

King's Cliffe Local Liaison Group

Meeting 7th June 2006

Present

John Huntingdon
Gene Wilson
James Wathen
Cllr. Priscilla Padley
Cllr. Pauline Bradberry
Fiona Cowan
Werner Schulze
Kevin Howard
Hilary Blunt
Peter Higson-Smith
Palden Dorjé
Karen Chabatoris
Martin Bates

Representing

Augean
Augean
Augean
Northamptonshire County Council
East Northamptonshire Council
Collyweston Parish Council
Collyweston Parish Council
King's Cliffe Parish Council
King's Cliffe Parish Council
Eastern on the Hill
ENC Environmental Protection
Environment Agency
NCC Waste Planning Authority

Before the meeting

Councillor Padley reported the death of Charles Cox. The meeting felt that a note of thanks and debt of gratitude should be recorded in the minutes felt by the local community for his hard work and requested that a record of thanks be made in the minutes of his hard work, efforts and contributions made to the Liaison Group.

1. Apologies

Daphne Sharpe
Phil Watson
Harold Gregory

NCC Waste Planning Authority

Introductions

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1 4.1 Q. Councillor Padley requested has anything been sorted out about the highways works.
- 2.2 A. Has been considered and is now part of the section 106 Agreement that is shortly to be signed.
- 2.3 6.2 Tree Species
Had Augean been able to locally source native tree species? – yes and had passed on a copy of the local provider about native trees to Gene Wilson and to Phil Watson. Gene explained that there had been an attempt to try and get some early planting in place along the southern boundary of the site but unfortunately this didn't prove possible.

- 2.4 Mr Higson-Smith expressed his concern that “whipps” would be planted rather than mature trees.
- 2.5 Details of the tree planting arrangements would need to be supplied to the Planning Authority 3 months after the signing of the planning permission. It is a public document but not a consultative document. It will be carefully examined by the County as part of its function as a Waste Planning Authority.

3. Augean Update

- 3.1 Gene Wilson gave a presentation on the intensive works that will need to be carried out over the coming months in order to rectify problems left behind by the previous owners of the site.

- 3.2 There was a need to carry out the works as there were dangers arising from the steepness of the slope on the northern face. The reasons were explained as relating to:-

- (i) Slope stability
- (ii) Erosions of the uppers layer
- (iii) Containment of the waste the landfill gas and the leachates
- (iv) Factors influencing the design were:-

(a) Putting in advanced control to help prevent some odours from the site to help keep pressure to also reduce some of the odour problems.

(b) Regrading the slope to a 1:3 and shallower. However in order to avoid encroachment in the area of the badger setts there was need for a retaining wall Gabion to be constructed along a 50 to 80 stretch within the site.

- 3.3 Risks management issues have been considered and these are

- (i) Health nuisance – odour, gas, dust, noise
- (ii) Environmental – surface and ground water
- (iii) Ecological – badgers, newts and trees

- 3.4 Peter Higson-Smith – Q. asked whether Wastego kept records of the types of waste in the co-disposal area?

Augean answered that they are not entirely sure but will undertake appropriate monitoring of any wastes during the operations and ensure the following are recorded:-

- 3.5 Monitoring of what wastes which are encountered
Site monitoring will take place
Water leachate
Gas
Dust

3.6 Additional off site monitoring would also cover:-

Leachate
Location
Formation
Frequency
Increasing

3.7 Remediation Supervisors will be able to stop the work on the ground if problems occur.

The Contractor will be in communication directly with the landfill manager.

3.8 Peter Higson-Smith Q. He raised concerns over groundwater protection e.g. If toxic leachate leaks to the north and gets on to the groundwater. This was noted but the monitoring measures and the operational works have been designed to ensure this does not occur. The project should take 23 weeks and a letter will be sent to the Liaison Committee and local residents before works commence.

3.9 Werner Schulze Q. What about the deer?

A. Should stay away because of the activity.

3.10 Councillor Mrs Padley raised the point that the fence at the northern boundary is gone. Will litter be a problem?

3.11 Gene Wilson summarised the main points relating to the works under the following headings:-

- (i) Starting on the 19th June 2006 and intended to last in the region of 23 weeks
- (ii) Principal activities
- (iii) Environmental controls
- (iv) Rockfill
- (v) Gabion wall construction
- (vi) Excavate cover soils
- (vii) Regrade (with 22,000 m³ of materials the majority of which will be soils for capping)

3.12 Q. Is it good quality soils for regenerative growth?

A. Because of the circumstances and engineering requirement this will mean that the land is very steep. Therefore there can be no restoration to agriculture and the restoration will be to rough grassland. Therefore if the quality of the soil is too good it will not be fit for the purpose of grassland with a high biodiversity value.

3.13 The compound for the contractors' vehicles and temporary offices will be kept totally separate from the ongoing landfill operation. It will be

necessary to remove some of the woodland scrub for the remedial works on the site but this is not significant.

- 3.14 Provision would be made for an invertebrate habitat on the western end outside of the SSSI.
- 3.15 The working would be carried out in strips of 50 to 10 m exposed and any one time.
- 3.16 The presentation slides could be made available on request to Carol Earpp at the site office.

4. Environment Agency Update

- 4.1 Karen Chabatoris, Environment Agency – confirmed that the Agency is to do some monitoring outside of the site.

Concillor Mr Padley asked whether there was testing of water outside the site?

It is monitored continuously and has been no pollution found in the groundwater.

No changes in groundwater course.

5. NCC Update

- 5.1 The delay in the issuing of the planning permission was a result of time taken to prepare the Legal Agreement.

6. Local Questions

7. Any Other Business

8. Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 6th December 2006

This was requested to as soon as possible after the works carried out.

Meeting adjourned to the landfill for a site inspection

The lorry holding area, the new barrier system was inspected. It was noted that the old two storey offices had been removed and that the laboratory had been repositioned under the old sheds. It was noted that the tyre stock pile had considerably reduced. The inspection was taken around the site viewing the tyre storage, drum containment/inspection area, wheel washing area, soils stock piles, the currently active cell and the cells to be infilled next, and the northern slope area at the eastern end. On return the new laboratory was inspected. The equipment had been installed relatively recently and was handling samples from most of Augean's sites.