

Notes of Clayton Hall Landfill Site Local Liaison Group – Chorley Town Hall
Wednesday 25 July 2018 – 6:00pm

Present: Cllr Mark Clifford (MC) Chairman – Vice-Chairman of Clayton le Woods Parish Council

Steve Grieve (SG) – General Manager – Quercia
Matthew Barlow (MB) – Landfill Manager – Quercia
Aidy Riggott - LCC
Lindsey Hoyle (LH) - MP
Cllr Matt Lynch (ML) – L Hoyle Office
David Clough (DC) – Residents’ Committee
Sue Clough (SC) – Residents’ Committee
Matthew Bennett (MBe) – Environment Agency
Neville Whittham (NW) – Cllr Clayton West and Cuerden
Amanda George – Quercia – Note taker

Apologies:

1 **Minutes of last meeting**

MC opened the meeting, thanked everyone for attending and then asked if all agreed to the last set of notes.

ML raised a couple of issues. The first concerned 2.1 where ML had raised an issue with regard to investigating Bluebell Woods. The notes stated that an investigation would be carried out and asked that an update be provided at the meeting. The second concerned 6.1, Landfill Communities Fund, second paragraph which read

“MC said that he had met with C Sinnott to see what CBC had to say and he asked CS if Clayton le Woods and Whittle le Woods were to take the initial offer was there a reason why they shouldn’t such as a legal reason and it was confirmed there wasn’t. MC then said that he had taken the decision for Clayton le Woods, he couldn’t speak for Whittle le Woods, to take up the initial offer of work with Quercia for work on Cunnery Meadow refurbishment. This prompted a lively conversation between MC and ML. It was agreed that this was for discussion/decision outside this group and that in future this item should be removed from the agenda.”

ML stated that he had an email from the director which he considered conflicted with the statement. ML said that whilst he understood there may not be a legal reason to apply for funding by The Wildlife Trust it was not the advice given. ML read out the email which is as follows:

“Their preference is that the council should be responsible for the administration of any fund, and that funds could then be distributed to groups and projects in affected areas using the same process as the council’s small community funding process. Groups and projects would be limited to those serving postcodes affected by the smell (including those in South Ribble), and would have a similar short application form to the existing fund (you can find that here).

Their rationale for this is that the process would be clear and transparent, and that it can be set up extremely quickly so there wouldn’t need to be any delays in awarding funding.”

ML said that this was not put forward at the last meeting. ML said the argument for the Council undertaking the administration of any funding was that the process would be open and transparent and that fairness would be spread across all affected areas. ML noted that on the last notes it stated that this discussion should happen outside this group. ML said that this wasn't a true reflection and what he had actually asked was what thought had been given to Buckshaw Village which was the second most affected area and said that he was informed that it was up to Buckshaw to do this. ML stated that this was not good enough and was not transparent and open which was what the Council had offered. ML said the committee had to think hard about any extra funding to compensate affected residents and how best to look at where the money went and using an open and transparent process. ML asked for support for the Council's position.

MC said that he disagreed with several points. Firstly MC received the email several weeks after the meeting with Chris Sinnott and that he had spoken with Steve (Grieve) to take up the offer. MC said that he disagreed that Buckshaw was the second most affected area and said that ML was going off information provided on the survey when actually it was the hotspots that should be looked at where Whittle le Woods was second and Buckshaw Village was third. MC said that when he had spoken with Chris Sinnott, Quercia's original offer would be followed up with further funding and which Quercia have said that they would like to use the Council for. MC said that in order to get a project started quickly through the Wildlife Trust that that was the position of Quercia and Clayton Le Woods Parish Council, MC said although Cllr Bell was at this meeting that was his position too which was to take up the initial offer. LH asked the reason Quercia selected the Wildlife Trust. SG stated that this had previously been administered by the Greenbank Trust which received the credits. The Greenbank Trust folded last year and it was decided by the then management team that as the LWT was receiving funding anyway it was agreed that the fund would be managed by them. MC again declared an interest in the LWT. LH raised issue with this as he considered MC had a conflict of interest. SG stated that MC had regularly declared his interest and that it was irrelevant to the company as he was not employed by them. LH said that MC should consider his position given that it was LWT that was going to administer the money. LH said his thought was that there should be three schemes to include Clayton, Whittle and Buckshaw and that they all deserved compensation. SG stated again that this was not a matter for Quercia and that it was stated at the last meeting that this discussion should happen outside of this meeting because this matter was nothing to do with the liaison group and should be dealt with separately. LH stated that it was being discussed because it was in the minutes. SG confirmed it was but the minutes stated that it should be discussed outside the group. LH said that he wanted to ensure that all areas were treated fairly. MC stated that there was further money due in future and that this was an initial offer to start something quickly and it was agreed by the group that further money would come via the Council. MC went on to say that the meeting he had had with C Sinnott was to discuss the legality. MC confirmed that he wasn't employed by LWT so not as conflicting as first thought. MC again said that he thought the group was reasonably happy with the exception of ML but that it was always agreed that the Council take on the funding. ML said that from the last meeting he understood that it was a free for all. ML said that it was his understanding the funding should be applied for not on the basis of the Council managing what came through. ML said that if that was the case then it needed to be clearly stated at the meeting. ML's understanding was that the Council have yet to officially agree. MC said that he had an email offering to administrate the funds. ML said there was a difference between offering and accepting. ML again said he had understood that anyone could bid and he directly asked if a deal had been done outside of the group and that it was the

decision of Clayton Parish Council. ML said that the minutes did not show that there was an agreement with the Council that should there be future funds that they would manage it. MC stated that it may not have been reflected in the minutes as it was a lengthy debate. LH suggested that it be minuted. AG asked what was to be minuted. ML replied that there had been an offer from Chorley Council that the Council's preference is that they should be responsible for the administration of any fund, and that funds could then be distributed to groups and projects in affected areas using the same process as the council's small community funding process. Groups and projects would be limited to those serving postcodes affected by the smell (including those in South Ribble), and would have a similar short application form to the existing fund. This is to provide clarity and transparency and could be set up quickly to avoid delays in funding. ML stated that he thought that this was quite clear but that it hadn't been brought to the last meeting. SG clarified that an organisation with charitable status would still need to administer the tax credits from Clayton Hall Landfill and then they could be directed elsewhere.

2 **Matters Arising**

None were raised.

3 **Current Situation on Site**

3.1 **Odour Control and Complaints**

MB stated that a significant resource had been put in place to ensure that odour was kept to a minimum. MB stated that the extremely dry weather had made operations more difficult due to clay drying out. This had been rectified by irrigation on site and bowsers wetting the clay down to minimise cracks and odour escape, attention had also been paid to the gas wells to make sure that cracks in the clay did not appear. Off-site inspections were also being conducted and where complaints were received then these were investigated to identify where they were coming from and whether it was the landfill or not. MB stated that there had recently been a lot of land spread and this is possibly what residents could smell. MB also confirmed that there were two full perimeter drive arounds per day covering the most affected areas of Spring Meadow, Buckshaw and Whittle. Gas production was also being checked on a daily basis with Quercia's own gas analyser rather than rely solely on the on-site gas contractors. MB has been proactive in communicating with the EA with regard to land spreading in advance of complaints being received. MB reported that there had been a rebuild to one of the gas engines. Whilst this was happening a flare had been in use.

SG handed out a document which concerned a matter arising from the last meeting which was from a gas review that the EA had undertaken in approximately March. SG stated that there were around ten items on the review that had all been dealt with in order of priority and to plan. SG highlighted that there were still some outstanding but this was because the due date had not yet been reached. ML stated that although there were due dates it didn't actually show if the actions were on track and suggested a traffic light system be used. SG advised that should it be foreseen that a deadline may not be met then this would be communicated. DC asked about capping completion and whether that was where the waste inputs were and MB confirmed it was. SG also confirmed that the area was up to level.

3.2 Engineering Works

MB continued with the engineering update which was Phase 1 was 98% complete which left two panels and the geotex to go on top which would be ready for lining on the 30th and then Phase 1 would be complete. Phase 2 was on track to finish at the end of September, this will open up the tipping area.

MB stated that there had been issues with trespassing which had been reported to the Police. Fencing had been vandalised and a window on a compactor had been smashed. The fencing had now been replaced and signage replaced. MC asked if the fencing was in line with planning conditions. MB confirmed it was and said that this type of fencing was generally used in construction sites. There was debate from the group as to whether this was sufficient and MC questioned whether there should be additional security. MB stated that there was already weekend security but would look at extending. This is to be investigated **ACTION: M Barlow**.

SG stated that the Planning Authority had been on site and that they were happy that the capping could start. SG confirmed that there were still parts of the site that still had not been brought up to level on the eastern side, as much as possible would be done but this may need to wait until next year.

AR raised the issue of dust and also water pressure given there were to be restrictions on using hosepipes. MB said that he had had a discussion with MBe to confirm if the company was on mains water or bore hole and confirmed that it was mains water. MB confirmed the water for dust suppression that had been used was ground water out of the dig area. SC asked if the company would be restricted once the hosepipe ban was in place. MB stated that he needed a discussion with MBe as MBe had been approached by United Utilities. MBe stated that different engineering methods may need to be used (covering with plastic) and the dry weather was forecast to continue so that rehydration was relied on less. LH asked whether water from the brook/streams could be used. MB said that the EA would need to be approached concerning that as an extraction licence would need to be applied for. LH said that this conversation needed to happen quickly in order to protect the site- **ACTION: M Barlow**.

3.3 Waste Inputs

MB confirmed the waste inputs were building gradually but not as quickly as had been hoped. MB stated that there had been some complaints received concerning flies. MB has explained to the meeting that the waste being received does not give a natural habitat to flies because it was inert and contained no food waste. MB stated that one of the residents who had complained had been half a mile from site with fields in between and that flies were consistent with the time of year. Fly control is being used on site in between shift patterns.

LH asked about rats. MB confirmed there was pest control on site. LH asked MB to confirm that the number of rats had not increased and MB confirmed that it hadn't.

3.4 Communications

SG said that there was not a lot to add and that the company was continuing to try and communicate as often as it could through regular updates on the website and twitter, the invite for people to visit was still there.

4 Environment Agency Update

4.1 Multi Agency Group

MBe confirmed he was standing in for John Neville. MBe said that part of his update had been covered by the document that SG had already handed out.

With regard to the Multi Agency Group MBe said there was not a lot to say other than the process was in recovery.

4.2 Inspections/Data

MBe reported that since 22 June there had been eight site inspections, seven were compliant with the permit, the one non-compliance was in relation to the landfill gas condition which was due to clay drying out and reported that this had since been rectified. The last inspection had been clear and another was due at the end of the week.

ML raised the issue of the complaint at Bluebell Wood and its investigation. MBe said that he hadn't been passed any information. ML asked if MBe could chase. **ML stated** he was disappointed it hadn't been looked into. **MBe asked for a reference for the complaint or letter, or a date, so he could chase it, but ML did not have that information at that time. ML stated he would try to get that information. ACTION: ML/MBe**

4.3 Complaints

MC said that before JN had gone away there had been complaints about smells of rubbish, gas, sewerage and asked MBe if he could add anything. MBe reported that from 13 June until 16 July there had been no complaints. 17th there was one. MBe looked at the FMD and there had been a slight **above background** increase in H₂S and methane. On 18th there were three complaints and that they were less than 4ppb which was just above background levels. The complaints were investigated and nothing could be confirmed as to a specific cause, the FMD showed there was a **sharp spike in methane but not H₂S** but it could not be determined if it was from the landfill. On 19-21st there were none. On 22nd there were four **complaints, again just an increase in methane, not H₂S. which indicated it was not the landfill as there should be an increase in both.** 23rd, no complaints. 24th, one about flies.

SC asked about fixed monitoring as she had been made aware that the fixed monitoring centre as Spring Meadow was no longer in use. MBe confirmed that it was still there and in use. MC said he had spoken with JN who confirmed that it would be there until December.

MC stated that JN had confirmed that the dry weather was making slurry smell more than normal.

4.4 Communications

MBe confirmed that their communications continued through community updates with the next one due on the 27th. **MBe said that when things get back to a normal level (up to a few complaints a month), communication may take on a more personal basis with phone calls or letters rather than through community update.**

5 Local Community Groups

5.1 DC passed around a document from a resident who stated his questions hadn't been raised who wanted to know what had been put in place to stop anything like this happening again. DC stated that there were still some residents who did not think that things had been explained properly. MBe said the EA had done route cause analysis which had revealed some unique causes which resulted in the major incident on site. MBe said that some of these causes were subject to legal process and investigation so couldn't compromise the investigation. MBe assured the group that as an Agency they "were all over this" and that a compliance plan was already in place for the next two years and focussing on the causes of the issues. LH suggested that there must be someone/department within the EA who could put out a general communication out to reassure residents that the EA was not hiding behind the legal process/investigation. SC stated that some of the residents felt they were being fobbed off. ML stated that consideration should be given by the EA to put out a communication in the simplest form that was easily understandable.

MC asked if there was any intention to grass or plant trees on the capped area. MB said that planting trees wasn't an option as roots could interfere with the cap. SG said the level of soil could be increased in certain areas to provide a shrub rather than tall tree effect.

MC asked what odour levels should be for the permit and MBe replied that it meant odour levels likely to cause pollution and said that the permit did not require no odour but it required odour to be minimised using appropriate measures such as effective capping/ containment, not having waste uncovered, etc.

MC asked NW if he had any comment. NW said that he was happy with what Quercia had done so far and referred back to the fencing and stated that if people wanted to break it down they would.

MC stated that the resident who didn't think his questions had been answered hadn't tabled them in the proper way and asked that questions be sent in rather than raised as a comment on Facebook.

6 Any other business

6.1 MBe said the EA had received the following email.

"Dear Sir/Madam, I am a concerned resident of Clayton le Woods and live adjacent to the Clayton Hall Quarry. The question is the licence has been granted for tipping in this site and I was under the impression that the area that's filled and finished and

was supposed to be landscaped and grassed but it is now receiving soil from another part of the quarry to the degree that it's become a serious worry as the height of this area is and will be increased and I need to know at what stage this height is being checked and controlled. The past height of one part of the site was grossly over raised and was cause for concern and noted, why have they now continued to raise the finished lower part up towards the 'high' area, I cannot recall this was mentioned at any of the meetings. could you please confirm and inform me if any controls are in place and why there seems to be a rush to 'dump' dusty sandy soil on top of the finished part of the quarry raising it dramatically.

Please can a representative of the quarry ' manager or supervisor' give me some answers to end the constant worry of the dust noise and height of this area, we were told this ' finished part' was finally ready and would be appropriately landscaped. I live a few hundred yards from this part of the site so after over 25 years was looking forward to an end to all this. Thankyou for your attention, regards, Resident of Spring meadow."

MBe commented that he thought this was referring to one part of the site. AR said that LCC visited the site a week ago to check and there were no issues. SG said he thought it was to do with a part of the site that had naturally greened over and that particular part needed another half meter of soil to be added to bring it to height and that is what had happened, once this had happened it would be professionally seeded. SG again confirmed that it was at the right height as per the requirement of the planning.

- 6.2 MBe made the meeting aware that Quercia had been invited in for a tape recorded interview under caution and that it was now up to Quercia to respond to that and the investigation would progress following that.
- 6.3 AR asked if a date in September had been set for the MAG debrief but no date as yet had been set.

7 **Date of Next Meeting**

Not meeting to take place in August, the next one is scheduled for 6.00pm Wednesday 19 September at the Town Hall.