a response.

SEM advised that all representations registered on the Peterborough Development Plan have been taken on board but unfortunately due to lack of resources have not all been formally responded to. SEM confirmed that all responses would be available on the website in due course.

MW asked how the presence of Home Farm prejudices the site.

SEM stated that the closer the housing to the site the more likely the prejudice the ongoing operations at the site. Waste management facilities including landfills are difficult to find and steps must be taken to retain when they have been identified.

2. Matters arising

HH raised the issue of litter along Home Farm footpath and along A47. HH advised his wife had litter picked since the last meeting and collected 5 black bin liners full. In the undergrowth there are large plastic pieces.

HH asked if this had blown over from site. MW advised that the litter may be historic. Once undergrowth started growing, SM would probably not see it.

GW advised we had undertaken litter picking along the A47 boundary but not on the Home Farm side of the road.

GW proposed that SM would contact HH to identify the litter and arrange for its removal..

SM

SEM asked if the EA had any concerns about litter blowing around at the site.

NS advised cover improved due to height of cell and therefore no litter lost from the site. GW advised that as the levels rise we would look at putting up litter fencing.

3. Augean Update

GW advised Thory stockpile dramatically reduced with a few piles left to move then they will move on to profiling Phase 7.

HH asked if this means the hole will be filled.

GW advised that in the local plan this has been marked as a potential area for landfilling.

SEM asked where the current non-hazardous waste comes from and GW advised its local industry waste.

4. Operations Update

GW advised:

- Gas flare replaced
- Well heads upgraded
- No new specific developments

HH advised there is occasionally a smell similar to bad eggs.

GW asked if residents at Home Farm could report any smells immediately so that Augean can investigate.

(NS and the site foreman visit the site after the meeting. The only significant odour detected was near Toll Cottage.)

MW asked if can to contact SM at weekends and GW confirmed that this was correct.

MW asked how plans for electricity generation was going with regards the gas flare.

GW advised needed to recontact the contractor who recommended a larger engine as NS was pushing for a decision.

GW advised the site is still working in Phase 5 with new cell development probably next year. Bradshaw Land is in Waste Development Plan

MW asked about plans for Phase 1.

GW advised that restoration to be planned; planning permission obtained includes higher levels than current

MW asked if it would be cleaned out and reprofiled.

GW advised not economically possible.

MW asked how the height would be increased. GW stated could overfill the area but would need to review HRA, however, a few years off completing this.

MW asked if we could not do nothing. NS advised "no". GW stated the area needs to be restored with agreement by the EA.

MW stated that the planning permission for the site expires 2013.

GW stated that Augean will need to consider extending the life of existing areas.

HH asked if the Bradshaw Land would be extended beyond 2013.

GW advised that this area would need separate planning permission.

MW raised concerns that Cross Leys had planning permission.

SEM advised this permission was limited and had been granted before SEM joined PCC. Believes this is for inert waste only. The importation of inert waste relates to the profiling of the land near the high pressure gas pipe which runs across the site. GW advised this was a proposal for inclusion into the local plan.

SEM confirmed that representations were sought on additional sites put forward for inclusion into the Minerals and Waste Development Plan earlier this year.

NS advised Mick George had shut down one of his other sites at Southorpe.

MW concerned that this area was fast becoming a dumping ground with more and more sites being licensed for tipping. GW advised this is what the development plan review consider.

SEM stated that the plan is to provide provision in a number of places over a period of time to ensure that sites are available in area so that waste is not stock piled.

MW commented that waste was removed from Thornhaugh to Newcastle which could have filled the site. GW advised was told to remove by the LPA and this was the right economic decision for the Company at the time.

5. Peterborough City Council Update

SEM advised no planning permission proposals for the site.

6. Update on Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan

The Submission Stage Minerals and Waste DPDs are currently going through the committee stages for approval by Council on 2nd December for pre-submission consultation for six weeks and then formal submission to the Secretary of State in June 2010. There is likely to be a EIP in the autumn of 2010 with adoption of Core strategy in late 2010 and the site Specific Proposals in 2011. The preferred option for Thornhaugh 1 is SNHRW.

The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development plan will consist of two DPD's and three supplementary planning documents.

One supplementary planning document will provide guidance for the design and location of all waste management facilities locations whilst another will provide design guidance for the inclusion of waste facilities in commercial and housing development for all areas and districts.

The third supplementary planning document is a master plan for Langwood/Block fen at Earith/Mepal. This area is out of PPC jurisdiction.

MW asked what the meeting was at the Town Hall on Monday evening. SEM was not aware of the evening meeting or what it is about.

7. Environment Agency Update

NS advised two areas to discuss cover and gas.

Cover - discussed with SM on making improvements as the waste height was increasing. Improvements had been made however further cover is required.

SM

Gas - Regulations require that landfill gas is contained, collected and either used to produce electricity or flared for destruction. Thornhaugh produces low volumes of gas so a flare is used, as currently there not enough gas to generate electricity from a standard sized engine. This is why a microturbine is being investigated for use by Augean, something which the Agency supports. The flare used on site is required to be changed to a high temperature enclosed type.

MW advised that he believed Augean had ordered a micro turbine.

GW stated that Augean had looked at doing it late last year but deciding whether to revert back to the original plan or put in a bigger engine. Once decision is made, the installation is to be completed earlier next year.

NS completed by stating this was one of his quiet sites.

NS to provide business cards to MW and HH so they may contact him if they need to.

NS

8. Monitoring of air quality and ground gas at Home Farm

Confusion over when the last monitoring data was submitted. MW believed it was around 1½ years ago; GW thought it had been sent after the meeting before the previous meeting? GW to check

GW

GW presented a summary of the most recent monitoring results.

Elevated carbon dioxide has been detected but this is consistent with the limestone strata

NS/SM

Dust

There are weather related peaks but all within the specified limits

NS stated aware of differences between landfill and main road particulates and never noticed dust from the site.

HH has observed excessive dust but could be down to either road, agricultural or landfill.

GW asked what colour the dust was as limestone would be a pale colour where soil would be a rusty colour.

Asbestos

Graph showed signs of recent spiking but not above the limit.

NS advised asbestos cell closed and capped with 1m of clay so unlikely to come from site.

Data collected is reported to EA on a quarterly and annual basis.

9. Application for LLW at East Northants Resource Management Facility, Kings Cliffe

GW advised in late July a Planning Application has been submitted to Northants County Council and an Application for Authorisation has been submitted to the Environment Agency and consultation ends September 2009. PCC have been asked to consider the application as an adjoining authority.

SEM advised this will be going to committee on 13 October after they have consulted with Parish Councils. SEM stated Phil Watson, Planning Officer at NCC, had agreed PCC feedback could be submitted later than requested.

GW advised Augean would continue to make presentations to Parish Councils – 5 or 6 completed so far out of a possible 15. The presentations completed have been open with around 3 people in attendance.

HH asked what the general feeling was to the proposal.

GW stated the surgery was successful, which MW attended, but there is a group in Kings Cliffe who was very concerned and is lobbying against the proposal and then there are others who do not know why they making a fuss. We held a Site Open Day last Saturday but only 12 people came; 3 from Kings Cliffe only. A public meeting was held in Kings Cliffe which 150 people attended and was run by the people lobbying against the proposal.

HH asked if any radon measurements had been taken in the village and if discovered down there how would they feel.

GW advised that radon measurements had only been taken at the site and found nothing. That could be due to the site being on clay and radon levels are more likely in sand/gravel.

MW asked why the consultation was so wide.

GW explained after speaking with NCC Planning Officer they felt four parishes were to be consulted (Kings Cliffe / Duddington / Collyweston / Easton on the Hill) and to some degree Thornhaugh and Wansford; Wansford took a stronger interest. Cllr Heather Smith requested consultation with Rutland as it was just the other side of Duddington. PCC consulted straight a way.

MW asked how much would the site take?

GW stated that 3m tonnes of low level waste would be produced over 100 years. An average of 30,000 tonnes per annum would be produced depending on projects and some may be disposed of on the producer site. Kings Cliffe has 600,000 cubic metres of space, however, the site would continue disposing of other waste streams so it is difficult to state how much of the waste will be received.

MW raised a concern on people not knowing the waste is there and running around it in the future.

GW advised that there are not many hazardous sites (only 6 in the UK) and that there is no indication of any other hazardous waste sites taking this waste.

10. Any other business

None.

11. Date of next meeting

Friday 12 February 2010 at 11.00am at East Northants Resource Management Facility.