

# CONNON BRIDGE LANDFILL SITE

## COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING MINUTES

### **Meetings**

Tuesday 24 January 2017	2
Tuesday 28 March 2017	8
Tuesday 06 June 2017	16
Tuesday 12 September 2017	22
Tuesday 14 November 2017	30

## meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	24 January 2017
Location	Connon Bridge
Recorder	Emma Emmens
Chair	Chris Male

### Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Chris Male	CM	SUEZ	Regional Manager
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Landfill Senior Site Manager
Katherine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Site Manager
Steve Massey	SM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Edwyn Walsh	EW	SUEZ	Leachate Plant Manager
Gerry Cavanagh	GC	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Regional Manager
Paul Jordan	PJ	Braddock Parish Meeting	
John Emerson	JE	Local Resident	
Sarah Taylor	ST	Environment Agency	PPC Officer
Janet Haley	JH	Local Resident	
Henry Haley	HH	Local Resident	

Sue Webb	SW	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract – Team Leader
----------	----	------------------	--

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	<b>Welcome and Apologies</b>	
1.1	CM welcome and introductions. Apologies given for Doug Mills, Jenny Mills, Mary Rees and Dale Unsworth. CM expressed condolences for the extremely sad and unexpected passing of Mick Butfield who was a respected and well liked member of the forum.	
2.0	<b>Review previous minutes/matters arising</b>	
2.1	Janet and Henry Hayley requested their apologies to be added to the minutes.	
2.2	JH and PJ raised questions regarding the transfer station on site, noise and traffic volume. SM explained and answered their questions, and questions regarding the RTS and potential for shredding waste there to divert waste from the landfill.	
2.3	JH requested opening date of CERC SM advised the 30 trial was underway and if no issues this would be complete hopefully the end of January.	
2.4(a)	KA updated that hauliers have been advised of infringement notices on the issues raised, roadside parking and give way. Requested residents collect registration of vehicle, time and date.  CM advised all complaints have been responded to.	
2.4(b)	JH raised the issue of increased fly tipping in the county, which she had seen featured on local television.	
3.1	JH raised the incident re: Survey Data. CM explained the outcome, findings to date indicated that there was an error in data supplied by the survey company	

	<p>and that the survey company were reviewing their procedures to prevent any potential for further incidents.</p>	
<p>3.2</p>	<p>Ian Mitchell gave the operational update:</p> <p><b>Tipping Operations</b></p> <p>Waste tipping operations along the western flank of Phase 4 have largely finished, with the exception of the southern-most end which will be completed soon.</p> <p>Waste inputs continue to remain at a lower rate due to the waste being diverted to the CERC, average tonnage into the landfill per day is around 150 tonnes of bulky waste which is not suitable to go to the CERC.</p> <p>The transfer station here re-opened on the afternoon of the 19<sup>th</sup> of December. Domestic waste is tipped within the building and is bulk loaded into trucks and taken down to the CERC at St Dennis.</p> <p>The site continues to receive soils from various locations which are <del>is</del> being stockpiled for use during future restoration, current inputs are between 750-1250 tonnes per day.</p> <p>Mr Mills raised the issue of lorries parking on the road outside the site entrance on 13 January, those drivers found or reported parking outside the site would be told not to return.</p> <p><b>Capping</b></p> <p>As described to the group at the last meeting, operations were tipping along the Western flank to bring the area up to full waste height in preparation for capping.</p> <p>Following testing of the material to ensure it is suitable to bring into the site as a non-hazardous waste, the site is now receiving Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) from the CERC, which is being placed over the western flank as an engineering layer.</p> <p>Plastic capping of the flank is being progressed through SUEZ's engineer and awaiting a confirmed start date.</p> <p><b>Leachate</b></p>	

	<p>The newly drilled leachate well in the northern end of Phase 4 has recently started to be routinely monitored and is currently reading slightly above compliance level, it is expected to become compliant soon.</p> <p>Clearflow will be attending site on Thursday this week to de-silt the well back to the drilled level. A 'top loading' pump will then be installed and the well leachate level and base monitored.</p> <p>All other levels remain compliant.</p> <p>The Leachate Treatment Plant staff have been transferring 40m<sup>3</sup> per day of leachate from Phase 4 storage tank and treating it through the plant.</p> <p>Weekly monitoring undertaken on 12 December, found slightly elevated ammonia levels in the on-site surface water ditch that runs along the south of the site. Further monitoring was undertaken to pin point the area that contamination was entering the ditch.</p> <p>The level of contamination found in the ditch was very low, and measures were put in place immediately to ensure that no contaminated water left site.</p> <p><b>Gas Extraction</b></p> <p>At the last liaison group meeting in November SUEZ reported that drilling was taking place on site with the re-drilling of 20 gas wells, these works were completed soon afterwards.</p> <p>SUEZ continues to review the gas extraction systems with our contractors who remediate any identified issues.</p>	
3.3	<p>JH raised concerns of gas odour recently. CM advised of future plans re: wells, capping and utilising the gas.</p>	
4.0	<p><b>Environmental Agency Update</b></p>	
4.1	<p>ST gave an update for the Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There have been 7 odour complaints – still low</li> <li>• ST had been onsite the previous day and could smell a 'gassy' odour</li> <li>• Leachate levels are good</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awaiting more information re: capping work onsite</li> <li>• De-silting of wells, underway and going well</li> <li>• Awaiting investigation report re: drilling incident (Data survey)</li> <li>• Maintain gas infrastructure to prevent potential odour leaving site</li> </ul>	
5.0	<b>Questions/Issues to be addressed</b>	
5.1	ST to email amendments to JS for previous minutes	ST
5.2	JH raised concerns of meeting times being changed. CM explained that it was entirely his fault and apologised.	
5.3	JH asked if dog waste is separated in incoming landfill loads . KA advised it is mixed in the general load by the collection authority.	
5.4	<p><b>Operations Update</b></p> <p>CM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IBA - recycled aggregate, good material used in construction.</li> <li>• Capping – work to be carried out Q2 (Feb – April) ideally using IBA as the engineering sub grade</li> </ul> <p>EW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treating Leachate on site. ,LTP is dealing with site volumes so tankers don't have to leave the site to take away any leachate to licensed facilities.</li> </ul> <p>SM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer Station operational from 19<sup>th</sup> December, waste traffic controlled, no increase in traffic. Weekly amount handled is around 600 tonnes. The amount of waste taken off site not greatly affected.</li> <li>• Shredding trial – no date set as yet, awaiting council decision. Background noise being monitored – decrease in noise and reduce landfill noise whilst survey is undertaken to gain accurate readings.</li> <li>• Trial next Monday in small area of Transfer station finding the best practices for plastics.</li> </ul>	

	<p>CM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussed gas, this is a resource and SUEZ will manage this with CLP to prevent it from escaping and generate energy.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Any other business</b>	
5.5	<p>JE asked about hearing a 'strange' loud voice saying "put it over there" repeatedly.</p> <p>It was explained that it's a loud speaker giving instructions to tipping drivers, advised they will request operatives refrain from using this.</p>	
5.6	<p>JE requested information on penalties on fly-tipping.</p> <p>ST explained the penalties and sentences.</p>	
5.7	<p>CM discussed receiving email queries from DM re: smell of gas and noise.</p> <p>IM to contact DM to discuss and apologise for delayed response.</p> <p>CM advised a noise survey had been undertaken by a private, independent contractor and this found the noise generated from within the site was within the permitted levels of the previous planning permission (Noise is now regulated by the EA).</p> <p>JH requested the figures from the survey.</p>	
5.8	<p>JH mentioned building contractors working on local new housing estate complaining to residents re: odour.</p> <p>CM explained when capping is complete, the odour control will further improve and there is a long term plan in place.</p>	
5.9	<p>CM thanked residents for taking part in the forum, explained it's helpful for the company</p>	
6.0	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
6.1	Tuesday 28 <sup>th</sup> March 2017 at Connon Bridge 5.30pm	

## meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	28/03/17
Location	Connon Bridge
Recorder	Janine Sargent
Chair	Emma Jordan

### Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Paul Jordan	PJ	Braddock Parish Meeting	Chair
Henry Haley	HH	Local resident	
Janet Haley	JH	Local resident	
Chris James	CJ	Environment Agency	
Mary Rees	MR	Environment Agency	PPC Officer
Jenny Mills	JM	Local resident	
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Katherine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Site Manager
Carole Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	Chair
Doug Mills	DM	Local resident	
Edwyn Walsh	EW	SUEZ	Leachate Plant Manager

Geoffrey Pearse	GP	St Pinnock Parish Council	Councillor
Stephanie Carlyon	SC	Cornwall Council	Development Officer
Natalie Chard	NC	SUEZ	Community Liaison Manager
Sue Webb	SW	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract – Team Leader
Emma Jordan	EJ	SUEZ	Corporate Affairs Manager (South)

Ref	Note	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
1.1	EJ welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced herself (SUEZ Corporate Affairs Manager for the South), and Natalie Chard, SUEZ's new Community Liaison Manager based at the CERC.	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Review previous minutes</b>	
2.1	JM asked for her apologies to be added to the minutes. JH asked for an amendment to 2.4(b), which JS noted. JH also asked if the minutes from the November meeting had been amended, JS confirmed that they had, including the ones referred to in the minutes (ref 5.1).	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>SUEZ operational update</b>	
3.1	<p>IM gave the operation update:</p> <p><b>Tipping Operations</b></p> <p>In the last meeting we reported that we were tipping in the valley below last year's temporary capping area that we had stripped after the New Year. We also reported that our waste inputs were right down to around 150 tonnes of mainly bulky waste a day due to the CERC accepting the domestic waste.</p>	

	<p>We are now very much further on in our waste placement than we thought we would be!</p> <p>The CERC had just about finished their commissioning period when storm Doris hit in the last week of February. As some of you may be aware from the media coverage, the roof of the CERC was damaged during the event and all waste deliveries to the CERC were stopped. Initially the waste was held in the transfer stations in Cornwall, however it became necessary to divert all the waste from the transfer stations into landfill while the issues at the CERC were sorted out. We also then accepted direct delivery of the dustcart waste. Waste continued to be diverted from the CERC into Connon Bridge Landfill Site until Thursday last week. We had a number of days when we were hit very hard with waste deliveries by artic vehicles from the transfer stations. To try to alleviate traffic issues we stopped the soil and IBA deliveries coming into site.</p> <p>We had closed the active tipping area down as we were only accepting the 150 tonnes of bulky waste a day, and we very quickly had to open up the area to enable us to tip more than one vehicle safely at a time. We also had to make void available for the additional waste by removing the southern temporary cap. This was done in two stages, as we didn't want to open up too much of the area before we needed to use it.</p> <p>The southern end of Phase 4 is now tipped to what we believe is to final waste height, based on a survey carried out on the 10 March. Waste is now being placed above the sump area to tie-in and shape into the western flank.</p> <p>Another survey is due to be undertaken on 12 April to determine if the area is to full height and so be available to cap, and to show us where we need to tip more waste to achieve the correct levels.</p> <p><b>Capping</b></p> <p>As we said in the last meeting Incinerator Bottom Ash has been placed across the Western flank in preparation for capping. After the first layer we started placing another layer of a finer ash material over the flank, however the import of IBA was stopped due to the increase in vehicle movements.</p> <p>With the amount of waste diverted from the CERC and the removal of temporary capping to accommodate this waste it is hoped that the areas that were temporarily capped and have now been stripped and tipped can be permanently capped.</p> <p>With the additional waste we have worked out roughly that for every day we accepted the waste that would have gone to the CERC we have used approximately 4 days of void.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>As we are contracted to provide landfill void until the end of 2018, we are again looking at the potential to build a mini-cell or a further lift along the western edge of Phase 4. This is with the designers and more senior managers within the company and we are waiting for their decision.</p> <p><b>Leachate</b></p> <p>We have previously reported that the re-drilled leachate well, number P4A3R, in the northern end of Phase 4A was giving dip readings above compliance level, and that silt had been building within the base of the well.</p> <p>Clearflow came to site and removed the silts and liquid from the well on the 26 January with a deep lift tanker.</p> <p>A top loader pump was installed in the leachate well, which has been running more consistently than the bottom loading pump since its installation, and dips to base have not shown that silt is building in the well again.</p> <p>We have been going through an exercise of turning off the pump 48 hours prior to the reading being taken to ensure we have a 'settled' reading.</p> <p>Unfortunately the level is still above compliance level, but is on a downward trend. The other monitoring point in the phase is compliant.</p> <p>The Leachate Treatment Plant staff continue to blend the Phase 4 leachate and treat through the plant, meaning that fewer tankers are required. This is the leachate that was historically too high in COD to successfully treat through the plant.</p> <p><b>Gas Extraction</b></p> <p>Plans are currently progressing to install a further 9 gas wells in the western flank. We are hoping to have the drilling rig on site mid-April. This drilling is to be undertaken by a special rig that is able to drill while on steep slopes. We are also speaking with our new Gas Support Manager about the need to re-drill wells in the area of Phase 4 where we have recently been tipping. These will be to replace wells that were installed some time ago and have been raised with the waste meaning that extraction through the full waste depth is not currently possible.</p> <p>We are continuing to accept soils for restoration and will be looking to increase the quantities being brought into site once we know that the CERC waste will not return.</p>	
3.2	PJ asked what the contingency plan for CERC downtime was when Connon Bridge closed in 2018. IM said that he couldn't answer this, as it would be	EJ

	<p>Cornwall Council who made this decision. PJ requested that Cornwall Council, in coordination with their contractor SUEZ, came back with an answer on this point. SW said that a contingency plan would be part of the Cornwall Council waste strategy going forward, which was being consulted on at the moment. DM asked what would happen with the bulky waste coming to Connon post 2018. EJ confirmed that both the contingency for CERC downtime, and the plan for bulky waste post 2018, would be raised with Cornwall Council.</p>	
3.3	<p>Following on from IM's update, PJ asked if SUEZ could confirm a cut-off date for when leachate would be in compliance. IM said that the problem was now in a different part of the site, that it was a month since the pump had been installed, SUEZ were carrying out sampling every week and were trying their best to bring it down as quickly as possible. DM said that SUEZ had just been fined £500,000 over leachate at Connon and in 2015 they were fined £110,000 at another of their landfill sites, SUEZ should know when leachate will be compliant. IM reiterated that he couldn't give a date but they were trying to bring it back into compliance as quickly as possible. PJ said that it was incumbent on SUEZ to recognise that some of the residents were extremely fed up, especially as a lot of the issues seem to reoccur every few months. He added that SUEZ had obligations to local residents, the environment and the Council, and the leachate issue needed to be resolved. He asked for this point to be minuted. PJ, referring to the contingency plan for CERC downtime, said that the local residents had suffered issues from the landfill for 50 years and were adamant that the contingency would not be Connon. JH said that a contingency plan should have been thought about a long time ago. The permit at Connon had already been extended many times, which suggested a lack of forward planning. EJ said that SW had explained that the waste strategy was currently under consultation. PJ asked if it would be possible for someone to attend the next meeting from Cornwall Council who can give answers to the questions raised. EJ said she was very happy to make this request. DM said he wanted an assurance that Connon would close on December 31<sup>st</sup> 2018.</p>	EJ
3.4	<p>EJ said that she would send round the PDF of the statement that was issued at the time of the recent court case. She explained that SUEZ had accepted 6 of the charges, but disputed 5. The Judge in the case said that SUEZ's overall compliance record was good, and that they had taken steps to resolve the issues. PJ said that SUEZ had come up with a press statement but have still not apologised to the local residents and that the meeting today should have started with this. JM said that for 15 years they had put up with the various issues – e.g. the odour, the noise, the litter and stones on the road - and nobody has ever said sorry. CJ said he could remember Gareth making an apology previously. EJ asked if when residents complain they receive an apology. A discussion took place. EJ said that now SUEZ had NC as Community Liaison Manager, she can help to handle this.</p>	EJ

3.5	<p>JM raised an issue with lorries backed up to the main the road, and turning in dangerous places, which she hadn't be able to speak to anyone at Connon about (in a timely fashion). EJ asked what the best way for residents to complain was. IM said these had to go through the helpdesk and then site staff responded as quickly as possible. JM said it would be helpful to speak direct to IM when it was something urgent. KA said there had been a particularly bad day where all the artics from the transfer stations had turned up at the same time (following the CERC closure for several days for roof repairs). GP said that the fact Connon is the only landfill in the county is the problem, as every time a new site was suggested there was uproar. JM said it was very frustrating when they couldn't get out of their property due to queuing vehicles or parked vehicles. KA said Connon staff had been out and moved vehicles on when they were parked off site. She said they would also issue another email to the hauliers to explain the policy. She added that if residents can report lorries with registration number SUEZ will deal with the driver/haulage company concerned. DM asked if there was a contingency plan for handling situations where a large number of lorries come in at once. KA said it was a case of balancing the number of soil delivery lorries with waste deliveries. EJ said this issue would be taken away and looked into. She added that the issue with the CERC roof was an extreme circumstance, where the whole site had to be closed for safety. Going forward the CERC has two lines, so even if one has a problem, the waste can still be processed on the other line.</p>	KA/IM/EJ
3.6	<p>EJ said that the CERC has now been officially handed over to SUEZ. She offered the opportunity for anyone from the liaison group to visit the CERC. NC will send out an email to make the arrangements.</p>	NC
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Environment Agency update</b>	
4.1	<p>CJ said that the enforcement court case referred to earlier in the meeting, which took place in February, was from incidents in 2012/13. SUEZ received a fine of £180,000, and £325,000 costs were awarded against them.</p> <p>MR gave the rest of the EA update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There have been no odour or noise complaints since the last meeting.</li> <li>• There was a complaint about the importation of clinical waste into the site.</li> <li>• The landfill gas well condensate incident – an investigation report has been received into the incident and will be reviewed. The EA understands that monitoring is still being undertaken, but that the problem seems to have been resolved.</li> </ul>	MR

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are further landfill gas wells to be installed on the western flank of phase 4 and the EA have some information from SUEZ to look at on this.</li> <li>• There will also be some wells to be re-drilled in phase 4 – the EA is awaiting information on these.</li> <li>• The capping hasn't started yet and now the area to be capped is under review as to whether further waste will be tipped in relation to an extra lift or a new mini-cell.</li> <li>• Landfill gas odour issues are much better at the moment, which is very positive, but the EA are continuing to monitor.</li> <li>• With regards to leachate, there is still a little bit of undulation with levels and Phase 4 is out of compliance.</li> <li>• With regards to the drilling incident discussed at the previous meeting, the EA have received the report and need to review it.</li> <li>• MR inspected the site today with IM and there were no issues.</li> <li>• The EA have been working on the permit template variation. There are no significant changes to any limits, it has just been brought up to date (all non-hazardous landfills across the country have been done). MR asked if anyone wanted a copy of this, DM requested a copy, MR to email it to DM.</li> </ul>	
4.2	<p>GP asked what would happen after 2018 with leachate, i.e. would there still be staff at Connon to look after it. IM said that once it was closed it would be capped/restored which would considerably reduce the amount of leachate produced, but that staff would be retained on site to manage the Leachate Treatment Plant. EW said that SUEZ would maintain leachate infrastructure until the site was handed back to Cornwall Council, and then they would take on the responsibility. CJ said that the landfill will still need active management after 2018 for both gas and leachate, but leachate generation will be much less after capping. He added that Cornwall Council will be bound by the conditions of the permit to manage the site. GP said that the electricity generated from the gas was a very positive thing and asked how much was produced. KA said 4 engines produced 4MW and the other engine 750KW. MR said this was as much electricity as was feasible from the site – the maximum allowed by the grid connection, with any excess gas flared off.</p>	
4.3	<p>DM asked if the groundwater was still being monitored by the EA after the drilling incident. MR said it was monitored regularly throughout the event and no issues were found, and the boreholes are still being monitored. DM said it was worrying for local residents. CJ said a lot of work was done to repair the holes promptly and reiterated that no issues had been found. JH asked how often the</p>	

	river was monitored. SW said it was monitored weekly because of the old landfill site. KA said that SUEZ do in house monitoring as well. MR said that the permit says monitoring should be undertaken weekly.	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Questions/issues to be addressed</b>	
5.1	PJ asked IM for clarification about the proposed new cell mentioned in his update. IM said this was just being looked at as a contingency measure. He added that this was part of 4b so no additional planning permission would be needed. DM asked how far from full the landfill was. IM said with the issues at the CERC they were now a lot further along with filling the void. On the plus side this meant some areas could be capped sooner than expected.	
5.2	JM mentioned the grass verge by the gate being churned up. KA said that a lorry had 'ploughed' along the edge, for reasons unknown. JM said this was possibly when a lorry was reversing up the road. KA said they must be using the highway for manoeuvring as they are sometimes leaving site (over the weighbridge) and then coming straight back in again to fill up at the transfer station. JM said it would be good to know when there's a hold up on the road for whatever reason, and a quick phone call/email would suffice. IM agreed this was a good idea and would take it on board for the future.	IM
5.3	JM said she was still concerned about the issues that had occurred with lorries during the CERC downtime. KA said that if it is planned maintenance at the CERC that's easily manageable, but the recent problem was unexpected and took several days to put right. Initially waste was held at the transfer stations, but then they became full and all the artics arrived at Connon at the same time. CJ said that pre-planned downtime was not a problem, but the roof issue was unexpected and closed the whole site down. EJ added that both lines would not usually be down at the same time. She reiterated the offer for liaison group members to visit the CERC, where queries of this nature could be raised with the CERC management.	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
6.1	CS said she was not on email and had therefore not received copies of the minutes. JS will post these in future.	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting:</b> Tuesday 6 June, 5.30pm at Connon Bridge.	

## meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	06/06/2017
Location	Connon Bridge Landfill
Recorder	Janine Sargent

### Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Dale Unsworth	DU	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract – Team Leader
Mary Rees	MR	Environment Agency	PPC Officer
Stephanie Carlyon	SC	Cornwall Council	Development Officer
Natalie Chard	NC	SUEZ	Community Liaison Manager
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Katharine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Site Manager
Edwyn Walsh	EW	SUEZ	Leachate Plant Manager
Emma Jordan	EJ	SUEZ	Corporate Affairs Manager (South)
Stuart Higgins	SH	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Regional Manager
Chris Charge	CC	SUEZ	Energy Technical Support Manager

Henry Haley	HH	Local resident	
Janet Haley	JH	Local resident	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local resident	
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Doug Mills	DM	Local resident and St Pinnock Parish Council	

Ref	Note	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
1.1	Apologies were received for Paul Jordan (Chairman Braddock Parish Meeting).	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Review previous minutes/matters arising</b>	
2.1	JH and HH queried the incinerator bottom ash (IBA) being brought to Connon landfill and raised concerns about odour and dust. SH explained that it was an aggregate product made from IBA being used for a regulating layer ahead of capping. It also provides a good cover. It is used as a capping layer and therefore helps to reduce odour. The aggregate product is classified as non-hazardous. Once in place it hardens. SH to confirm particle size and review dust monitoring results.	SH
2.2	Re: item 3.4, EJ explained that DU was in attendance representing Cornwall Council.	
2.3	Re: item 3.5, the SUEZ statement had been circulated with the minutes.	
2.4	Re: item 3.6 KA/IM reiterated that the best way to contact staff on site was via the helpdesk who would pass on any queries/complaints.	
2.5	Re: item 3.7, visits to the CERC had taken place.	

2.6	<p>DM had sent an FOI request about the closure of the site. The reply had confirmed that it would close in December 2018 and that no application to extend the permit beyond this date would be made.</p> <p>DU confirmed that waste not suitable for the CERC would not be sent to Connon. Cornwall Council and Cornwall Energy Recovery Ltd are investigating options for the future treatment and/or disposal of this waste.</p>	
2.7	The minutes were approved.	
3.0	<b>SUEZ operational update</b>	
3.1	<p>IM gave the operational update:</p> <p><b>Tipping Operations</b>          Since the last meeting the site has been accepting the lower tonnage of bulky waste and all other domestic waste is being processed at the CERC.</p> <p>The transfer station has been accepting domestic waste from the local area which is bulked to the CERC. It is also accepting green waste from the local area which is bulked to a contractor's facility.</p> <p>Operations are mid-way along Phase 4, tipping on what used to be the access road up to final waste height.</p> <p>IBA aggregate has been placed across all the waste tipped to height as a capping layer.</p> <p><b>Capping</b>          Contractors have attended site to quote for the capping of Phase 4. The area has been extended to include the sump area and all the area to the south of the current tipping area that is now to height.</p> <p>The contract has not yet been awarded as SUEZ is deciding whether the void will be extended.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note – SUEZ can confirm that no further void will currently be engineered, and we are progressing plans to permanently cap the phase 4 flank as well as all available areas at the top.</b></p> <p><b>Leachate</b>          SUEZ have agreed an action plan with the Environment Agency to reduce the leachate level in the re-drilled leachate well, number P4A3R, in the northern end of Phase 4A which is giving dip readings above compliance level.</p>	

	<p>Daily checks are undertaken to ensure the pumps installed are working to their maximum ability. The action plan includes dates for updates to be provided to the Environment Agency.</p> <p><b>Gas Extraction</b></p> <p>The drilling of nine gas wells in the western flank was delayed as the specialist 'crawler rig' required for drilling on steep slopes had required maintenance work. The rig was delivered this morning and set-up to commence drilling tomorrow, following completion of the necessary paperwork.</p> <p>There is a programme to re-drill some of the existing gas wells in the Phase 4 area that have been raised with the waste. It is hoped this may start after the nine wells are completed, depending on the drill depths within the CQA Plan being agreed.</p> <p><b>General</b></p> <p>SUEZ continue to accept soils for restoration. The stockpile area has been moved to the west of the site, closer to the Phase 4 area to reduce plant movements when restoration commences.</p>	
3.2	<p>CC introduced himself and gave a brief update on landfill gas management:</p> <p>The work to drill the nine gas wells would last about a week and maintain compliance. Once installed the wells will be connected to the gas collection system.</p>	
3.3	<p>JH asked if the amount of waste coming in was reducing, commenting that over the bank holiday there seemed to have been a lot of waste collection vehicles. IM explained that these were going into the transfer station for waste to be bulked to the CERC on Tuesday. SH added that the CERC was not able to accept waste deliveries on bank holidays.</p>	
3.4	<p>DM asked if gas management would be a problem if the planning application for the gas engines was refused. CC explained that according to the gas production model, the capacity currently on the ground is adequate for the gas that will be produced (i.e. no new engines planned) – this is because many of the new wells are replacing existing wells, which are dropping off in terms of gas production. SH added that CLP were sorting out the lapsed planning for the existing gas engines and added that it was essential for the site to have them. DM had commented on the application and had no problem with the gas engines in principle, as long as they weren't noisy but was concerned that CLP were seeking to access the site by the back gate (and not the main gate) on the planning application. CC said he would ask for clarification from CLP on this.</p>	CC
3.5	<p>SH provided further clarification on capping and void management, explaining that SUEZ were working with a designer/preferred contractor on a plan. SH said</p>	SH

	<p>that there was some uncertainty over whether there was a need to develop extra void, and that this decision was currently being discussed at a higher level. Once a decision was made (which should be in the next few weeks), SUEZ could go ahead with the capping. SH would advise the liaison group following a decision. In response to a question from DH, SH said that at present inputs the existing void would last until November this year.</p>	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Environment Agency update</b>	
4.1	<p>MR gave the EA report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There have been no complaints since the last meeting.</li> <li>• The EA are monitoring the landfill gas installation work underway.</li> <li>• The EA are in discussion with SUEZ over some of the specific details of the capping and the CQA plan is still to be agreed.</li> <li>• With regards to the leachate levels that are out of compliance the EA have agreed an action plan with SUEZ to get the levels down.</li> </ul>	
4.2	<p>HH reported a very localised, unusual odour at his property but wasn't sure if it was associated with the landfill so hadn't reported it.</p>	
4.3	<p>DM asked what elements of the capping plan still needed to be agreed. MR said that the EA had received a CQA plan and a stability risk assessment from SUEZ and that the discussions had been about the steepness of the slopes and the use of IBA aggregate in the cap.</p> <p>A discussion ensued about the use of IBA aggregate as a regulation layer in the cap. SH explained that the IBA formed a crust but didn't set 'rock hard' so wouldn't puncture the liner. There are strict conditions to be met before the plastic can be placed. He added that capping would not go ahead until the plan is fully approved by the EA but SUEZ were putting everything in place, so they were ready to proceed as soon as agreement is reached.</p>	
4.4	<p>JH asked about non-compliant leachate levels in phase 4. MR said this related to a newly drilled well that had been out of compliance since it was drilled. SH explained that it was thought to be caused by water 'perching' (where water trapped in the landfill drains into the well from the side walls) and not a reflection of leachate levels at the base of the site. He added that this issue had arisen in a different location in the past and the levels had come back into compliance once the water had drained from the landfill.</p>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Questions/issues to be addressed</b>	
5.1	<p>In response to questions from JH, DU explained that the plastics recycling trial had good results and the council would soon roll out collections around</p>	

	<p>Cornwall. All residents will receive a leaflet about the new scheme. Cornwall's recycling rate is around 36% and further improvements can be made – the Council is producing a Waste Strategy to tackle this, and there would be a new collection contract from 2020.</p> <p>DM asked about wheelie bins and DU replied that the Council are exploring lots of options.</p>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
6.1	<p>SH asked DM for an update on the Parish defibrillator project. DM said the Parish Council would like to put it in place this year and provided updated costs as the Parish Hall were now installing the associated telephone line. SH confirmed SUEZ were happy to support the project and would raise a sponsorship form. SH added that SUEZ would consider supporting other Parish initiatives. DM mentioned an initiative to reduce vehicle speeds with new road signs and will keep SH informed of this.</p>	DM/SH
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting:</b>	
	Tuesday 12 September 2017, 5.30pm at Connon Bridge.	

## meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	12/09/2017
Location	Connon Bridge Landfill
Recorder	Natalie Chard

### Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Dale Unsworth	DU	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract – Team Leader
Mary Rees	MR	Environment Agency	PPC Officer
Natalie Chard	NC	SUEZ	Community Liaison Manager
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Katharine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Site Manager
Edwyn Walsh	EW	SUEZ	Leachate Plant Manager
Stuart Higgins	SH	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Regional Manager
Patrick Daws	PD	SUEZ	General Manager
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Richard Peugh	RP	Cllr for Trelawny Division	
Paul Jordan	PJ	Chairman Braddock Parish meetings	

Henry Haley	HH	Local resident	
Janet Haley	JH	Local resident	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local resident	
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Doug Mills	DM	Local resident and St Pinnock Parish Council	

Ref	Note	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
1.1	Apologies were received from Chris Charge –SUEZ, Emma Jordan – SUEZ and Stephanie Carlyon and Sue Webb – Cornwall Council	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Review previous minutes/matters arising</b>	
2.1	SH asked for any comments and action points reviewed.	
2.2	<p>Re: item 2.1 Dust monitoring was carried out. Four monitoring points were used around the site D1,2,3 and 4. The results of the testing were checked against the permit allowance particle size of 200mg per m<sup>2</sup>, per day. The highest reading was between June – July where 32.3mg per m<sup>2</sup>, per day was measured. This was well below the compliance level. A fine aggregate was found in the sampling and the highest readings were over towards the lagoons in D4.</p> <p>JH asked if August results were available.</p> <p>SH stated they were still awaiting results</p>	
2.3	Re: item 3.4, CC sent an email regarding this action in which he stated that he had contacted CLP and that they had confirmed that the planning application allowed for continued access through the front (Main) gate, with only emergency access through the rear gate. Western power systems will continue to use the	

	<p>rear gate to access their transformers when required. Therefore going forward access for CLP personnel on site will remain the same.</p> <p>DM suggested that this would be an ideal time to limit the amount of traffic going through the rear gate stating it would be better for all traffic to come through the main gate, using the rear gate for emergency only. He asked why an internal route from end to end can't be used.</p> <p>SH stated this could be reviewed but only once the landfill site had been closed as this would reduce the amount of interaction with the current vehicle movements.</p> <p>JM raised concerns about vehicles dangerously leaving the rear exit.</p> <p>SH asked for registration numbers in order to be able to challenge drivers.</p>	
2.4	<p>Re: item 3.5 SH recently emailed Liaison Group Members explaining that they were no longer developing void space. He stated that as from 01/09/2017 all waste has been diverted to the transfer station, which has allowed for more capping works to happen. However the site is still available if needed.</p> <p>In response to a question from JH, SH explained the lorries delivering waste come from around Cornwall.</p> <p>PD confirmed that household waste is coming to the transfer station as well as the bulky waste from around Cornwall. However instead of it going to landfill the bulky waste is being diverted to an alternative landfill site operated by a third party.</p> <p>In response to a question from DM, PD confirmed that there has been no change to lorry movements at the site since the 01 September 2017.</p> <p>CP asked why bulky waste can't go direct to the new alternative landfill. PD stated that it is better for the environment as smaller vehicles bring the waste to the transfer station and then the waste is bulked onto larger vehicles.</p> <p>In response to a question from CP, PD explained that the CERC is too small to be able to accommodate bulking. DU added that there is no facility at the CERC to bulk waste to be taken away to landfill.</p> <p>JH questioned the amount of larger vehicles arriving on site to remove the bulky waste. PD stated the vehicles movements have remained almost the same.</p> <p>PJ questioned this, suggesting there had been an increase as empty lorries now arrive to remove the bulky waste to the alternative landfill. PD noted that this was offset by a decrease in bulky waste arriving at site in the first place, as it was being bulked up and sent to an alternative landfill site directly from a select number of other transfer stations</p>	

	<p>SH confirmed that the amount of vehicle movements are within the planning permission but that he would be happy to carry out a review. PD agreed.</p> <p>DM asked what had changed at the transfer station to enable it to now be able to deal with the bulky waste. SH stated there had been no change, bulky waste was being stored inside the transfer station before being bulked onto larger lorries.</p> <p>JH noted that Sue James had mentioned during a radio interview the installation of a shredder at the CERC. RP added that in the interview she had also said the shredder would be used for both domestic and commercial waste.</p> <p>DU clarified that Cornwall Council and its Contractor were investigating options for a shredder to reduce the amount of bulky waste going to landfill. Initially, a waste shredding operation would be trialled. However, the trial would not be based at the CERC and for the moment the most likely location would be Connon Bridge Refuse Transfer Station, which had been mentioned to the liaison group at previous meetings. The trial would only occur on "Contract Waste". He confirmed there were no proposals at present to trial any commercial waste.</p> <p>PJ considered this news disappointing, as residents had assumed with the closure of the landfill site in 2018 that traffic movements and noise levels would greatly reduce. He felt residents would be very upset if SUEZ and the Council intend to make full use of the current infrastructure on site with these proposals,.</p> <p>PD committed to providing the CLG with details of proposals including figures for noise levels and confirmed that the proposed shredder would have noise control and that it wouldn't operate all the time, as there is a relatively small amount of waste to process.</p>	SH/PD
2.5	Re: item 6.1 SH provided an update on the Parish Defibrillator project. The final approval is with our Chief Executive David Palmer Jones. SH promised to update with any news as soon as possible	SH
2.7	The minutes were approved.	
3.0	<b>SUEZ operational update</b>	
3.1	<p>IM gave the operational update:</p> <p><b>Capping</b></p> <p>Capping works have commenced with the contractors now in the process of laying the capping material on the western flank, which is the first area of their programme.</p>	

Screening of the soils, which are to be laid above the cap, is being carried out in the western end of the site. Dumper access to place the soils is also from this end to ensure stability of the cap and to minimise vehicle movements at higher levels of the site.

Once the capping progresses away from the western flank, access will be from the eastern side of the phase which means that later in the programme plant will have to travel at higher level to access the capping area.

The capping contract has been extended from the original area as operations have filled more of the phase to height, and is now expected to be completed towards the end of October.

#### **Gas Extraction**

In the last meeting we advised that nine gas wells were due to be drilled in the western flank and that the rig had just arrived on site.

The nine wells were completed, connected to the gas extraction system and the drillers had left site by the end of the following week.

Since then, a further nine wells were drilled to replace some of the existing gas wells in the Phase 4 area that had been identified as being less effective as they had been raised with the waste. Again, all wells were progressively connected to the extraction system.

The wells that were replaced have now been removed and sealed.

CLP, the gas contractor, are working closely with site staff and the capping contractors to minimise disruption to the gas collection system during the capping works.

CLP are now working on the design of the final gas extraction pipework layout, which will start to be installed as the capping is completed.

#### **Leachate**

Leachate well P4A3R continues to be closely monitored and recent settled readings have shown a downward trend in leachate level. The action plan agreed with the Environment Agency continues to be followed and updated accordingly.

We previously reported that the Leachate Treatment Plant team were successfully treating Phase 4 leachate through the plant.

Following a slow-down period of throughput through the treatment system to allow for a tank to be removed from the process and inspected, we are pleased to report that the team are now treating Phase 4 leachate through the system

	<p>again at a rate of around 40m<sup>3</sup>/day. This minimises the requirement for tankers taking leachate off site.</p> <p>The site is not accepting soils for use during restoration at the moment. Inputs stopped during the summer and the capping contractors are now carrying out soil screening works in the area. Quantities on site will be reviewed once the capping contract is completed or nears completion, and more soils will be brought to site if required.</p>	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Capping works – Engineering update</b>	
4.1	<p>SH gave the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 18,000m<sup>2</sup> placing plastic is required, we are currently half way through this.</li> <li>• Leachate at P4A3 is still elevated although it is on a downward trend. There has been a 50% reduction and capping may well reduce this further however, it could mean that a drilling rig will be needed back on site.</li> </ul>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Environment Agency Update</b>	
5.1	<p>MR gave the report for the Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received 4 odour complaints all for landfill gas, 1 in July and 3 in August.</li> <li>• A waste odour was detected on site during today's visit. With some odour identified by the local school. This was from the transfer station.</li> <li>• Well 3D2 has been regularly out of compliance. Since the previous meeting, but MR was informed that this was back in compliance last week</li> <li>• Well P4A2 has been out of compliance on some occasions since the last meeting but quickly comes back into compliance</li> <li>• Well P4A3 at the top of the site is the main concern there is an action plan in place to get it compliant.</li> </ul>	
5.2	<p>JM had noticed a gas odour towards Connon Bridge farm over the August Bank holiday but didn't report it.</p> <p>JE stated they could smell an odour earlier on today.</p> <p>SH explained that there are a lot of works happening on site at the moment which although minimised could result in a short term increased risk of odour.</p>	SH

	<p>However the waste odour is unlikely to be from the landfill operations site. During a recent progress meeting with the capping contractors SH reinforced that disconnections should be minimal with CLP connecting back on swiftly to reduce odour.</p>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
6.1	<p>In response to a question from DM, SH stated that there were no problems with birds on site at the moment.</p>	
6.2	<p>RP asked whether the exit onto the B3359 is the responsibility of highways or would SUEZ consider carrying out some maintenance and litter picking.</p> <p>SH confirmed it is the responsibility of highways and due to health &amp; safety he could not send staff out to litter pick without road blocks. Any matters of this nature would therefore need to be referred to highways.</p>	
6.3	<p>CS reported a collision with a large rock on the road because she was unable to move out of the way due to an oncoming lorry. IM to reinforce the checking of lorries tyres as they leave site as large stones can get stuck in the tyres and carried out into the road.</p>	IM
6.4	<p>In response to a question from JH, SH said that 15 to 20 lorries per day bring IBA aggregate to the site, which equates to around 1,500 tonnes aggregate per week.</p> <p>KA added that much of the aggregate had been placed already, around 300mm deep, but the deliveries would continue for a few more weeks as it is such a large area.</p> <p>PJ wanted clarification whether IBA aggregate is going to be stock piled at Connon Bridge. SH confirmed it wasn't and is only being used for the current capping works.</p>	
6.5	<p>JM asked if lorries are allowed to carry out repairs on site, as she recently challenged a driver on the road who told her this was not allowed.</p> <p>KA confirmed that drivers are no longer allowed to park in the apron area as there is less space than before. However IM added that there is space to accommodate lorries elsewhere on site and drivers have not been prevented from parking on site.</p> <p>DM suggested this may account for drivers using the side of the road as a toilet stop. SH asked members to report any drivers seem doing this and to take their</p>	

	number plates so SUEZ can address this issue. KA added that there are toilet facilities on site for drivers to use so there is no need for incidents like this.	
6.6	JM reported a sink in the hedge along from the HWRC, acknowledging this wasn't SUEZ' responsibility she suggested it would be nice if it could be removed.  SH will ask the HWRC team to pick it up.	SH
6.7	DM expressed his thanks to Janine Sargent for coordinating the printing of the local parish magazine.	
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting:</b>	
	Tuesday 14 November 2017, 5.30pm	

## meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	14/11/2017
Location	Connon Bridge Landfill
Recorder	Natalie Chard

### Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Dale Unsworth	DU	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract – Team Leader
Peter Marsh	PM	Cornwall Council	Service Director - Environment
Kevin Bryant	KB	Cornwall Council	Head of Waste Services
Sue James	SJ	Cornwall Council	Portfolio Holder for Waste
Stephanie Carlyon	SC	Cornwall Council	Development Officer
Chris Daly	CD	Cornwall Council	Strategic Planning Manager
Jon Drew	JD	Cornwall Council	Enforcement Manager
Mary Rees	MR	Environment Agency	PPC Officer
Robert Wood	RW	Environment Agency	Waste Team Leader
Natalie Chard	NC	SUEZ	Community Liaison Manager
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Katharine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Site Manager

Edwyn Walsh	EW	SUEZ	Leachate Plant Manager
Stuart Higgins	SH	SUEZ	Assistant Regional Landfill Manager
Patrick Daws	PD	SUEZ	General Manager
Gareth Phillips	GP	SUEZ	Head of Planning and Property - South
Annemarie Wilshaw	AW	SUEZ	Planning Manager
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Richard Pugh	RP	Cllr for Trelawny Division	
Colin Martin	CM	Cllr for Lostwithiel	
Paul Jordan	PJ	Chairman Braddock Parish meetings	
Henry Haley	HH	Local resident	
Janet Haley	JH	Local resident	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local resident	
John Emerson	JE	Local resident	
Steve Cook	SC	Local resident	
Joanne Bunny	JB	Local resident	
Rebecca Harris	RH	Acting Head of Braddock Primary School.	
Doug Mills	DM	Local resident and St Pinnock Parish Council	

Ref	Note	Action
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
1.1	Apologies were received from Cllr Phil Seeva	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Bulky Waste Shredder Operation</b>	
2.1	<p>PD opened the meeting by reiterating the commitment made at the last Community Forum meeting to hold a dedicated single issue discussion at the start of this meeting in relation to the planned shredding operation at Connon Bridge RTS. PD advised that those attending purely for the shredder discussion could then depart and proceedings would then revert to the standard agenda. PD introduced the topic and made reference to information recently shared with the group. One of the key topics that had appeared recurrently within recent correspondence surrounded confirmation of the operator’s ability to undertake the planned activity in compliance with extant regulatory permissions, and in particular Planning Permission. GP was asked to clarify the planning consent SUEZ currently had in place.</p> <p>GP referred to the 2013 Cornwall Council planning committee meeting to extend the time of operation to 2036. Planning approval for the extension was granted at that meeting to allow ongoing ancillary operations including the HWRC, Transfer station and RDF operations but subject to a Unilateral Undertaking with the caveat to stop landfilling by December 2018 and for SUEZ not to seek any further time extension for landfilling.</p> <p>GP stated that the planning permission granted in 2013 covered the time extension to 2036 for the continued use and operation of the Offices and 5 separate activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. HWRC,</li> <li>ii. Pollution control infrastructure e.g leachate treatment (NB gas engines are covered by separate planning permissions),</li> <li>iii. Waste transfer station,</li> <li>iv. The production of RDF using waste wood</li> <li>v. The production of RDF using residual waste.</li> </ul> <p>He confirmed that SUEZ had permission to treat bulky residual waste through a shredder if required under the RDF part of the planning permission.</p> <p>GP confirmed that Planning Permission for all of the listed ancillary activities had been implemented in that by implementing any one of the above activities</p>	

	(HWRC), that all 5 were simultaneously implemented as they were contained in one permission.	
2.2	<p>PJ thanked GP for his comments but asked for the opportunity to put forward local residents' views. He stated that all agreed landfill was not sustainable but that they felt that Cornwall's residents were now having to pick up the burden of the waste shredding operation because there is a need to utilise the full capacity at the CERC. He asked if waste was currently being brought in from outside of county to meet this capacity and if so from where.</p> <p>PM stated that the local plan meant that capacity was built into the CERC to reflect future population growth. Therefore it was designed to have additional capacity which would be dealt with using commercial waste, ideally from Cornwall.</p>	
2.3	<p>PJ wanted confirmation that the trial could in fact become permanent and would end up not only being used for household waste but also start taking commercial waste.</p> <p>PM and PD agreed that the Planning Permission does not restrict the shredding operation to either a trial or the receipt of domestic waste only. It was however necessary to undertake the trial to capture essential operational and commercial data that would ultimately establish both the viability of a long term shredding operation and the best location in which to site it.</p> <p>PD commented that potentially commercial waste shredding from in county derived sources would displace some of the commercial waste being brought in from outside of the county.</p> <p>PJ commented that RDF seems to be a sensible thing to do but couldn't understand why it wasn't designed in at the CERC. Residents feel that Connon appears to be the easy option.</p> <p>DM added that even SJ, the portfolio holder said it would be at the CERC.</p> <p>SJ explained that she had only been the portfolio holder since June and when she made that comment she wasn't up to speed. She added that she holds one of the biggest portfolios covering a variety of areas, waste being only one of them. She apologised for her error.</p>	
2.4	<p>PJ stated that residents' perception was that the area was going to become quieter, less busy and the landfill once restored could become a useable amenity. He wanted it noted that residents are disappointed that the installation of the shredder has hardly been discussed, with no time line. It appears to have been announced in September's meeting that a trial was happening but residents want to know if it is a trial what other sites were considered.</p> <p>PD stated that other potential locations had been evaluated including CERC. The assessment had demonstrated that it was not suitable for a bulky waste</p>	

	<p>shredding operation. There is insufficient space within the tipping hall to accommodate the necessary activity.</p> <p>PJ referred to areas on a plan of the CERC where residents felt a shredder could be installed.</p> <p>PD explained that it is not just the room for the shredder that needed to be considered but the bulky waste itself and the stockpile. On this basis the CERC does not have the room for this operation.</p> <p>PM explained that factors such as planning permission and location made Cannon Bridge the most appropriate site to trial the shredding operation.</p> <p>DM felt the design of the CERC should have incorporated a shredder.</p>	
2.5	<p>PJ referred to the increase in miles as HGVs would be bringing bulky loads to Cannon then back to the CERC once it had been shredded, he didn't consider this to be very environmentally friendly.</p> <p>PM stated that bulky waste at the moment is doing far more miles having to go to landfill outside of the county. He asked what the history of the vehicle movements were at the site, PD shared information with the group. Vehicle movements had reduced dramatically since the commencement of operations at CERC and were well below figures presented within the planning application.</p> <p>PJ stated that residents' perception was that vehicle movements would stop after December 2018 not just return to normal.</p> <p>PD informed the group that bulky waste does in fact take up more room in its raw state and therefore requires more trucks than shredded waste and is more efficient in terms of mileage.</p>	
2.7	<p>PJ suggested that the recent fire in the transfer station and the obvious delay until March, was an opportunity for planning permission to be sought to have the shredder installed at the CERC. He went on to refer to previous planning applications for Cannon and prosecutions from the EA. In particular he referred to the noise permit where it stated that levels should not be above ambient noise and that in January 2012 this was breached.</p> <p>PM commented that he didn't feel there was a need to revisit that.</p> <p>PJ stated that if a noise survey is carried out and shows it to be above ambient noise, that given past prosecutions residents don't feel confident it will be dealt with effectively.</p> <p>PD noted the previous breach was for an operation carried out in the open air involving mobile and therefore is not the same as a contained controlled operation within a building</p> <p>PM stated that any noise would have to comply with the Environmental Permit.</p>	

	<p>PJ went on to refer to various past breaches stating this doesn't provide comfort to residents.</p> <p>PD explained that a slow speed shredder had been specifically selected which is quieter than others and it will be in a building with push walls to help reduce noise levels.</p> <p>DM disputed that a slow speed shredder would be quieter because of the type of engine.</p>	
2.8	<p>PJ challenged the planning consent for extension to operations. Stating that since such operations did not begin within 3 years of the consent that residents felt, that this could be challenged through a judicial review. Reference was made to condition 6 of the planning consent and asked for confirmation of the definition of 'wastes originating from Cornwall's waste collection routes' as residents believe that is a reference to kerbside collections only and therefore does not cover bulky waste from elsewhere.</p> <p>PD explained that this means the route through the waste stream by which the waste arrives in any of the contract treatment and/or disposal sites</p> <p>GP added that he thought that the time-limited opportunity for a judicial review on the planning permission had now lapsed.</p> <p>PJ stated that if shredding were to take place it could be assumed that Cornwall Council were acting irrationally and therefore could still be reviewed. He advised that he has been told residents would get legal aid to support a judicial review and they would consider this route.</p> <p>GP referred to the 2013 permission for extension stating that the planning conditions were there for a purpose. At the time of the extension the CERC had been granted permission and therefore the Connon Bridge application was to support the CERC. Decisions made during the committee meeting agreed there should be no further landfilling beyond 2018 but that Connon would become an ancillary site. If under condition 6, as suggested by PJ, it referred to kerbside collections, there would have been conditions added relating to the number and type of trucks.</p>	
2.9	<p>PJ stated that he thinks the shredder will come to Connon anyway but asked for all to search their conscience.</p> <p>PM Thanked PJ for putting forward residents thoughts and stated he would take on board the information, he appreciated the passion in the room but that Cornwall Council were on a specific time line for the trial of the shredder.</p> <p>JH raised her disappointment at the lack of prior information and stated that the shredder was only mentioned in January's meeting.</p>	

	<p>PM explained that for now they need to move forward with a facility that doesn't breach permits. A trial is temporary it allows for things to be looked at again in more detail.</p> <p>RP asked what was meant by temporary and PM explained that the shredder was being leased whilst a trial is carried out.</p> <p>RP challenged this saying that SJ had said it was being purchased. SJ denied this stating it has always been on a lease basis.</p> <p>PJ asked that everyone continues with these discussions after today's meeting and asked if PM would join further CLG meetings.</p> <p>PM agreed to join further meetings for further discussions.</p> <p>PM reiterated that the principals of the business case is that a trial is the right thing to do.</p> <p>PD thanked everyone who attended for contributing to this part of the meeting and invited those that needed to depart to leave before moving on to the next agenda item.</p> <p>PM, KB, SJ, CD, JD and RW departed.</p>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Review previous minutes/matters arising</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	Before reviewing operations SH referred to previous minutes and asked for any comments. All members agreed were happy with the minutes which were agreed.	
3.2	2.4 – A review of vehicle movements was carried out by PD and the information shared with Forum members.	
3.3	2.5 – SH has kept DM up to date with the progress on the purchase of the defibrillator which is now awaiting delivery.	
3.4	5.2 – SH has reinforced with contractors the need for close monitoring of odour controls during capping. The contractors now attend daily meetings.	
	6.3 – IM was to check tyres on vehicles to ensure no large stones were being taken out onto the road. IM informed that since the last meeting they have only had vehicles delivery IBA aggregate and therefore none have been identified.	
	6.6 - SH was asked to remove a sink left in the hedge. This was already removed by the time SH arranged to retrieve it.	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>SUEZ Operational Update</b>	

<p>4.1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capping works had commenced with the contractor laying the capping material on the western flank. This area has now been largely completed and soils placed over the cap.</li> <li>• The eastern and southern flank of the site have also been completed with the capping material and soils and the contractors are now working towards the sump area.</li> <li>• The south-eastern corner of the capping proved to be challenging, with perched leachate escaping the initial cap area but contained within the works. The contractor and SUEZ took immediate action to prevent contamination of the surrounding soils.</li> <li>• To complete these works the contractor unfortunately had to continue working later than the planning hours. The Environment Agency were informed of the event.</li> <li>• Progress with the capping has been hampered by recent stormy weather and the contractor has advised SUEZ that the completion date is mid-December</li> <li>• SUEZ has been made aware of a number of complaints regarding odour in the last couple of weeks. The contractor is working closely with CLP Envirogas who have been disconnecting the gas extraction wells in the area of work in the morning and reconnecting them at the end of each day to try to minimise the disruption to the gas collection during the capping works. The contractor, CLP and SUEZ are doing everything possible to minimise the risk</li> <li>• To allow the contractor access SUEZ had to remove the leachate collection system from the gas wells. Contractors are ready to re-install the pumps and associated pipework once the sump area capping is completed to restore maximum gas collection as swiftly as possible.</li> <li>• Leachate well P4A3R continues to be closely monitored and the action plan agreed with the Environment Agency continues to be updated accordingly. Although last week's settled dip showed a slight increase from the previous one, overall the downward trend has continued. SH commented that if the levels in P4A3R did not continue to reduce then they may have to install further extraction wells which would require drilling, this is currently being reviewed.</li> <li>• The Leachate Treatment Plant team continue to successfully treat the leachate being collected from Phase 4, with no leachate removed off-site by tanker since 6 October.</li> <li>• SUEZ expects that the production of leachate in Phase 4 will further fall once the capping works are completed.</li> </ul>	
------------	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site has not accepted waste for landfilling since 31 August, however it has been receiving the IBA aggregate for use as a regulation layer under the cap. This will cease once there is sufficient stock on site to complete the capping works.</li> <li>Soils were accepted for one week only at the end of October, these will be used to shape up the bottom of the western flank as additional stability for the soils placed over the cap.</li> <li>Aquaseeders are due to attend site later this week to seed the available areas where soil has been placed.</li> </ul>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Environment Agency Update</b>	
5.1	<p>MR gave the report for the Environment Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There have been six odour complaints since the 31 October.</li> <li>1 odour complaint was reported inside someone's property and therefore is deemed to be quite serious.</li> </ul> <p>IM stated that contractors are working late to help reduce the potential for odour as much as possible. SH stated that IM had investigated all complaints and had specifically investigated a complaint one late evening and did not pick up any odour.</p> <p>MR had concerns that it could be something other than capping.</p> <p>JB stated that whilst it's cold there is an odour nearly every night around 5.30pm.</p> <p>JM mentioned that the previous night's odour was quite strong.</p> <p>SH to raise this with CLP and investigate further.</p>	SH
5.2	<p>MR informed group that because of the capping works a report from an experienced CQA inspector is produced. However, she only received the report yesterday so had very little time to review it.</p> <p>MR informed the group that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3D2 – has been back within compliance since 15 September.</li> <li>P4A2 – has been within compliance since the last liaison meeting.</li> <li>P4A3 – is being closely monitored.</li> </ul>	
5.3	<p>MR stated that a new variation has been issued. The whole permit is now consolidated however, a new variation was received yesterday.</p> <p>JH asked what the new permits referred to. MR stated that they covered conditions about the site including odour, noise, leachate levels, landfill gas, waste etc.</p>	

	<p>JH asked why there were more new variations.</p> <p>SH stated that the new variations related to surface water on site and to ensure that the permit SUEZ has is fit for purpose.</p> <p>MR stated that although an application had been made it doesn't necessarily mean it will be agreed.</p>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Questions/ Issues to be addressed</b>	
6.1	<p>PD gave an update on the recent fire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a fire in the transfer station on Monday 30 October, CCTV confirmed it started at 5am.</li> <li>• The last load of waste was received on Saturday at 11am, which means it was in the RTS building for 43 hours before the fire began.</li> <li>• A thorough investigation is underway but have identified that two fire watches were carried out on the Saturday and three on the Sunday, but nothing was detected.</li> <li>• There has been a forensic investigation by the fire service and our insurers, and both have been unable to establish the source of the fire.</li> <li>• A survey has identified that the steel structure is still intact however, extensive repairs are required.</li> <li>• A contractor has been appointed and works should begin in December with a view to a return to operations by March. However a partial return to operations is being considered.</li> </ul> <p>DM asked whether a sprinkler system was being considered.</p> <p>PD explained that a sprinkler system would protect the primary steel works but not necessarily put out a fire.</p> <p>SH apologised to residents for any inconvenience and disruption to water supplies, stating that at the time of a fire the fire service take over the incident and the primary consideration is to put out the fire.</p> <p>KA explained that she did inform the fire brigade that if they used the main supply it would affect local residents, and that they brought two extra tenders with water to try to alleviate the burden on local water supplies.</p> <p>HK asked when it is rebuilt will it have sound proofing added.</p> <p>PD replied that the insurers will only return the building back to its original state.</p>	
6.2	<p>SC raised the issue of traffic backing out on to the main road and asked if a traffic management system could be put in place.</p>	

	<p>JM confirmed she had witnessed the same and that it meant she had to travel on the wrong side of the road to get past which was dangerous.</p> <p>IM explained that when JM called recently about the lorries it was because of the soils being delivered to site as part of the capping process. The hauliers were immediately contacted and the number of movements reduced the following day.</p> <p>DM asked if a member of staff could be made available to help with traffic control.</p> <p>SH stated that traffic movements from soil should again reduce however, restoration materials will still need to be delivered in the future to achieve the restoration scheme.</p> <p>JE informed the meeting that cars trying to get into the HWRC also joined the queue of lorries.</p>	
6.3	<p>DM asked who is responsible for the different operations on site.</p> <p>PD explained that this CLG was set up for the landfill but now that the focus was changing, operational support for the transfer station and HWRC should be represented at this meeting too. PD agreed to facilitate the necessary attendance.</p>	PD
6.4	<p>JE informed the group that on exit of the site there was a stop sign and a solid line on the road however the word stop has now eroded and asked if this could be reinstated.</p> <p>SH will investigate and action.</p>	SH
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting:</b>	
	Tuesday 13 February 2018, 5.30pm at Connon Bridge.	