



Northamptonshire County Council

David Nicholson
Augean South Plc - Communications
Slipe Clay Pit
Kings Cliffe Landfill Site
Stamford Road
Kings Cliffe
PE8 6XX

Please ask for: Phil Watson
Tel: (01604) 236638
Our ref:
Your ref:
Date: 29th March 2011

Dear Mr Nicholson

KINGS CLIFFE LOCAL LIAISON GROUP

I write to confirm arrangements have been made for the next meeting of the group, to be held at the Kings Cliffe Underground Youth Club, Memorial Hall, Church Walk, PE8 6XD. on **Wednesday 6th April 2011 at 2.00pm.**

I enclose copy of the last meeting minutes held on 2nd February 2011.

I look forward to seeing you, If you are unable to attend or send a representative, please let me know.

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. Minutes of previous meeting
3. Matters Arising
4. Operator's update
5. Environment Agency update
6. County Council update
7. Any other business
8. Date of next meeting

I look forward to seeing you at the meeting.

Yours sincerely

G.P. Watson

For

Chief

Planning

Officer

Development Control, Planning
PO Box 163, County Hall
Guildhall Road
Northampton, NN1 1AX

w. www.northamptonshire.gov.uk


t. 01604 236638

f. 01604 236065

e. gpwatson@northamptonshire.gov.uk



Northamptonshire
County Council



Kings Cliffe Local Liaison Group Meeting

Meeting 2nd February 2011

Present

Phil Watson (PW)
Roy Boulton (RB)
Sandie Parsons (SP)
Fiona Cowan (FC)
Leslie Heasman (LH)
Philip McCrone (PMc)
Richard Parkinson (RP)
Michael Day (MD)
Pauline Bradberry (PB)
Heather Smith (HS)
Kevin Burton (KB)
Felicity Stevenson (FS)
Eleanor Nicholson (EN)
Gene Wilson (GW)
Simon Moyle (SM)

Representing

Northamptonshire County Council
Northamptonshire County Council
Duddington Parish Council
Collyweston Parish Council
MJCA
Laxton Parish Meeting
Apethorpe Parish Council
King's Cliffe Parish Council
ENC District Councillor
NCC County Councillor
Environment Agency
Easton on Hill Parish Council
Jennings Nicholson Association
Augean
Augean

1. Apologies

Werner Schulze Collyweston Parish Council
Andrew Howard King's Cliffe Parish Council

Councillor Heather Smith raised a question about attendance and whether David Burgess from Woodnewton Parish Council had been invited. PW apologised that it appeared he had been missed off the list. It was further noted that Tixover and Barrowden had been invited but were not in attendance.

It was noted that Kevin Burton from the Environment Agency had replace Nick Simmons as the site inspector.

2. Minutes of the last Meeting

Agreed

3. Matters Arising

To be picked up on the main agenda

4. Operators Update

- 4.1 SM – Currently tipping in Phase 4b. Need to start to construct a new cell which would be for Phase 5. The design for this is being drawn up for consultation with the Environment Agency. Aiming for design, CQA, EA approval and a Programme for construction for May/June of this year. This would create a further 200,000m³ of void in cell 5a and a similar amount in cell 5b.

4.2 Great crested newts – Augean has found another colony and intend to translocate them. 500 have been translocated so far.

4.3 Augean are developing a Biodiversity Action Plan, particularly for reptiles and invertebrates.

4.4 HS – asked Augean to explain what the construction of new cell actually entails: -

SM responded as follows:

- Extract clay down to the limestone beneath
- Survey of limestone for any cavities
- Input engineered clay to 1.5 metres depth
- Lay a 2mm polyetholene "plastic" cover
- Cover this with a protective layer of sand and gravel on the base and up the sides for 2 to 3 metres
- Gravel is also needed to enable Leachate to collect at the base of the site

4.5 GW - commented that cell 4b will be filled this year. He explained the various layers of materials/soils etc required as part of the capping and topping out for restoration.

Future Development Matters

4.6 GW – Reported that Augean has a site known as Cooks Hole next to their Thornhaugh site. This is land with an old ironstone and limestone mineral extraction permission but there is a need to review the planning conditions (to achieve modern conditions), and Augean are intending to comply with this requirement.

4.7 GW - referred to Thornhaugh Local Liaison Group which includes Wansford and Thornhaugh Parish Councils and Peterborough City Council – HS asked whether any of the Northamptonshire Villages close by should be invited to that meeting?

4.8 GW - was happy with this suggestion and in discussion it was wondered whether it should include parishes such as Collyweston; Easton-on-the-Hil; Yarwell; Nassington; and Kings Cliffe. FC suggested this could be referred to Parish Watch. They could co-ordinate and play a role in communicating matters so that the group doesn't get too big.

4.9 PW - commented that the sites are mineral permission only and not waste development. That would have to be a separate planning permission process.

4.10 GW - confirmed that the site has to be restored without any imported infill.

Low Level Radioactive Waste (LLW) Application

4.11 GW - confirmed that Augean had received the European Union Euratom Treaty, Article 37 permission 3 / 4 weeks ago. This is part of the process for obtaining an Environmental Permit to deposit LLW.

4.12 Environmental Permitting – the draft permit was issued by the Environment Agency in February 2010. The final permit is expected this month.

- 4.13 The Secretary of State's decision on the planning appeal is expected by 24th May 2011. The Inspectors report is not published in advance.

Western Extension

- 4.14 GW - explained Augean's intentions to make a further planning application to extend the site on the land within Augean's ownership and within the overall area of the existing planning permission. This would extend the site life to 2026.
- 4.15 It is currently intended to include hazardous waste and LLW, although this is dependent on what Secretary of State says in his decision and not necessarily on the decision itself.
- 4.16 GW - also explained that the application submission would be to Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) and not the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC). He explained that due to the timescales of when Augean need to have a decision on the application (ie before Mid 2013) ; and because he is not anticipating receiving an early decision from NCC (ie within the 16 week statutory determination period for applications with Environmental Impact Assessment); the intention of Augean would be to appeal against non-determination after 16 weeks had expired. This would leave time for a planning inquiry and a Secretary of State decision before Mid 2013.
- 4.17 HS - asked the NCC Officers to comment on this.
- 4.18 PW – explained the 16 week period was based on an August 2011 submission. On most occasions if 16 weeks is to be exceeded then we would seek agreement to an extension of time from the applicant. However the applicant does have the right to appeal against non-determination.
- 4.19 FC - expressed concerns about the full process being undermined. The company appears to be calling all the shots!
- 4.20 HS - asked GW why are you sticking to 16 weeks? Why not agree to a longer timescale.
- 4.21 GW - is concerned if the application is refused beyond 16 weeks then the appeal timescale doesn't work and the planning permission would run out.
- 4.22 HS - commented that public concerns generally are about feeling conned! General acceptance about the site in the past was about completing the current proposals.
- 4.23 FW - was concerned that the public will feel "squeezed". The outcome of the current application for LLW is not known. HS commented that Augean would be consulting on an application including LLW. GW commented about potentially pursuing longer openings through the planning process.
- 4.24 LH - talked about the timetable back from August 2013. Currently the site has to be restored by August 2013, but Augean need to know if they have to restore to the agreed profile or to a different profile, which would have to be agreed with the Planning Authority.

- 4.25 LH - If there were an appeal to get a decision on extending the life of the site then Augean have to make provision for the time for that process. Therefore, Augean have to be either assured of a decision date by NCC or going for a non-determination appeal process.
- 4.26 LH - also explained that for the new application they are following the IPC process in case this became relevant and they are therefore building in 2 stages of consultation: -
- Before application is submitted
 - Formal consultation when the application has been submitted
- 4.27 HS - explained her view which was probably also held generally, that there is a difference between 2015/16 and the longer term proposals to go on to 2026. Most people would probably accept that the current site should be completed. SP felt that the whole matter was not fair to the local community.
- 4.28 FS - suggested making 2 applications rather than 1. One would be seeking an extension in time to 2016 and the other the extended site until 2026.
- 4.29 RB - commented that there is a clear feeling and mood in the meeting that the democratic process would be denied if there was an appeal against non-determination. The County Council may also find it easier to make a decision on a 2/3 year extension in time rather than to extend to 2026.
- 4.30 GW - said he was prepared to go away and look at the suggestion of making separate applications for extending the time until 2016 and another for extending the area of waste disposal until 2026.
- 4.31 SP - asked whether there was sufficient hazardous waste to fill the site of the proposed extension given GW is saying that there has not been enough to fill the current site.
- 4.32 GW - commented that the recession has reduced the amount of waste being generated and the site would have filled faster.
- 4.33 HS - commented that the European Union were looking to reduce waste that goes to landfill and it feels wrong to be extending landfill sites when there could be less waste for disposal in the future.
- 4.34 GW - there are ways of treating waste and this is being done when possible but there will still be lots for disposal.
- 4.35 GW - explained that the company would soon be pursuing Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping. The process to be followed will be as though the application was to follow the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) process, as this represents best practice.
- 4.36 GW - There will also be a draft statement of Community Consultation which will explain the consultation which Augean propose to follow. This will involve Northamptonshire County Council, East Northamptonshire Council, the Environment Agency and also the Local Liaison Group and other bodies. The main timetable will be: -

- February/March 2011 - EIA Scoping and Draft Statement of Community Consultation. This will last for 28 days.
- April 2011 - Pre-application consultation process (60 days)
- June/July 2011 - Amending and finalising the planning application
- August 2011 - Planning application submission
- September 2011 - Further consultation after submission of application
- 4.37 LH – explained the EIA Scoping exercise which will commence in February 2011. This will be subject to consultation. NCC will undertake the consultation exercise.
- 4.38 HN – Heather Nicholson from Nicholson Jennings explained the consultation requirements. A Statement of Community Consultation will be produced, starting with a draft which will be amended to take account of comments and then passed to NCC and ENC. The opportunity to comment would be advertised in local papers.
- 4.39 HS – recommended the Nene Valley News which goes to all households.
- 4.40 HN – explained the consultation objectives: -
- A 2 way passage of information;
 - Record and take account of issues raised
 - Report back results of exercise
- 4.41 HN - In terms of the catchment area for consultation the current thinking is to consult parish councils within a 10km radius of the site.
- 4.42 HN – There are proposed exhibitions in May 2011 (dates to be decided) but are currently thinking of arranging: -
- Thursday in Kings Cliffe from 1pm – 7pm
 - Friday in Apethorpe or Wood Newton 1pm – 7pm
 - Saturday in Collyweston or Easton 10am – 3pm
- 4.43 HN – the proposed public workshops would be likely to be in June 2011. They are open to suggestions on subjects to be covered, the programme, who should attend, the number of events and what would be covered. Current thinking are these subjects: -
- Site designs
 - Health impacts
 - Environmental Impact Assessment
 - Any other subjects?
- 4.44 GW – commented that the site exists and therefore it is not an option in this case to actually consider alternative site locations as this would not be a realistic choice.

- 4.45 HS – suggested that a public exhibition event should also be arranged to cover Laxton/Wakerley and Duddington.
- 4.46 PMc – Asked about the clay cap on the restored site and whether it can be penetrated by tree roots?
- 4.47 GW – explained that there is 1½metres of soil above the artificial liner and the clay is beneath this. Forestry Commission research has shown tree planting on landfill sites is OK. Tree roots are mainly in the top soil layers and any that go down lower will move laterally if they come across any difficult obstacles.
- 4.48 LH – explained that the risk assessments undertaken to support the application take account of the worst case scenarios, such as penetration of the cap above the waste.

5. Environment Agency Update

- 5.1 KB – Kevin Burton introduced himself again as the new Environment Agency inspector and his contact number in Kettering is 01522 785929.
- 5.2 HS – Asked for KB's comments about leachate monitoring at the site now that it is not taken away but reused and placed back into the site.
- 5.3 KB - said there were no issues. There had been some compliance issues with leachate previously but these are now resolved. The waste at the site has the ability to absorb the leachate. Some of the hazardous waste is treatment residue from waste incinerators. This has lime with some metal contaminants. However, these are all within defined levels.
- 5.4 KB - The filter cake from the Olympics site has a high organic content (oils). All imports to the site have to pass a leachate test because they are not soluble.
- 5.5 KB - In respect of dust, this comes in either bags or containers. Materials which come to landfill generally has a higher moisture content. The site has to identify wastes at the point of entry.
- 5.6 SM – confirmed that site operators at the landfill area communicate by 2-way radio with the office and know what waste is coming in and where to place it. When asbestos is brought in the area where it is to be placed is damped down first. There are chemists on site who analyse waste samples to make sure it is acceptable for disposal.

6. NCC Update

- 6.1 PW – confirmed that the Secretary of State (SoS) decision on the appeal is expected on or before the 24th May 2011. The Inspectors report is not available to see until the SoS decision.
- 6.2 The Locations for Waste and Minerals Development Development Plan Documents (DPD) have been progressed to a point where they are now close to adoption. Augean were involved in the examination in October 2010 on the Waste Locations DPD and

some changes were made to reflect their comments. The Control and Management of Development DPD had a short examination in January 2011 and Augean were also involved in this.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 HS – asked that Woodnewton Parish Council be invited to the next meeting.

8. Date of Next Meeting

8.1 Wednesday 6th April 2011 at 2.00pm at Kings Cliffe Underground Youth Club, Memorial Hall, Church Walk.

