

CONNON BRIDGE LANDFILL SITE

COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING MINUTES

Meetings

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Tuesday 27 February 2018 | 2 |
| Tuesday 15 May 2018 | 12 |
| Tuesday 25 September 2018 | 20 |

meeting minutes

| | |
|----------|-----------------------------|
| Subject | Connon Bridge Liaison Group |
| Date | 27/02/2018 |
| 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 |
| Ian Davis | ID | Code 7 Consultants | |
| Sarah Taylor | ST | Environment Agency | PPC Officer |
| Mary Rees | MR | Environment Agency | PPC Officer |
| 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 |
| Patrick Daws | PD | SUEZ | General Manager |
| Annemarie Wilshaw | AW | SUEZ | Planning Manager |
| Natalie Chard | NC | SUEZ | Community Liaison 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 | |
| Jenny Mills | JM | Local resident | |
| John Emerson | JE | Local resident | |
| Doug Mills | DM | Local resident and St Pinnock Parish Council | |

| Ref | Note | Action |
|------------|--|--------|
| 1.0 | Welcome and apologies | |
| 1.1 | Apologies were received from Tim Warne - Cornwall Council, Stephanie Carlyon – Cornwall Council, Stuart Higgins – SUEZ, Henry and Janet Haley – Local residents | |
| 2.0 | SUEZ operational update | |
| 2.1 | <p>Landfill</p> <p>IM reported that the original 17,060m² area of permanent capping, discussed at the previous liaison meeting was completed just before Christmas.</p> <p>Jones Brothers were contracted to complete a further agreed capping section and mobilised to site on 29 January 2018. This contract was completed on Friday 16 February.</p> <p>The capped areas have not been completed with soils at full depths, as this will be done during the final restoration scheme.</p> | |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| | <p>Following the completion of the capping on the western flank of P4, gas well pumps were returned to the wells on Phase 4. The new lines were set up and the wells were back on and pumping before Christmas.</p> <p>Due to the delay to the capping and completion which was completed in February, there was no gain from the benefits that the capping would have provided around P4A3R. The well continues to be closely monitored and the agreed action plan with the Environment Agency continues to be updated accordingly. Last weeks settled dip, which is when the pump is turned off for 48 hours before, showed a level of 4.35m liquid within the well.</p> <p>All other wells/phases remain compliant although there was a minor 1cm breach in well P3D2 on 1 February 2018.</p> <p>The Leachate Treatment Plant Team continue to blend the leachate being collected from Phase 4 however, the COD level within the leachate has risen since the completion of the capping works. As a result not all of the leachate from phase 4 can be treated on site and some had to be tankered.</p> <p>In January Hi-line carried out some tree cutting around the site to prevent branches from touching the power lines. Following this work, new fencing was installed to cover the gaps that were created by the tree cutting on the southern boundary to the site.</p> <p>As reported by email to the liaison group, during January an intruder entered the site at night causing malicious damage to several items of plant which were parked around the office. Following this, overnight on site security has been introduced with 24hour coverage at weekends.</p> <p>DM informed the group that the installation of the fencing had caused several problems as the contractors, during a particularly wet period, were parking on and damaging the verges, which have not yet been reinstated. The fence now cuts off a track used by local deer and environmentally he considered it has had a negative impact.</p> <p>IM stated that unfortunately the site needs to be secure and therefore a fence had to be erected.</p> <p>DM suggested a smaller secure compound would have been better.</p> <p>EW stated this had to be completed due to the cost of damages caused on site and to ensure no one is on site who shouldn't be.</p> <p>PD suggested that any further works carried out on site will be done with conversations with contractors to ensure considerations to residents are made.</p> <p>AW stated that SUEZ would check the condition of the verges.</p> | <p>IM</p> |
|--|--|-----------|

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | <p>JE raised concerns that the Police had not wanted to get involved regarding the vandalism incident.</p> | |
| <p>2.2</p> | <p>Bulky waste shredder operation</p> <p>PD introduced the discussion surrounding the installation of the bulky waste shredder. Essentially the project was more or less in alignment with the programme outlined during November’s community forum meeting. There had been a slight delay (of approximately two weeks) to the reinstatement works to the Transfer Station. A comprehensive update would be provided later on in the proceedings. PM referred to the discussion at the previous liaison group meeting and explained that there was a need to move forward with the trialling of a shredder in accordance with the plans already discussed. However he emphasised the Council’s commitment to investigations into alternative sites continued and results from the trial would be required before a final decision was made. No conclusions had been made as yet, a review of- possible sites, including the CERC was being carried out. PM stated he was happy to attend any further liaison group meetings in order to answer any questions the group may have on the shredder and its location. PD added that Suez had recently received an instruction from the Council to provide a proposal for undertaking a feasibility study into potential alternative locations.</p> <p>RP stated that he had hoped that after the previous liaison group meeting that the group might have been given some idea of the possible noise levels. He raised concerns of local residents, who wanted to know what the possible decibel levels would be and asked what responsibility the EA have in this.</p> <p>MR explained that there is a permit in place for the site which includes a standard noise condition which states, emissions will be at levels where noise will not cause pollution outside of the plant and that SUEZ must ensure everything is done to minimise noise and vibration. Once the trial is up and running if there is any pollution the EA will address it then.</p> <p>RP went to go on and say he was disappointed that he feels the shredder being at Connon Bridge was a fait accompli and asked would noise levels be taken into account.</p> <p>PD explained that SUEZ have already considered the noise levels by selecting a slow speed shredder, considering its location in the transfer station and the configuration of the building, using push walls to reduce the noise.</p> <p>PJ asked would there be any sound proofing and referred back to previous noise issues on site which residents feel took too long to resolve. He asked if the noise became an issue would SUEZ switch the shredder off. PD reiterated that previous noise complaints had been in relation to items of mobile plant (the Compactor) which by nature move around the site closer to receptors and have no additional noise attenuation, for instance push walls, cladding etc.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | <p>PM answered that any issues will be managed to the best effect and that we would work within our permits, if the regulatory body had to intervene we would have to comply.</p> <p>DM asked what was being shredded as he didn't feel that bulky waste meets the planning permission as he felt that the waste does not arise from one of the Authority's "collection routes". It was advised that the PC clerk would formally respond to the community forum meeting in this respect. He wanted to note that previous temporary operations have always ended up being permanent and so one of the concerns with the shredder trial is that it will become permanent like other operations. He suggested that the speed of the shredder would not reduce the noise because of the size of the engine and stated that it would be as noisy as a compactor. He made reference to previous noise complaints dealt with by the EA.</p> <p>In response to a question from PJ, PD explained the trial would be for 6 to 12 months. This would give an opportunity to look at alternative sites and assess actual noise levels.</p> <p>In response to a question from JE, PD explained that a noise simulation would not be suitable because of the high number of variables including wind speed, ambient temperature, humidity etc.</p> <p>PJ accepted the trial was inevitable but stated that the group would continue to apply pressure to find an alternative site.</p> <p>In response to a question from RP, PD explained 16 April 2018 was the aspirational date for shredding to begin, however training would have to be factored into that.</p> | |
| 2.3 | <p>DM expressed residents' disappointment in the number of vehicles that will still be visiting the site. It will be a lot more than they were led to believe would come after December 2018 when the landfill site is due to close. PD referred the group to the historical traffic modelling exercise that had been circulated prior to the last community forum meeting which demonstrated a considerable reduction in vehicle movements following the effective cessation of tipping operations at Connon Bridge and the commencement of waste treatment at CERC. They were well within levels of traffic movements outlined within the planning application.</p> <p>CM summarised residents' feelings, stating that even if the shredder is quiet residents still don't want the shredder here because of the increased vehicle movements.</p> <p>PM confirmed that all findings would be reviewed and everything would be taken into account, in a measured and considered way.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 2.4 | CS wished to raise again that Cornwall's bulky waste should not be coming to somewhere in the east of Cornwall because of unnecessary mileage. | |
| 2.8 | <p>RTS/ HWRC</p> <p>PD referred to the major fire on 30th October 2017 and reported to the group that the reinstatement works had been progressing well and it was looking hopeful that the transfer station would be completed by mid-April. Therefore the trial shredding operation should begin in mid - April. He went on to explain about an initiative to reduce the amount of black bag waste at the HWRCs and reported that there had been a 30% recovery rate.</p> <p>DM reported that there had been more incidences of domestic waste being dumped in verges, which seemed to be happening after the 4pm closure. He asked the Council representatives should there be a return to summer opening hours in order to reduce this.</p> <p>PM explained that the Council are currently reviewing the wider aspect of waste management in Cornwall, of which this was one element. There will be a cost implication and that is why when it was looked at previously it did not change however, new elected members will be reviewing this again.</p> <p>DU added that there are lots of different motivations why people dump waste, it could be because it is chargeable.</p> <p>CM asked if details could be passed on by PM to the next committee meeting so that contact could be made with the Cannon Bridge CLG in order that evidence of this tipping could be passed on and discussed further.</p> <p>PM agreed to do this.</p> <p>DU Explained that if any further incidents occur that residents should telephone Cornwall Council on 0300 1234 141 or fill in the online form at http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/street-care-and-cleaning/refuse-flytipping/</p> <p>PM referred to a previous incident where he had witnessed littering and a fixed penalty fee of £80 was issued. He stated it is not acceptable behaviour and where possible everyone should report it.</p> | PM |
| 3.0 | <p>EA update</p> <p>MR reported that there were 2 odour complaints received at the time of the last meeting on 17/11/17. Since then the site is mostly capped, with one small area open, so that vehicles can get into the area. As a result of this there should be much reduced potential for further landfill or gas odours.</p> | |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | <p>The EA received notification that the capping was completed in mid-February.</p> <p>One leachate point in discussion with SUEZ (P4A3R), where 1.2m is the limit. EA received the notification of the last settled reading of 4.35m.</p> <p>P3D2 and P4A2 – these two locations have breached sporadically which have been dealt with through the scoring scheme.</p> <p>A Permit Variation Application has been submitted and is now being reviewed by the Technical Teams within the EA. This is for a removal of the limits on the surface water monitoring on three locations – one of which is for the Cannon Bridge stream below LTP discharge. The monitoring will remain in place but the limits have been requested to be removed.</p> <p>DM questioned what was being monitored, he was concerned why SUEZ were asking for the levels to be removed.</p> <p>MR explained that the level on the LTP discharge will not be amended, removed or monitoring stopped. The assessment undertaken by the national permitting and national geoscience team of the proposals in the application, would also include consideration to the flows of the stream and impacts on the environment further downstream.</p> | |
| <p>4.0</p> | <p>Planning authority update</p> <p>AW introduced herself to the group and advised that she would be presenting proposals for the restoration of the site. She showed a plan of how the land could be restored. She discussed how the original plan had changed due to some of the void not being filled and the contours of the land changing. She proposed that a wetland area should be created in the lower area, as natural rainfall could be used to create this, shallow wide ditches would be created to bring the water to that area.</p> <p>ID added that the restoration would be based on an agricultural design and showed several images of the types of vegetation and planting that would take place to create woodland areas, supporting wildlife and biodiversity. He explained how the wetland area would be created and how it would be surrounded by a native wildflower, grassland area which would encourage biodiversity such as dragonflies. The fields would be created with boundaries made by natural hedges.</p> <p>AW highlighted an existing walk way around the perimeter and highlighted a permissive link which went across the land but would have to be fenced either side for safety. AW asked the group if the permissive link shown on the plans</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | <p>was related to a previous pathway, as it wasn't ideal having to cross where well heads and pipework would remain.</p> <p>HK suggested it may have been to do with houses that used to be at the edge of the site before it was developed.</p> <p>PJ stated he felt the permissive link would mean more use of the land.</p> <p>AW explained that a planning proposal had not yet been sought and that she wanted to take on board the views of the CLG before putting a final proposal together.</p> | |
| 4.1 | <p>PJ added that he had thought the land, once restored would have been more of an amenity for residents to use. Apart from the footpath he felt that the public couldn't make use of most of the land and suggested that if there is going to be a lot of biodiversity encouraged, that perhaps bird watching huts or other uses could be incorporated into the design.</p> <p>CM suggested perhaps different length of walks could be incorporated so that dog walkers had a choice of walks. Suggesting that more than one path would potentially give more benefit to locals.</p> <p>AW explained that open access does not lend itself to a former landfill site but that perhaps a number of walks/paths could be considered. She referred to the United Mines site where restoration had taken place and bridle paths had been reinstated as permissive links but, for health and safety reasons, they had to have five foot fences either side.</p> <p>DM added that if walkers were going to be encouraged, parking areas would have to be considered. He also asked if the wetland area was being created from diverted water, what would happen during spells of high rainfall.</p> <p>AW explained that water would be diverted to different areas and that when designs are created they plan for the worst case scenario and they are closely scrutinised by the EA.</p> <p>HK asked how long it would take the land to recover from being a landfill site.</p> <p>AW answered that realistically it would take around 60 years and therefore the infrastructure would be in place for a long time.</p> <p>CM asked would the wetland area, have the potential to attract nuisance flies to near neighbours. ID replied that he didn't see that as a potential problem. They had no issues at other similar sites they have developed.</p> <p>DM asked how long it would take to establish.</p> <p>ID stated it would be between five and eight years, with some grasses</p> | |
| 4.2 | <p>PD asked AW how the process of gaining planning permission worked.</p> | |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | <p>AW explained that during a pre application request that there would be talks with the Council, this consultation process is not with the public. When the planning application is submitted this is when the public have the opportunity to get involved.</p> <p>PD thanked AW and ID for their presentation.</p> | |
| 5.0 | <p>Questions/issues to be addressed</p> <p>PD referred to the action points on the previous minutes:</p> <p>5.1 - SH was to update on odour complaints, this was done earlier in the meeting by MR.</p> <p>6.3 - PD will ensure that additional members of staff will attend future meetings with a representative from the shredder operation and transfer station.</p> <p>6.4 – SH has organised contractors to repaint the stop sign and all white lines will be refreshed. This is scheduled for completion before the RTS starts up again.</p> | |
| 5.2 | <p>JM stated that although a lot less, there are still one or two lorries parking up outside the site.</p> | |
| 6.0 | <p>AOB</p> <p>RP wanted to take the opportunity to ask PM directly about nappies in black bin bags, as this had been raised by several members of the public in his Parish.</p> <p>PM clarified that there would not be a weekly black bin bag collection for disposable nappies. He went on to state that everything is under review at the moment and that Cornwall Council are aware that a 'one size fits all' scenario is not suitable for Cornwall. In some areas they are looking at promoting a two weekly black bin bag collection and using campaigns to promote the use of real reusable nappies.</p> <p>PJ then asked if a fortnightly collection is being introduced, would volume for black bin bags be restricted.</p> <p>PM explained that the scrutiny committee will be looking at containment as part of the review. Wheelie bins are not suitable for all areas and therefore a blend of options will be required however there will probably be restrictions on volume to help drive the public to recycling.</p> <p>PJ asked would family size be factored into the restrictions.</p> <p>PM referred to working in the North of England where particular communities traditionally had large families and they had moved to three weekly collections, He didn't foresee any problems moving to fortnightly residual waste collections.</p> | |



| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 6.1 | DM wanted to let the group know that the defibrillator that had been sponsored by SUEZ was being installed the next day and training on the use of it had been scheduled for Tuesday 3 April 2018 in the community hall. | |
| 7.0 | Date of next meeting: | |
| | Tuesday 15 May 2018, 5.30pm at Connon Bridge. | |



recycling and recovery UK

meeting minutes

| | |
|----------|-----------------------------|
| Subject | Connon Bridge Liaison Group |
| Date | 15/05/2018 |
| 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 |
| Robert Wood | RW | Environment Agency | PPC Officer |
| 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 |
| Patrick Daws | PD | SUEZ | General Manager |
| Annemarie Wilshaw | AW | SUEZ | Senior Planning Manager |
| Roger Smith | RS | SUEZ | RTS site Manager |
| Natalie Chard | NC | SUEZ | Community Liaison Manager |
| Carol Spear | CS | St Pinnock Parish Council | |
| Richard Pugh | RP | Cllr for Trelawny Division | |

| Colin Martin (Part) | CM | Cllr for Lostwithiel | |
|---------------------|--|--|--------|
| 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 |
| 1.0 | Welcome and apologies | | |
| 1.1 | Apologies were received from Paul Jordan, Chairman for Braddock Parish meetings. | | |
| 1.2 | <p>Actions</p> <p>2.1 SH informed the group that the verges have been checked and all work is now completed.</p> <p>2.8 PM confirmed that he has passed on the group's comments regarding fly tipping. He explained to the group that there will be a public meeting in the autumn which will review the HWRCs and any changes.</p> <p>DM raised the subject of HWRC opening hours and suggested that this was one of the reason for fly tipping in the area.</p> <p>PM confirmed that opening hours would be one of the issues reviewed by the scrutiny panel on the 24 May and that their report would form part of the discussions at the meeting to be held in the autumn.</p> <p>JH asked when and where the meeting in the autumn would be held.</p> <p>PM stated he would be happy to inform the group of the meeting date once confirmed.</p> | | PM |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 2.0 | SUEZ operational update |
| 2.1 | <p>Landfill</p> <p>IM reported that CLP, the gas contractors, had recently been on site. In early April they drilled eight new gas wells which once the drilling was completed were all connected to the gas extraction system by 10 April.</p> <p>Originally 11 gas wells were planned to be drilled in April however, on Phase 4 the full depth of soils had not been applied and therefore the drilling could not go ahead, due to the risk of damage to the caps.</p> <p>During the engineering works on Phase 4 a pipeline was installed to carry leachate down to the leachate plant. As part of the final restoration works the burial of this pipeline began at the end of April. This is likely to take around six weeks and involves lifting the line from its position at the base of the slopes above the southern ditch and moving it further up onto the site then burying it in a trench.</p> <p>The monitoring of P4A3R continues as it is the one well that is over compliance for leachate. However, the well continues to show a downward trend since it was capped in February.</p> <p>There have been two incidents at the leachate plant since the last meeting. Both incidences occurred within the UF plant and resulted in sludge being spilt within the bunded area of the site.</p> <p>The first incident was following a fitting failure and the second is currently under investigation to identify the cause.</p> <p>Both spills were contained within the bund and cleaned up swiftly, with some sludge being removed off site by a tanker or pumped back into the treatment tank. Phase 4 leachate is currently being tankered off site, until the plant is brought back up to full capacity.</p> <p>SH added that they have recently hydro-seeded areas of the site to help stabilise parts of it.</p> <p>DM asked when would the rest of the hydro-seeding take place.</p> <p>SH informed the group that the rest would be completed once planning for the restoration works had been agreed. The site is currently waiting for soils to be delivered which will support the landscaping.</p> <p>DM mentioned they had heard something that sounded like a bulldozer.</p> <p>IM informed the group that there had been some tidying up around the site which</p> |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | <p>may have caused some noise but that all the work should be finished by today.</p> | |
| <p>2.2</p> | <p>Bulky waste shredder operation</p> <p>PD stated the transfer station and shredder had returned to availability on the 25 April. The shredder had arrived on the 23 April and had required commissioning and health and safety checks first. The early stages of the testing have shown that it is working well and producing a good product, making an important contribution to diverting bulky waste away from landfill to the CERC. The shredding operation had been operational in some capacity for over 3 weeks.</p> <p>RP asked is there a shredder and two swing shovels in the RTS building.</p> <p>PD answered that there is a dedicated machine (360 “rubber duck” wheeled excavator) for loading the shredder and an existing wheeled loading shovel for managing all of the stockpiles within the Transfer Station. This is an existing machine. He stated that the shredder is tracked in during the day and tracked out at night following clean down and maintenance checks as part of standard fire control procedures.</p> <p>JM asked if the shredder had been working this week as there were loud shredding type noises on the preceding Thursday morning.</p> <p>PD informed JM that the noise of the shredder was predominantly engine noise with the shredding activity itself virtually imperceptible and an initial walk around the site showed that the sound dissipated quickly. PD added that during recent meetings that he had attended on site in close proximity to the shredder there was no audible noise from the shredding operation</p> <p>SH suggested it could have been the pipeline work that was being completed using a dumper and excavator.</p> <p>JM did not agree.</p> <p>PD asked if residents could possibly report noise when they hear it. In order to pinpoint the source of any noise it was vitally important that the type of noise, the location at which the noise was heard and the date and time of the incident were recorded and reported. Ideally any concerns surrounding noise should be raised to site as soon as possible so that site staff can investigate with immediate effect.</p> <p>JM stated she didn’t want to have to do that as she has been reporting issues for years.</p> <p>DM asked what was being shredded.</p> <p>PM answered bulky waste arising from household waste deliveries by members of the public to Household Waste Recycling Centres and a limited number of</p> | |

| | | |
|------------|---|------------------------|
| | <p>kerbside household waste collections</p> <p>DM reiterated that in his opinion, the shredding of bulky waste does not comply with the planning permission and repeated the position that he had made during prior community forum meetings that he intended to articulate his position in writing to the Planning Authority</p> <p>JH asked if Cornwall Council are still looking at other sites to locate the shredder.</p> <p>PD confirmed that other sites are actively being reviewed following the issue of an instruction by CC and that SUEZ will be reporting back to Cornwall Council in the summer.</p> <p>PM assured the group that the report will be looked at but that there is no commitment to move the shredder. The necessary permissions exist for the bulky waste shredding operation to remain at Cannon Bridge Transfer Station for the duration of the contract. However, he is happy to report back the findings to the group.</p> <p>JM stated that she feels the opinions of the Liaison Group are being dismissed.</p> <p>DM asked again why the CERC was not considered a suitable location in the first place.</p> <p>PM stated that the group had already discussed this at the previous meeting and that permits were in place here to carry out a trial. However, it was important to first establish the facts, produce a clear timetable of reporting back to the group and to review with open minds.</p> <p>RP asked if SUEZ could arrange a time and a date to see the shredder operation and could the EA explain about decibels so that the group are informed.</p> <p>PD/SH both stated they are happy for this to go ahead but wanted a few weeks to allow the routine to become established.</p> <p>SH suggested that early indications are good and that the shredder is working well.</p> | <p>PD</p> <p>PD/SH</p> |
| <p>2.3</p> | <p>RTS/ HWRC</p> <p>RS informed the group that normal operations were back up and running. After an initial review it was decided that any shredding would be completed in the mornings between 9am and 11am.</p> <p>DM stated that now the RTS is back in operation they have noticed R & R lorries parked outside.</p> <p>PD stated that whilst the lorries were parking on the public highway he would be happy to arrange for the haulage companies to be contacted to reinforce the message about entering the site and parking. He also asked where possible if</p> | |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---------------------|
| | <p>residents could note the registration numbers. It is of critical importance that as much detail of any offending vehicles is captured e.g. haulier, registration number, date, time and any other relevant information. If it is not possible to record the registration numbers then a record of the time of the incident may allow reconciliation with weighbridge arrivals and tickets.</p> <p>DU undertook to convey the same message to the Authority's Collection Contractor, BIFFA</p> <p>JM stated she didn't want to be constantly taking down registration numbers.</p> <p>PM suggested it may be worth referring to the contractual arrangements between R & R and SUEZ.</p> <p>JM explained that drivers are still using the lane which is a public highway as a public toilet.</p> <p>JH asked if there any security cameras on the gate so culprits could be identified.</p> <p>SH answered that there are no cameras at the gate.</p> <p>DM raised again his concerns about possible accidents due to parked lorries and the restricted vision they cause.</p> | <p>PD</p> <p>DU</p> |
| <p>3.0</p> | <p>EA update</p> <p>MR reported that the EA had received operational and fire procedure plans from SUEZ, which are currently with the review panel. She stated that the EA had not received any complaints since the last meeting in relation to Landfill operations.. Robert Wood confirmed that the EA had not received any complaints relating to the shredder operation.</p> <p>MR confirmed that there had been two issues with the leachate plant. The first incident was completed and closed down, whilst the second is currently being reviewed.</p> <p>MR informed the group that an action plan had been produced for P4A3R and that it will be included in the permit as an improvement condition stating that leachate will be removed in line with the improvement plan. Levels for P4A3R on 25th February 2018 were 4.35m and on the 1st May 2018 they had dropped to 3.3m which shows that levels continue on a downward trend however the permit limit is 1.2m. The permit variation is ongoing and also refers to the stream.</p> <p>SH stated he was unable to provide an update on the variation as SUEZ are still to respond to the EA.</p> | |
| <p>4.0</p> | <p>Planning authority update</p> <p>AW referred to a map of Connon Bridge landfill site and reiterated ideas outlined</p> | |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | <p>to the group at the last meeting for a less formal restoration of the site to woodland and pasture rather than a formal agricultural field structure. She informed the group that she is about to start discussions with the planning authority to get views on the plans.</p> <p>AW stated that she had considered the views of residents from the last meeting but that public access was not suitable whilst the site was still active and waste within the landfill degrading. However a new footpath was being considered that crosses over Old Connon.</p> <p>This is a possibility as Old Connon does not have the same infrastructure as the new site. AW explained about also creating a new spur off the existing footpath which, although it would be fenced, would give a good view point over the area from the high point of the restored landfill.</p> <p>HK asked if there would be any parking.</p> <p>AW stated that there would not be any parking areas, explaining that it was not the intention to encourage use of the area and that the footpaths were more for local people to use. She went on to explain that contact with local schools had been made to forge links and encourage an educational element.</p> <p>NC stated she had received a positive response from the Head of Geography at Liskeard School and Community College. Explaining that on the current Geography A' Level there was a unit on waste management and they were very keen to work with us on that.</p> <p>PD added that following the last Community Forum he had engaged in dialogue with Paul Jordan regarding the potential involvement of local schools in the development of the final restoration scheme. They had concluded that this was an excellent suggestion and PD had liaised with NC with a view to actively engaging local schools with Suez at an early stage. Suez have a variety of educational offerings, including visitors' centres at both Bodmin MRF and the CERC. NC is actively pursuing contact with the local schools with a view to inviting them along to the Visitors' Centres.</p> <p>JH asked who will maintain the landfill site.</p> <p>SH stated that the restoration needs to be completed by December 2020 and that, once restored, the site would be handed back to Cornwall Council, CM asked when the land would have settled enough to allow for more footpaths. SH stated that as the land would be handed over to Cornwall Council around 2020, it would be their decision.</p> | |
| 6.0 | AOB JH asked for confirmation that there was no more landfill happening in Cornwall and asked what refuse collection lorries were doing at the site. | |

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| | <p>PD confirmed there had been no tipping to landfill since the end of August 2017.</p> <p>SH explained that collection lorries drop off their waste at the RTS and then the waste is bulked up onto an artic lorry which goes to the CERC.</p> <p>JH went on to explain that there are two very noisy dust carts which arrive on site regularly.</p> <p>SH asked if they could get the registration numbers so they are able to identify the vehicles.</p> <p>DU stated if given the registration numbers that he would follow that up with BIFFA.</p> | |
| 6.1 | <p>JH raised concerned about the bimonthly Liaison Group meetings being extended to almost quarterly.</p> <p>PD explained that at the last meeting, the date of this meeting had been decided to make sure the shredder operation had started.</p> <p>SH stated he was happy to continue with a two monthly schedule but that at times some may have to be moved by a week or so.</p> <p>CM explained as a councillor there are lots of meetings to go to and that recently they had been given a years' worth of dates and asked if that could be done for the Liaison Group meetings.</p> <p>PM stated that he was sure that wouldn't be a problem but that there does still have to be an element of flexibility, to make meetings relevant to the events happening, for example this meeting and the shredder operation.</p> <p>NC agreed to schedule two monthly meetings for the following year and advise the Liaison Group of the dates via email.</p> | NC |
| 7.0 | Date of next meeting: | |
| | 24 July 2018 | |

meeting minutes

| | |
|----------|-----------------------------|
| Subject | Connon Bridge Liaison Group |
| Date | 25/09/2018 |
| Location | Connon Bridge Landfill |
| Recorder | Natalie Chard |

Present

| Name | Initials | Company | Title |
|---------------|----------|--|--------------------------------|
| Peter Marsh | PM | Cornwall Council | Service Director - Environment |
| Patrick Daws | PD | SUEZ | General Manager |
| Ian Mitchell | IM | SUEZ | Senior Site Manager |
| Roger Smith | EW | SUEZ | Site Supervisor |
| Natalie Chard | NC | SUEZ | Community Liaison Manager |
| Janet Haley | JH | Local resident | |
| Henry Haley | HH | Local resident | |
| John Emerson | JE | Local resident | |
| Doug Mills | DM | Local resident and St Pinnock Parish Council | |
| Richard Pugh | RP | Cllr for Trelawny Division | |
| Matt Sleeman | MS | Cornwall Council | Planning Officer |

| Ref | Note | Action |
|-----|------|--------|
|-----|------|--------|

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---------|------------------------------------|-------|--|
| 1.0 | Welcome and apologies | | | | | |
| 1.1 | <p>Apologies were received from Stephen Cochran, Jenny Mills – local residents, Howard Knapman - St Pinnock Parish Council, Stuart Higgins, Katharine Alexander, Edwyn Walsh, Annemarie Wilshaw - SUEZ, Paul Jordan - Chairman for Braddock Parish, Robert Wood – Environment Agency.</p> <p>Matt Sleeman joined late but introduced himself. He will be providing maternity cover for Stephanie Carlyon</p> | | | | | |
| 1.2 | <p>Actions</p> <p>2.2 PR had agreed at the last meeting to provide data regarding the tonnage of waste being shredded each week and the number of HGV lorry movements. NC advised that PJ had also requested in his email that these figures be reported at each meeting. PD stated he was happy to do that and therefore he would share the information under the shredder operation section and make a regular item. The figures could be appended to the minutes.</p> | | | | | |
| 2.0 | SUEZ operational update | | | | | |
| 2.1 | <p>Landfill</p> <p>IM reported that activities on site at the moment consist of daily monitoring and routine maintenance. There continues to be no waste into the landfill and there had been no soils delivered as part of the restoration.</p> <p>The monitoring of P4A3R continues with the last settled reading being at 2.44 metres. (down from 2.57 metres at the previous meeting) There is still a downward trend and the Environment Agency are happy with the progress. All pumped readings for the well are compliant.</p> <p>The leachate treatment plant continues to treat all of the leachate that is being produced and as a result no leachate has been tankered off site.</p> | | | | | |
| 2.2 | <p>Bulky waste shredder operation</p> <p>PD shared with the group the data requested from PR at the last liaison group meeting and explained that the data referred to the period 01 May 2018 – 31 August 2018.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="336 1809 1294 1951"> <tr> <td data-bbox="336 1809 1099 1877">Total tonnage received for shredding during this period</td> <td data-bbox="1099 1809 1294 1877">6812.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="336 1877 1099 1951">Average tonnage processed per week</td> <td data-bbox="1099 1877 1294 1951">390.9</td> </tr> </table> <p>Lorry movements with shredder</p> | Total tonnage received for shredding during this period | 6812.68 | Average tonnage processed per week | 390.9 | |
| Total tonnage received for shredding during this period | 6812.68 | | | | | |
| Average tonnage processed per week | 390.9 | | | | | |

| | |
|---|------|
| Average artic in per week (HWRC Material) | 15.9 |
| Average Roro in weekly | 48.2 |
| Average loads out weekly (back haulage loads to CERC from Connon RTS) | 17.5 |
| Average total loads in/out per week | 81.6 |

Following a question from the audience explained why there were discrepancies in the number of incoming and outgoing artics, Principally associated with compaction efficiencies.

RS reported that there had been no significant change to operations since the last meeting and that the shredder has been running for an average of around 35 hours per week. There has been occasional Saturday work but most of the bulky waste has been processed over the 5 day working week.

RP asked during the trial have SUEZ seen a fluctuation in the amount of bulky waste received. RS advised that there has been a little seasonal difference but in the majority it has roughly been the same amount each week.

DM asked if SUEZ were still receiving an average of 1000 mattresses per week.

RS confirmed that this was still the case.

JH asked if these were coming from businesses and PD explained that the shredding operation was currently only processing household bulky waste and no commercial waste was going through the process.

DM asked if there was ever a dismantling service for mattresses where the metal could be picked out. RS thought that there had perhaps been something in Devon, PD explained that metal in mattresses is relatively light and inherently contains a high degree of contamination with mattress “fluff” etc so taking it out at source only gives small volumes and it is not economically viable.

RP then asked what happens to mattresses and the metal in Cornwall. PD explained that once they are shredded, the materials go to the CERC and any metals will be collected as part of the IBA recovery process with magnets and eddy current separators by Suez’s sub-contractor Ballast Pheonix and sent for recycling to Henry Orchard.

PD then updated the group on the progress of the feasibility study which Cornwall Council agreed to carry out, looking at other possible locations for the shredder. The study undertaken on behalf of CC is now largely complete in draft and it was hoped that the findings could be reported back at the next meeting.

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| | <p>JH asked how many sites had been considered. PD answered that there were a number in Cornwall that had been reviewed but this report specifically dealt with the CERC</p> <p>JH asked if there were any dustcarts delivering on a Sunday, RS stated they could be commercial vehicles but that none would be delivering to site on a Sunday.</p> <p>HH asked why do the dustcarts have to be so noisy, despite reporting noisy dustcarts at previous meetings and being told it had been sorted he is still being disturbed by noise from some of the vehicles. HH said it was difficult to capture number plates as the vehicles were driving by so fast.</p> <p>RS suggested he speak to the weighbridge and that if they hear a particularly noisy dustcart to phone in and then they can identify the vehicle. The information can then be reported back to CC for them to pass onto their Collection Contractor, Biffa</p> | |
| 2.3 | <p>RTS/ HWRC</p> <p>RS informed the group that they are continuing with standard operations and that there is nothing new to report.</p> <p>PD informed the group of the new Tetra Pak trial which is available at seven of HWRCs, unfortunately it is not available at all due to the size of the container and space restrictions at some HWRC's. This trial is being undertaken on behalf of CERL.</p> <p>PD stated that currently SUEZ continues to trial a black bag diversion scheme at sites which involves removing bulky waste and putting it into a separate bin which is sent then sent straight for shredding, with the remainder of the black bin bag waste going straight to the CERC.</p> <p>RP then started a discussion about the collection of recyclables in particular plastics. PM referred to the new collection contract which was due in April 2020 and stated that the new trucks will need to change to reflect the changes in people's recycling habits and needs in the future.</p> <p>PM stated that recycling statistics for each area are available from Cornwall Council and he would be happy to send RP the stats for his area.</p> <p>JH asked why you are no longer able to buy things that people wanted to throw away from the HWRC's in Cornwall. She had seen this happening on a TV programme involving a SUEZ site and wondered if there are any plans for that here in Cornwall.</p> <p>PM informed the group that Cornwall Council are now looking at building a few more HWRC's with a retail outlet. Currently some of the reusable waste does go to a couple of outlets, one of which is the St Blazey reuse shop. PD explained</p> | PM |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| | <p>that he was in discussion with Pauline Giles about extending the trial to Newquay and Connon Bridge HWRC's</p> | |
| <p>3.0</p> | <p>EA update</p> <p>NC informed the group that she had received apologies from the EA who had stated in an email that there are a number of pressures on their resources and that they will only attend future meetings if there are aspects of the permitted sites that the residents need to discuss.</p> <p>They stated that they are pleased that everything seems to be operating as planned and have not received any recent incident reports in relation to the site.</p> <p>DM asked if they were no longer going to attend because of the end of the landfill operation. PD explained it was just the EA's new policy.</p> <p>JH asked if the EA will still come and visit the site and PD informed the group that the EA will continue to monitor the site to ensure that there are no permit breaches. PD added that the site holds a number of Environmental Permits, not just for the landfill. The EA will continue to monitor and enforce all of the other permits</p> | |
| <p>4.0</p> | <p>Planning authority update</p> <p>Apologies were sent from AW who had nothing further to add from SUEZ.</p> <p>MS introduced himself to the group stating he had been with Cornwall Council planning department for over 14 years and had previously worked on the Connon Bridge site. He informed the group that whilst SC was on maternity leave he would be taking over her workload and would be attending the meetings in her absence.</p> <p>He informed the group that he had reviewed the proposed changes to the restoration plan at Connon Bridge and that it had gained positive support from the planning officers at Cornwall Council.</p> <p>PD informed the group that AW hoped to be able to give more detail to the proposed plan at the next meeting.</p> <p>DM stated that his impression of the amended proposed plans was that it was a money saving exercise because they didn't have to bring in more top soils.</p> <p>MS advised that the plans had also been reviewed by the Wildlife Trust and that they were supportive of the amendments. He also informed that group that top soil was quite difficult to get hold of.</p> | |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | <p>JH asked how much top soil would be needed for the original grazing land plans MS explained that pipework would have to be buried and that in fact this would be more of an issue than the soils.</p> | |
| 5.0 | <p>AOB</p> <p>JE asked if there were any plans for any landfill mining as he had seen it in the news this week. PD confirmed there were not.</p> <p>RP thanked SUEZ for arranging the guided tour around the transfer station to see the shredder in action, commenting it had helped to put minds at rest. PD thanked the group for attending and explained that was exactly why the invitation had been extended, to be transparent about the operation.</p> <p>DM asked if he had recently heard gun shots and was there a problem again with seagulls.</p> <p>RS explained that they had recently used a gas cannon to try and stop seagulls getting into the RTS building. They were expecting a visit this week from a bird contractor to review the problem.</p> <p>PD agreed to arrange for early mince pies at the next meeting</p> | |
| 6.0 | <p>Date of next meeting:</p> | |
| | <p>27 November 2018</p> | |