

**Notes of Clayton Hall Landfill Site Local Liaison Group – Teams Mtg**  
**Wednesday 13 January 2021**

Present: Cllr Mark Clifford (MC) Chairman – Chairman of Clayton le Woods Parish Council  
David Clough (DC) – Residents’ Committee  
John Neville (JN) – Environment Agency  
Cllr Neville Whitham (NW) – Chorley Borough Council Representative  
Cllr Peter Auwerx – Whittle le Woods Parish Council  
Mike Harvey (MH) – General Manager - Quercia  
Simon Green (SG) – QSHE Manager – Quercia  
Amanda George – Note taker – Quercia

Absent: Sue Clough, Michael Green

1 **Minutes of last meeting**

Agreed as a true record other than the title was incorrect and stated Town Hall. This to be changed to Teams Meeting **AG**

2 **Matters Arising**

No matters arising. MH mentioned that he had provided all the information requested during the last meeting. With regard to the footpath a small track excavator is needed to dig a channel adjacent to the path in order to provide effective drainage. This has not been possible for the moment due to the poor weather.

3 **Current Situation on Site**

3.1 **Odour Control and Complaints**

SG reported that there had been one complaint received but was unrelated to odour. For the year there had been 31 received in total.

3.2 **Engineering Works**

MH reported that some work had been done in October but bad weather and shorter working days had meant that the work had to be suspended until March at the earliest. Work will hopefully continue then Covid restrictions allowing which could impact on contractor working.

3.3 **Waste Inputs**

MC asked about waste inputs so that they could be minuted. MH replied that they were included in the site update that had been issued but for the purposes of the minutes waste inputs were at 1200 tonnes per week.

3.4 **Communications**

MC asked whether it would be possible to have more photos given that site access to visitors was now restricted due to Covid. MH stated that photos were taken on a regular basis and that he would happily provide them although not much had changed. **MH**

## 4 Environment Agency Update

### 4.1 Multi Agency Group

JN commented that he was still the representative of the group and if there was anything to report he would do so but interaction was currently on an adhoc basis.

### 4.2 Inspections/Data

JN reported that due to Covid restrictions that had been no physical visits over the last few weeks. There main interest had been the restoration and how levels were being met in terms of complaints, etc.

### 4.3 Complaints

JN confirm that there had been no odour complaints received by the EA which was very encouraging.

### 4.4 Communications

As in previous meetings, JN confirmed that he did not have an update on any potential future legal case due to legal privilege.

## 5 Local Community Groups

MC raised a question received from residents concerning the height of the mount as they believed it was above the permitted height. MH reported that the site is surveyed every year for statutory reporting purposes. The survey determines available void space. It has to be undertaken for the annual environmental report which is submitted to the EA in order to demonstrate compliance with the permit. It is also done to demonstrate to LCC Planning Authority that our tipping and restoration levels are in accordance with the site planning consent. The most recent survey was done in December 2020 and we are fully compliant. MC asked MH to confirm that it was restoration soil in the heaps on the north of the site and MH confirmed it was. MH stated that there was soil that was waiting to be moved on to the capped area. MH reported that the LCC Planning officer visited the site 3-4 months ago and had received no correspondence from them. He continued that the permitted levels are high and that some are not at their final height, these will be capped and have a metre of soil put on top which over time will drop.

MC asked if there were plans to remove top soils and capping works and open up areas for further tipping and MH replied no, once an area is capped it is too expensive to uncap so not cost effective. The permitted pre settlement contours has a 55m depth of waste at its highest point. The waste is predicted to drop 10 metres at its greatest depth to achieve its final post settlement contours. MC asked MH if he was confident there is no point over height. MH replied yes.

MC asked another question on behalf of a resident which was "how long will the waste be inputted and the site finally finished". MH said that there were two ways to look at this. The company could take all types of waste which would fill the space much quicker but could bring other issues or it could continue with the type of waste it was currently taking but it would take longer to fill. MH stated that at current waste inputs it would be 2026 and

realistically with capping and restoration two years later which is when the landfill planning permission runs to. MC stated that in previous meetings that 2023 had been stated. JN commented that it is the planning permission that allows the waste to be received, it is the permit that determines the waste types so confirmed what MH had said that 2028 was within that time. JN went on to say that the permit would be in place for quite some time after to ensure that there was no problem to the environment. JN suggested that if there were conversations regarding this then the difference between Planning Permission and Environmental Permit should be explained.

MC asked whether he was right in thinking there was a 60 year care package. MH stated that there is a requirement under the site environmental permit to make a financial provision to ensure there are no environmental impacts such as landfill gas, leachate, etc for up to 60 years after the site had stopped taking waste.

DC mentioned that he had received a comment concerning a “few whiffs” in the Whittle area but that they had not been officially report so had been unable to check out and therefore couldn't say whether it was related to Clayton Hall or not.

MC asked PA and NW if they had any comments and both replied no.

JN asked DC for more details of the complaint he had received just in case there was a future enquiry so that he could cross reference **DC**. JN reported that there had been odours reported as a result of farming activity.

## 6 **Any other business**

- 6.1 MH reported that there is a 1m strip of land that owned by CBC that runs between the residents' line and the company's. One resident had taken down their fence and encroached on the company's land. MC asked for the information to be email to him and he would take it up with CBC. **MH/MC**

## 7 **Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 14 April 2021, 6pm, via Teams