

Notes of Clayton Hall Landfill Site Local Liaison Group – Town Hall, Chorley
Wednesday 11 April 2018 – 6.30pm

Present: Cllr Mark Clifford (MCI) – Vice Chairman of Clayton Le Woods Parish Council
(Chairman)

Steve Grieve (SG) – General Manager – Quercia
Ian McSpirit (IMcS) – Senior Operations & Technical Manager – Quercia
Cllr Eric Bell (EB) – Whittle le Woods Parish Council
Cllr Matt Lynch (ML) – Lyndsay Hoyle MP Office
Angela Baron (AB) – Assistant Secretary Residents’ Committee
David Clough (DC) – Residents’ Committee
Sue Clough (SC) – Residents’ Committee
John Neville (JN) – Environment Agency
Cllr Michael Green – Lancashire County Council
Cllr Paul Walmsley – Chorley Council
Dr John Asbury (JA) – Public Health England

Apologies: Cllr Perks
Andrew Howard (AH) – Environmental Health Officer
Sakthi Karunanithi – Director Public Health LCC

1 Minutes of last meeting agreed.

2 Matters arising

MCI stated that communications need to be improved. Quercia was slow to respond re the complaints over the weekend.

SG added that residents can call the helpline but no calls had been received but was confident that the response to incidents would improve.

SC stated that no one will call helpline because there is never an answer.

ML asked if social media was monitored on site as perhaps complaints would have been picked up sooner.

SC asked if anybody at Quercia monitored Facebook.

SG – not consistently as the focus is on site works. Following a meeting this morning with Sirius Comms the helpline issues had been ironed out and SG was confident that it was now as it should be. The hours were 8.00am to 8.00pm.

3 Current situation

3.1 IMcS gave site update –

Cap is in place and working well.

An issue with Well 84 was identified on Friday and has been repaired.

Haul road has been reinstated under CQA supervision to ensure no damage.

Progressing de-watering pin wells which are part of the gas infrastructure.

Deep well de-silting and de-watering taking place this week.

Gas collection has improved – increase in quality and yield – engine output 433kw to 613kw.

Surface water pumps have been installed and working.

Odour monitoring taking place 2x daily off site. MB out with EA to calibrate that monitoring.

The S E edge of the capped area has detected H₂s emissions on the slope – we are on with designing a solution with the EA, hopefully this will be carried out over next 2 weeks depending on materials etc and will update later.

3.2 ML - is the site over height?

IMcS – no and has been verified by LCC independent survey.

ML – What are the trigger levels?

JN – initially 100ppb and now notify the site of anything over 40ppb.

ML do the EA only respond to their monitoring results?

JN – Officers will look at the weather information and will attend areas where odour is most likely if indeed it was present. **We review calls coming in and we monitor Facebook but don't respond back directly.** We use it as indicator to target monitoring and generally levels are coming down. There are peaks – Mon between 1:00am and 3:30am around the 100ppb mark.

3.3 Complaints

Over the last few days as follows 5th 93 - 6th 24 - 7th 48 – 8th 62 – 9th 96 – 10th 7 – 11th 4

JN – stated that the EA have been asked by residents how many **complaints received that day (in conversation with call handlers on the incident communication hotline)**. Individuals in the call centre may **only be aware of the number of calls taken individually** and not the full total of the call centre. Call centre operators will not be passing on the number of complaints as this could cause mistrust in the community.

SC also reported a noise at 10pm on Saturday night. IMcS said there was no activity but it could be a pump starting automatically.

AB said that a small business owner had funded some initial work from a Landfill Gas consultant and there would be some questions to which the action group would like answers from Quercia and other organisations.

3.4 Regulatory Control

JN explained that one of the objectives of the **Regulation 36** notice was to maximise the gas flow in the infrastructure on site. As well as the cap there are a series of measures which combined will be needed to bring the site back into compliance. Further **Regulation 36s** will follow.

SC asked if EA will be stopping the input of waste, JN replied that there would be a method of working to be agreed before waste would be accepted.

Following on from the gas review what actions can be expected.

SG – we would respond to EA with an action plan and timescales. There are short, medium and long term activities and once agreed timescales will be shared.

AB – Residents have concerns about odour complaints not being credible, are Quercia happy with the EA results in light of what happened recently?

SG – Feels the works have gone a long way to resolving issue, we have always said there would be additional works once initial phase completed.

AB – how long are the additional works expected to take?

SG – 3 to 4 days for the actual work and hope to complete in the next 2 weeks dependant on weather and material availability.

AB –there are reports of burning smell associated with the sulphur smell, is anything burned on site? A report received east of the site earlier today.

SG – no waste is burned on site.

AB – what about the gas in gas engine?

SG – Gas emissions from the engine are considered to be odourless.

AB – have Chorley, EA and PHE been involved in considering combustion emissions.

JN- This is part of the gas review and he will take comment and report back. JA added that EA will rely on Monitoring Guidance 2004 (Action JN)

EB – the smell is worse at night, what happens at night to make levels higher?

JN – we have seen elevated levels in the evening, no particular issues relate solely to night, it is a period where the air is colder and still. No specific feedback from EA officers yet.

EB – concerns from residents about capping expectations, I acknowledge levels are a lot less but could other areas on site cause problems?

SG – the recent odour we believe is from one particular area which has not been capped – it's a relatively small area and don't believe will spread further. Believe additional capping down the steep slope will work.

PW – do we know what materials are in the bottom of the site – Quercia have said no records previously, could this issue pop up somewhere else?

SG – there are no plans to excavate anywhere else, not expected to be repeated.

MCI – when he was on site he noticed when vehicles use haul road there is a lot of vibration, ground shakes, could this cause problems in the future?

IMcS – that's the norm for a landfill site, the road has been engineered to same standards any other site

JN – it is normal for what we see on Landfill sites, however the onus is on the operator to control odour from site. Series of improvements to be made at Landfill, we are working over and above to stop odour. EA expects short term then 6 to 18 months programme of improvement. EA are expecting approval for engineering works and there will be 3x officers on site 12th April to agree works.

SC – Quercia have said no waste until April, will EA put a hold on further inputs.

JN – Quercia is not accepting waste in the short term, Steve may be best to inform of timeframe Quercia are working to.

SG – Given weekend events waste inputs have been postponed further until latest planned works are complete. Quercia had already stopped taking waste and won't take more waste until serious pollution stopped.

JN – Quercia need to submit a suitable method statement before accepting waste.

AB had a list of questions from residents to be supplied to EA & Quercia. Some question answers partial but questions will be answered fully once submitted. (Action Quercia)

DC – when will the PHE results be published?

JA – They will provide the results asap. In terms of response rate PHE had contacted 7000 households, approx. 17000 people and had received around 2000 responses. A 10% return rate on survey.

DC/SC questioned why has it taken 3 months to get to this level of reporting on monitoring results and how long will Jerome monitoring carry on.

JN – As stated in February the level of monitoring we are at starts with officer monitoring and has progressed with spot and fixed monitoring, over time we settled into routine so results are reliable. Fixed monitoring will continue for 6 months after May. We will continue to review the mobile spot monitoring.

SC – asked what is the position of LCC and CBC.

MG - the Council was fully supportive of the residents but it had no enforcement powers but hoped for a speedy successful outcome.

PW – pleased to see an improvement but still a long way to go. We have been told that waste will only be brought onto site if conditions are met and there is an agreed plan.

EB – asked that when tipping restarts there is continual monitoring which hasn't happened before.

DC – asked why a temporary cap. IMcS said it would be in place at least 5 years and would be unlikely to be taken up

DC – can Quercia hold another public drop in session?

SG – at this stage we feel the liaison group the best way for information to be disseminated. There would be no benefit for another meeting in his opinion.

ML – the MP's office is being contacted by elected members, could an update meeting be held for elected members - a closed meeting post the local elections in May?

SG – Yes that is possible (Action ML/PW)

JN – Could we check all ward and County Council representatives are receiving multi-agency updates. (Action Members)

AB – asked if the concentration of H2S is measured on site? Also, what measurements are taken to assess concentrations of Sulphur Dioxide. IMcS said he would report back.

JN also said details will be an Annual Report for the site. (Action IMcS/JN)

4. Communications

JN – tabled a “heat” map showing areas of complaints. That data to produce the map was altered to remove clearly identifiable individual properties due to concern about data protection. The map could not share more widely until individual properties had been removed. The map would be shared as soon as possible.

MCI – Clayton Le Woods Parish Council Magazine is to be distributed Wednesday 11th April – will include information from Quercia and PHE. Similar info in Whittle Le Woods Parish Council notice.

SG - commented Quercia aims to be the lead on communications on site. Accepted coming from a fairly low point but seeks to improve. A draft comms strategy had been prepared and would be issued in time for next meeting. He explained the key elements.

ML made a comment we need to manage expectations on speed of response to ensure timescales and expectations are practical. i.e. MP's office tries to respond in 2 working days.

PW – what checks and balances going to be in place on what Quercia puts out, will it go via the EA?

JN – Its not the EA role to monitor all comms sent out by Quercia, would challenge any false or misleading information related to regulation emission etc. In the short term happy to advise if Quercia unsure.

PW – initially those checks should be visible to build trust in the communications. It would also be helpful if questions could be co-ordinated to avoid repetition.

ML – how long will the multi-agency group run for. It has been a reliable source and how will that transition to Quercia for providing info.

JN – We'll take that point away and review. (Action JN)

5. SG – hoping to have delivered a plan update for future site engineering activities and aiming for a draft for next meeting.

6. AB – how do we apply for funding for local projects?

MCI suggested a sub group be set up from this meeting to identify local projects. SG agreed that would be helpful to understand priorities.

SC – LCC could clarify the conditions for extension of planning2016 regarding the covering of waste (Action MG)

Date of next meeting Tuesday 24th April 5:30pm Chorley Town Hall

