

CONNON BRIDGE LANDFILL SITE

COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING MINUTES

Meetings

Tuesday 29 January 2019	2
Monday 25 March 2019	10
Tuesday 11 June 2019	18

meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	29/01/2019
Location	Connon Bridge Landfill
Recorder	Natalie Chard

Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Patrick Daws	PD	SUEZ	General Manager (Chair)
Phil Rudin	PR	SUEZ	Regional Manager
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Stuart Higgins	SH	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Regional Manager
Katherine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Site Manager
Edwyn Walsh	EW	SUEZ	Leachate Plant Manager
Natalie Chard	EE	SUEZ	Senior 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	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local Resident	

Peter Marsh	DU	Cornwall Council	Service Director - Environment
Sue James	SJ	Cornwall Council	Portfolio holder for Environment and Public Protection
Victoria Parker	VP	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract Projects Officer
Richard Pugh	RP	Cllr for Trelawny Division	Parish Councillor
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Christine Butler	CB	Local Resident	
Paul Jordan	PJ	Chairman for Braddock Parish	
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	Carol Spear
Ref	Note		Action
1.0	Welcome and apologies		
1.1	Apologies were received from Colin Martin –Councillor for Lostwithiel, Dale Unsworth – Cornwall Council, Matt Sleeman – Cornwall Council and Annmarie Wilshaw – SUEZ.		
1.2	<p>Actions</p> <p>2.3 DU organised for RP to receive the recycling information regarding his Parish.</p> <p>5.0 IM actioned this and the grass is now trimmed.</p> <p>5.0 SH provided an approximate figure of 4.2 million tonnes, as unable to access data from the old Connon site.</p>		

1.3	<p>Before the previous minutes were agreed JH wished to challenge 2.2, the feasibility study looked at potential location at the CERC and that PD had said other sites must have been discussed before he started work in Cornwall. JH referred to minutes taken in February 2019 where it states that other sites were being looked at.</p> <p>PD clarified this explaining it meant different sites at the CERC.</p> <p>DM disagreed and said at one point he remembered the site where SUEZ shredded wood was being considered.</p> <p>PD stated it was the only site he was asked to investigate and that there were a number of different options at that site which were investigated.</p> <p>Minutes were then agreed.</p>	
2.0	SUEZ operational update	
2.1	<p>Bulky Waste Shredder operation</p> <p>PR updated the group stating that since the 01 May 2018 they had processed 13000 tonnes of waste through the shredder. There had been a slight decrease of waste from a weekly average of 389 tonnes down to 373 tonnes and the average weekly vehicle movements were 77.3.</p> <p>In general since the last meeting tonnage has dropped with sites getting quieter although January saw a spike in activity with a large amount of waste and mattresses coming in just after Christmas.</p> <p>PJ stated he continues to be astonished at the amount of mattresses received compared with the number of Cornish residents.</p> <p>PR explained that typically they receive around 1000 mattresses per week. Unfortunately there was a breakdown of the shredder in January which meant that 3 days of operation time was lost and therefore the shredder has had to run the last two Saturdays in order to catch up.</p> <p>PJ challenged the tonnage of waste being brought to site for shredding during the trial period and raised concerns at what it would become post trial.</p> <p>PD stated that the EA's constraints are a maximum of 75 tonnes per day and therefore 25,000 tonnes per annum.</p> <p>PJ raised concerns at the environmental damage caused by not siting the shredder at the CERC.</p> <p>CS added her concerns particularly on the A390 where there are a number of large vehicles coming to site through the village where elderly and young children are trying to cross the roads. She feels that Cornwall Council and SUEZ are not listening to concerns and that the whole site should have been closed at the same time as the landfill site.</p>	

	<p>PJ added that there was no doubt that there was a positive reduction in vehicle movements however residents had thought that once the landfill was closed that everything would be sorted with no vehicles coming to site.</p> <p>DM asked if the remit of the CERC design was to process the whole of Cornwall's waste and queried why the opening to the furnace is so small and why the shredder wasn't considered at the design stage.</p> <p>PD explained that the design of the CERC is as it should be, the smaller opening ensures that the furnace reacts appropriately and combustion is sustained. PJ asked if this was the same at the MVV EFW in Plymouth and PD stated it was.</p> <p>PR then moved on to discuss the day to day operational issues and explained there had been a breakdown of the loading shovel. Unfortunately the replacement one sent had a reversing beeper instead of a white noise alarm. As it was urgently needed for operations, it wasn't sent back. However the company was contacted straight away, requesting a white noise alarm and another loading shovel was delivered within 2 days.</p> <p>DM felt that it wasn't acceptable that residents weren't notified.</p> <p>PD confirmed that there is a maintenance agreement in place for all equipment to be fitted with white noise alarms. SUEZ reacted straight away once the noise complaint was received however he agreed with DM and moving forward he was committed to ensuring that residents were notified as soon as possible.</p> <p>PR agreed to not accept any equipment on site that did not comply with the maintenance agreement.</p>	
2.2	<p>RTS / HWRC</p> <p>PR reported that there had been a peak of activity on site just after Christmas but that this had tailed off towards the end of the month.</p> <p>DM wished to raise concerns about lorries parking outside the site and shared a photo with the group of an R&R artic lorry parked in the lane. This means that any cars travelling along the lane need to drive on the wrong side of the road and it is a real safety hazard.</p> <p>PR confirmed that drivers have been asked not to park there and that there is an area on site where they are able to park up if necessary. The company was contacted regarding this particular driver and Suez was told that he was a new driver unfamiliar with the route and procedures.</p> <p>PD confirmed that unfortunately it is a public highway and therefore there is very little SUEZ are able to do about them parking there. However PD committed to ensuring that all drivers were notified about not parking outside the site.</p> <p>PR agreed to action this and notify drivers.</p>	PR
	Landfill	

<p>2.3</p>	<p>SH reported that currently on site, clearing of vegetation and some tree thinning works were taking place at the very top of the site. Since the last meeting there have been gorse cleared for maintaining gas extraction works. There was a small issue of a pump malfunction which allowed leachate to escape. However this was quickly tankered off site but it may require another tanker. SH then referred to the notification sent out to residents about the works being carried out on the replacement lid yesterday and reported that all work was carried out successfully.</p> <p>- Landfill restoration plans update</p> <p>NC updated the group on AW's behalf that the planning application to update the restoration and surface water details, as discussed at the previous meeting, should be submitted to the planning authority before the next liaison meeting and that residents will be updated once this happens.</p>	
<p>3.0</p>	<p>EA update</p> <p>PD informed the group that the EA will no longer attend these meetings unless there is an issue they wish to report on.</p> <p>PJ stated that there hadn't been any noise complaints which is good.</p>	
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Questions/issues to be addressed</p> <p>PJ wanted the opportunity to discuss the recent report commissioned and its conclusions. He made reference to the conclusion that states that there are operational and safety issues, that the size is tight to be able to operate a shredder safely on the CERC land. PJ suggested that there was land outside of the CERC perimeter that could be used and asked if the land was owned by Cornwall Council.</p> <p>PM informed the group that the land was owned by Tregothnan Estates and that the farms close by were 3rd and 4th generation farm owners and therefore it wasn't land that was available for use.</p> <p>PJ made reference to a planning application ref 18/11578 for a temporary overspill car park area and suggested that this would be an ideal area to site the shredder and asked why it can't go there.</p> <p>PD explained that the land is leased from the Tregothnan Estate.</p> <p>PM stated that the Connon Bridge site currently had the consent for this type of operation and that the report commissioned contained genuine detail which despite it stating that the CERC was not a possible site for the shredder, he continued to remain open minded. However, the area PJ referred to is a sloping piece of land and therefore wouldn't be suitable. It would also mean that another area would have to be found for the overspill car park which is often used and is</p>	

	<p>required during the planned maintenance shut down when there are large maintenance crews on site. He went on to explain that the Connon site has all the permits in place and that even if an alternative site was found tomorrow it would take at least a couple of years to get everything in place.</p> <p>PJ asked when the trial of the shredder was due to finish.</p> <p>PM explained that the trial finished on 31 December 2018, and that during the trial there had been significant financial benefits with no landfill. The shredder had been leased but now a shredder needed to be purchased. He informed the group that initial discussions about the heat off take from the CERC were under way and that this could make a difference to the area around the CERC with the possibility of more leased land. He understood the concerns of the residents but with a balanced trial period and the infrastructure and permits already in place for the life time of the contract at Connon Bridge, the shredder would remain. However Cornwall Council were committed to keeping an open mind to the possibility of other sites.</p> <p>JH asked if the CERC could operate without a shredder, she felt it was an essential part of the operation and therefore, as it wasn't considered in the initial design, that it was an afterthought. She then referred to the report, page 11, where it states that the decision was made in 2017 for the preferred location of the shredder and wanted to know who decided this.</p> <p>PD explained that the decision was made because operationally and for safety reasons, the CERC did not have the space.</p> <p>PM then reiterated that they will continue to be open minded about relocating the shredder and spoke of a possible super depot off the A30 but that again, these initial ideas would take time and there would be a need to manage the financial aspect as well.</p> <p>SJ then reassured the group that Cornwall Council had considered all possible sites and that she had suggested several of her own however none were suitable. She felt positive about the possibility of the heat offtake from the CERC that PM referred to and alongside that there would be the possibility of a site for the shredder.</p> <p>DM suggested that on the radio, SJ had said she felt the CERC should have included the shredder.</p> <p>SJ denied this and stated the alternative to the shredder is going back to landfill instead of waste going to the CERC. Moving forward she said they will look at the heat off take as an opportunity to relocate the shredder.</p> <p>CS stated that just as SUEZ and Cornwall Council are responsible for the safety of their staff, Parish Councillors are responsible for the safety of the residents. Unfortunately because the village was not by passed the lorries and trucks are still travelling through the village and she felt the community were not being</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>considered.</p> <p>RP reiterated that local people are not being considered and felt an example of this was that there was no consultation about the shredder trial, that it just appeared and that when it states other sites would be looked at it had been assumed it was not just the CERC that was being considered.</p> <p>JH referred the group to previous minutes where PD stated SUEZ were looking at potential alternative sites. The dates of the minutes were 27 Feb 2018, 15 May 2018 and 25 Sept 2018.</p> <p>PD assured JH it was only ever going to be the CERC site that was being considered and that he would provide the Cornwall Council instructions in the minutes for review.</p> <p>PM referred back to the discussions regarding heat off take and asked that the group ensured sensitivity around the media on this as could affect negotiations regarding the leasing of more land.</p> <p>CB asked what the time frame was for the heat off take.</p> <p>PM answered that if all went well it would be around 2 years as there would need to be planning consent, agreement with SUEZ etc.</p> <p>DM raised concerns that in the meantime residents would continue to endure R & R lorries speeding through the village and parking on roads.</p> <p>CS suggested that Cornwall Council put a speed camera in the village to slow the lorries down.</p> <p>PR welcomed any reports of drivers not adhering to safe driving practices as action can then be taken. He assured the group that a flyer would be given to all drivers reminding them about safety on the roads and not to park outside the site.</p> <p>PM wanted there to be a recognition of the financial pressures as well as environmental regarding the shredder. He informed the group that Cornwall Council are prepared to do more but actions must be measured. He stated he welcomed the dialogue and is happy to continue conversations.</p> <p>To bring the discussion to a close RP suggested that the group got together and put together all the points they wanted to raise in writing, so that a written reply could be received.</p>	<p>PD</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>DM referred to visibility on the splays leading out of the site.</p> <p>IM explained that it is a public highway and therefore not an issue for SUEZ.</p> <p>DM and CS made reference to the verge on the way to Lanreath which are cut</p>	

	<p>back really well and asked why it can't be done here.</p> <p>IM mentioned that DU had agreed to discuss with CORMAC but had not received an update on the outcome. VP to follow up with DU.</p> <p>PM suggested that someone from highways was asked to attend the next meeting.</p>	<p>VP/DU</p> <p>PD</p>
6.0	Date of next meeting:	
	Tuesday 26 March 2019	

meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	25/03/2019
Location	Connon Bridge Landfill
Recorder	Natalie Chard

Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Matthew Sleeman	MS	Cornwall Council	Development Officer
Phil Rudin	PR	SUEZ	Regional Manager
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Stuart Higgins	SH	SUEZ	Assistant Landfill Regional Manager (Chair)
Katherine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Site Manager
Edwyn Walsh	EW	SUEZ	Leachate Plant Manager
Natalie Chard	EE	SUEZ	Senior 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	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local Resident	

Peter Marsh	PM	Cornwall Council	Service Director - Environment
Sue James	SJ	Cornwall Council	Portfolio holder for Environment and Public Protection
Paul Allen	PA	Cormac	Highways Department
Richard Pugh	RP	Cllr for Trelawny Division	Parish Councillor
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Dale Unsworth	CB	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract Team Leader
Paul Jordan	PJ	Chairman for Braddock Parish	
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	Carol Spear

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and apologies	
1.1	Apologies were received from Annmarie Wilshaw – SUEZ, Mary Rees – EA, Christine Butler – Local resident, Patrick Daws - SUEZ	
1.2	<p>Actions</p> <p>2.2 PR notified drivers the week of the last meeting.</p> <p>5.0 PM arranged for PA from Cornwall Council Highways to attend the meeting today.</p> <p>PM asked for the topic of highways to be covered at this point in the meeting to allow PA to leave early.</p> <p>DM explained that there was a problem with the visibility on the main road due to the grassed splay not being cut all the way back to the ditch. The sight line is not</p>	

	<p>clear and it is dangerous for drivers leaving this junction. He has in the past contacted CORMAC to ask for it to be cut, which it has been but not sufficiently right back to the edge so the sight line is clear.</p> <p>PA assured the group that he will make arrangements to amend the existing plans and ensure that it is cut right back to the ditch in future.</p> <p>CS asked if the area could be monitored as it is not cut often enough.</p> <p>PA explained that A and B roads are cut twice a year however if there are ever any issues, the Parish Council can go through the website to report anything and the department will take action as soon as possible.</p> <p>PM informed PA that he had noticed a couple of overhanging trees, some with roots lifted out which could cause a highways issue. These were located on third party land – not SUEZ</p> <p>PA stated he would be happy to inspect the area after today's meeting.</p>	
1.3	<p>Before the previous minutes were agreed JH asked that the dates of the minutes she referred to under 4.0 be added. Those dates were 27 Feb 2018, 15 May 2018 and 25 Sept 2018. PJ asked that under section 2.1 where PR updated on the day to day operations that it is also minuted that PR agreed to not accept any equipment on site that did not comply with the maintenance agreement.</p>	NC
2.0	SUEZ operational update	
2.1	<p>Bulky Waste Shredder operation</p> <p>RP referred back to the previous minutes where it stated that PM continues to be open minded about the location of the shredder. He queried this noting he had written a letter over a month ago about the location of the shredder and nothing had changed. He informed the group that Cllr Fred Greenslade had told him that there was sufficient land around the CERC to locate a shredder. He also had previously suggested an area off the A30 but in his view there appears to be nothing happening about looking at alternative sites.</p> <p>PM explained that the land around the CERC was owned by the Tregothnan Estate. He assured the group that he remained open minded to recommending to the Council that the shredder be moved but that currently in his view the best opportunity for doing was if the heat offtake at the CERC came to fruition. This might then provide the opportunity to use the infrastructure created to support moving the shredder there at a lower cost. He set out that austerity means that budgets are constrained and any move would need a financial business case, existing on its own merits. At this point a potential move would be unlikely to be financially viable. Any move would need to meet the requirements of the Council's Environment and Commercial Board and show a reasonable return on investment.</p>	

He understood the rationale behind moving the shredder to a site nearer to the CERC however economically it wasn't viable when there was an existing site in place with all the consents required for this process.

RP registered his disappointment at the site not closing down when the landfill closed in December 2018 and emphasised his concerns about the amount of traffic still going through the village; despite several meetings discussing this he felt nothing was changing.

DM queried the original specification of the CERC and PM explained that the original contract was agreed during a time when the landfill still existed.

This was challenged by DM and JH noting that the CERC was designed when the original closure date for Connon Bridge landfill was 2014. DM suggested that Kate Kennally at Cornwall Council had accepted that the design of the CERC was wrong.

PM observed that the discussion was not taking matters forward and SH asked that PR be allowed to report on the shredder operation.

PR stated that year to date, since 01 May 2018 16,000 tonnes of bulky waste was processed. This gave an average of 370 tonnes per week. Traffic movements remain the same with 16 artic trucks and 44.5 RoRo's per week. The performance of the shredder meant that they had worked some Saturdays to process the waste and the maintenance carried out on re-facing the teeth needed to be done regularly in order to ensure optimum performance.

DM asked if the maintenance work the liaison group were notified about was carried out over the weekend. PR confirmed it was, noting that SUEZ had taken advice from the planning department before notifying the liaison group as a matter of courtesy. PR noted that clearly there had been no impact as DM was unaware that the works had been carried out.

DM suggested that the works carried out weren't urgent and queried why shredding still needed to take place when the CERC was shutdown. PR explained that during the planned maintenance shutdown at the CERC that waste continues to be stored in the bunker, so bulky waste is still shredded and taken there.

PM then asked why would the contractor / council incur expense and disruption by undertaking the work in the week when there was no breach of planning conditions for the work to be carried out on the Saturday.

PJ referred to a planning condition which stated that no vehicles should enter the site for non-essential work. MS explained that the work carried out was minor welding work which would take around ten hours. The wording of the condition referred to the day to day normal working practices and, as this work was essential maintenance, it did not fall within this. He added that Cornwall Council planning department had stipulated that the work be carried out inside the shed

<p>with no radios on to ensure there was no disruption to near neighbours.</p> <p>PJ suggested that SUEZ only asked permission after residents had complained about the work being scheduled for the weekend. PR disagreed and reiterated that the correct procedure was followed, with advice sought from the planning department before the Liaison Group was notified.</p> <p>Speaking directly to PM, PJ asked is out of hours maintenance allowed to be carried out on this site.</p> <p>PM queried what the liaison group was trying to achieve in complaining about the maintenance when there was no impact on the community and felt that this motivation was perhaps to create expense and disruption for the contractors and in turn the Council. .</p> <p>PJ said that wasn't the case stating he just wanted to make PM comply and that if there was no willingness to comply then he wanted the shredder shut down. He stated that planning consent is there to be adhered to and that the liaison group intends to make life difficult for the Council until that happens.</p> <p>SJ noted that the maintenance didn't interfere with anything and didn't disrupt anyone however if anyone wished to challenge any planning permission they could do via the Cornwall Council website.</p> <p>PJ referred to a different planning condition which requires RDF to be transported in blocks noting that at the moment it was being transferred loose. When he enquired about this through the local planning authority, he was told that it was a breach but that it wasn't in the public interest to challenge it.</p> <p>PM observed that liaison group meetings were to provide information and that aggressive behaviour is not productive and is not conducive to things moving forward positively.</p> <p>In reply, PJ felt that PM had been dismissive in the email he sent the previous week to him and noted he would insist that PM complies until the day the shredder leaves.</p> <p>PM clarified that the email referred to no material impact on the community however if there had been a significant impact on the community envisaged then he would have acted upon it. He explained that if planning and operations need to be changed then a good liaison group is about discussing the change but that discussions have to be genuine where all points can be aired in a civil, polite manner.</p> <p>SH informed the group that current planning is out for consultation at the moment and that any comments about the recent application should be made direct to the planning department.</p> <p>PJ referred back to the discussion regarding the transport of RDF and queried why the liaison group hadn't been informed about the material not being</p>

	<p>transported in blocks.</p> <p>SJ reiterated that the planning consent was out for consultation and any comments can be put in via the Cornwall Council website via the planning portal.</p> <p>JH recalled having driven behind a lorry from Connon Bridge taking waste to the CERC and observing rubbish escaping the lorry despite it being netted. She suggested therefore perhaps RDF should be transferred in blocks.</p> <p>PM emphasised that in the view of the planning officer, the maintenance work carried out did not breach any planning consent. Notifying the community liaison group about the works was to be transparent.</p> <p>PR explained that it was maintenance that needed to be carried out to improve the process and that unfortunately they were unable to get ahead of the work to complete the maintenance mid-week. He believed SUEZ carried out the correct procedure by contacting the planning department before proceeding.</p> <p>JH asked if maintenance being carried out at weekends would be the norm in future.</p> <p>PM referred to prior notice of this maintenance being given and that it appears the actions of the group could be motivated to take opportunity to cause inconvenience to the contractor and to run up costs for the Council.</p> <p>DM referred to previous incidences and experiences over the last 25 years due to noise, odour and other disruption that residents don't want it any more.</p> <p>SH then asked to move the meeting on to RTS and HWRC operations.</p>	
2.2	<p>RTS / HWRC</p> <p>PR informed the group that there had been no significant changes to the day to day operations of the transfer station or the HWRC.</p>	
2.3	<p>Landfill</p> <p>IM informed the group that daily monitoring and checks continue and will do until the start of the restoration works next year.</p> <p>SH added that there had been a recent tree survey carried out and that in May/June residents may see some works being carried out relating to the survey which covered all the trees around the site, the public footpath and along the main lane.</p> <p>DM asked if that included the Spray field section, SH stated he would have to refer to the report to check that but that all areas SUEZ has will be addressed.</p> <p>SH informed the group that the restoration application is out for consultation.</p> <p>PJ highlighted some of the conditions he was concerned about in particular burying of the infrastructure, working on Saturdays to complete the restoration work quicker and the amenity value of what is left of the landfill. He believed that</p>	

	<p>there was no pipework in the old Connon part of the landfill so challenged why that couldn't be opened up to the public. He felt that there should be more made of an education amenity and gave an example of bird watching sites with car parking facilities. He suggested that there was a cost saving due to the reduced amount of soil being brought to site for the restoration and therefore some of that should be spent on agreed amenities for the community.</p> <p>SH clarified that there was no cost saving on soils as this is offered to SUEZ free of charge. He reminded the group that the footpath route was agreed after discussions with the liaison group at a previous meeting.</p> <p>PJ informed the group that he felt strongly about local amenities being made available to the community.</p> <p>PM suggested that he respond with his views through the planning process but that he should be aware of budget constraints.</p> <p>CS asked what SUEZ had done on other landfill sites that had closed.</p> <p>SH referred to the recent restoration works carried out at the United Mines site and explained that there were some bridal ways which are frequently used but that these are fenced for safety reasons. Some of the pipework had been buried but not all. He went on to explain that the EA at some sites impose no public access.</p> <p>PJ suggested that if as per the original planning application the site was returned to agricultural land that all the pipework would have to be buried.</p> <p>DM suggested that the savings made from the new design would be around a million pounds and therefore the community should see some benefit from that.</p> <p>SH informed the group that any savings on bringing top soil to the site would be offset due to the thousands of trees being planted at a significant cost.</p>	
3.0	<p>EA update</p> <p>NC informed the group that there had been no issues reported and as such representatives of the EA would not be attending any further meetings unless issues arouse.</p> <p>DM asked if the EA still visit the site and carry out checks. SH replied yes.</p> <p>MS informed the group that the local planning authority produce a quarterly monitoring document which due to GDPR is no longer available however the report is sent to SUEZ who could share the document. He informed the group that currently there are no breaches on site and that the site is monitored four times a year. SH agreed to check whether SUEZ are able to share this report</p>	<p>SH</p>
4.0	<p>AOB</p> <p>CS stated she felt it was a disappointing meeting and that she felt let down by</p>	

	<p>Cornwall Council.</p> <p>PM agreed that it was a disappointing meeting and felt that there was a need to refresh the terms of reference as it doesn't appear to be genuine liaison if the focus of the group is to stop things happening which isn't productive. He suggested that there needs to be a dialogue that moves things forward and that it was not a productive use of anyone's time, he stated that whilst Cornwall Council was here to liaise, members of the group give up their own free time to attend and raised voices aren't good for anyone's health and he and hoped that this was not going to be continued as there would be no point in meeting with the same frequency. If this continues to be the case then written updates may be preferred with meetings on a much reduced frequency. He suggested that the next meeting should include a revisit of the terms of reference.</p> <p>SH agreed that there was a need to decide on how these meetings are conducted.</p> <p>JH stated she felt that they were only ever given a fait accompli and that a liaison group meeting had to work both ways. There had been an expectation that the 31 December 2018 would have seen the closure of the landfill but that the shredder was the last straw therefore there shouldn't be an expectation that residents would be calm and quiet about it.</p> <p>HK suggested to the group that actually having had to deal with noise and odour in the past that currently things were a lot easier and actually pretty good on the whole.</p> <p>SH thanked him for his positive comments and brought the meeting to a close.</p>	
5.0	Date of next meeting:	
	Tuesday 28 May 2019	

meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	11/06/2019
Location	Connon Bridge Landfill
Recorder	Natalie Chard
Chair	Patrick Daws

Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title
Matthew Sleeman	MS	Cornwall Council	Planning Officer
Phil Rudin	PR	SUEZ	Regional Manager
Ian Mitchell	IM	SUEZ	Senior Site Manager
Katherine Alexander	KA	SUEZ	Assistant Site Manager
Natalie Chard	EE	SUEZ	Senior Community Liaison Manager
Annemarie Wilshaw	AW	SUEZ	Senior Planning 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	
Jenny Mills	JM	Local Resident	

Peter Marsh	PM	Cornwall Council	Service Director - Environment
Colin Martin (Part)	CM	Cllr for Lostwithiel	
Christine Butler	CB	Local resident	
Howard Knapman	HK	St Pinnock Parish Council	
Dale Unsworth	CB	Cornwall Council	Integrated Waste Management Contract Team Leader
Paul Jordan	PJ	Chairman for Braddock Parish	
Carol Spear	CS	St Pinnock Parish Council	

Ref	Note	Action
1.0	Welcome and apologies	
1.1	Apologies were received from Richard Pugh, Cllr for Trelawny Division.	
1.2	<p>Actions</p> <p>1.3 NC dates as requested by JH at the previous meeting were added to the January minutes before being agreed as final.</p> <p>3.0 SH is currently on paternity leave so there is no update to report. However NC will follow this up and report to the group as soon as possible.</p>	NC
1.3	PD asked the group to refer to the draft code of conduct and terms of reference sent out to members prior to the meeting for review. Firstly he highlighted the suggested change of frequency to quarterly and explained that this was in line with other CLG meetings held throughout the business.	

<p>JH objected to this change stating that in the past because meetings were postponed that the original two monthly meetings became quarterly and that over the year there was a 50% reduction in the number of meetings held. If the quarterly meetings were then delayed this would mean that there would be even fewer meetings.</p> <p>PD explained that because landfill activity was greatly reduced there was no need for such a high frequency of meetings.</p> <p>DM objected to the change in frequency and suggested that the change was due to a wind down in SUEZ's community engagement referring to a discussion about the funding of the Posthorn Parish newsletter being withdrawn, once the landfill site was handed back to Cornwall Council in approximately two years' time when restoration works were completed.</p> <p>PD reiterated that the documents were at this stage only proposals and that as such this was the group's opportunity to discuss any of the points.</p> <p>DM then advised that he had a statement he wished to read out.</p> <p>PD asked as Chair, if DM could wait until the appropriate time in the agenda explaining he would have the opportunity to read his statement later. DM continued to read his statement PD requested yet again that DM refrained from reading his statement and waited until the appropriate time. DM however continued to read his statement which referred to the history of the landfill site and the issues residents had had over its history.</p> <p>Following the completion of DM's presentation, PD expressed his disappointment that DM had failed to respect the Chair noting a lack of courtesy, which of course should be shown both ways.</p> <p>PD advised DM that if he continued to show disruptive behaviour then, in his capacity as Chair, he would have no alternative but to request the DM left the meeting.</p> <p>CM shared his observation that usually the Chair is independent and not the person that ends up answering all the questions.</p> <p>PD agreed that this was a good point and shared that this was something that had been discussed and that currently SUEZ were looking into the possibility of an independent chair person.</p> <p>Having finished reading out the Terms of Reference PD then referred to the Code of Conduct.</p> <p>DM stated that the group hadn't needed terms of reference or a code of conduct in the past and couldn't see why they now needed them.</p> <p>PD explained that they were to ensure that everyone is treated with respect and courtesy. PD asked members to email NC with any proposed amendments to these documents they wished to be considered.</p>	<p>NC</p>
--	-----------

	<p>CS explained that she didn't have email.</p> <p>NC agreed to get her address to post hard copies and suggested any hard copy amendments could be dropped at the Connon Bridge office for the attention of IM.</p> <p>Having gone through both documents JH and DM reiterated their objection to moving the meetings to quarterly.</p> <p>CM suggested that the timings could be reviewed in a years' time. PJ asked if an issue was to arise would there be a commitment to having an ad hoc meeting. PD agreed that this would happen.</p> <p>In response to questions from JH, PD explained that during the day residents could contact the site as they had done previously but that out of hours they should contact the helpdesk number. The helpdesk being based at the Energy Recovery Centre in St Dennis.</p> <p>PD then referred to the Terms of Reference. CM asked if the attendees listed were the only ones allowed to attend, PD explained it was meant to be a minimum to ensure all questions arising could be answered.</p> <p>KA stated that these key people from local Parishes should then feedback to members of the public in their area.</p>	
<p>2.0</p>	<p>SUEZ operational update</p>	
<p>2.1</p>	<p>Bulky waste shredder operation</p> <p>PR reported that since last May 2018 17,826 tonnes of waste had been processed. There continues to be a steady increase in tonnage, on average around 411 tonnes per week which is up from 370 tonnes. Since the last meeting 1,800 tonnes of waste has be processed through the shredding operation.</p> <p>PR reported that the increase in bulky waste had meant an increase in vehicles which was up from 76 per week to 84 vehicles. There had been no breakdowns or maintenance required on site since the last meeting.</p> <p>PJ asked if the amount of mattresses received on site had tailed off. PR explained that there had been an increase in January however since then that there still seemed to be a large number of mattresses received.</p> <p>CS referred to the large number of lorries coming through the village. PR explained that these lorries would be bringing waste in and taking waste out.</p> <p>CS asked if the drivers could be reminded about the speed limit. PR stated that they had not received any complaints since the last meeting but that he would be happy to continue to remind the drivers of speed limits.</p> <p>DM then asked if the shredder was new when it arrived suggesting that because it had to be refaced in the 13 months since it arrived that it wasn't fit for purpose.</p>	<p>PR</p>

PR explained that refacing the shredder was not unusual and that it is usually carried out more frequently, it is a working part that is often replaced as part of routine maintenance.

JH noted the waste from the shredding process isn't baled and suggested that as a result of this that lorries were losing bits of waste and wanted to know what was happening about this.

PD explained that baling makes waste more suitable for storage and transportation as an RDF product and to prevent wind blown litter, however, as the waste is going nearby to the CERC and the lorries have sheeting, baling is unnecessary.

JM then stated that if you are following one of the lorries you end up with rubbish on your bonnet.

PD was surprised at this stating that sheeting is a very good system and that shouldn't happen.

CM informed the group that he had seen lorries driving through Lostwithiel losing rubbish and asked whose responsibility was it to ensure the sheeting was correctly secured.

PR explained that in the first instance it was the driver but that the site should not allow any vehicle to leave without the sheeting in place so SUEZ is ultimately responsible for this.

PJ felt that as the waste was not being baled it was more likely to create litter.

PR explained that baling the waste originally proposed as waste would be stored outside but now that it was going to the CERC baling is not needed.

CM asked if anyone sees litter coming from these lorries who should be contacted.

PD informed the group that they should contact the helpdesk on 01726 824488. PR went on to explain that the trucks have trackers so we can identify very quickly which lorries are involved.

DM then referred to the planning consent and in particular the section that stated 'no working on Sundays'.

PJ asked from a community's point of view, please can you avoid working on a Sunday.

MS explained that following the last meeting Cornwall Council's planning department had received complaints regarding the maintenance carried out on

	<p>the shredder on a Sunday but that these were now closed with no further action required.</p>	
<p>2.2</p>	<p>RTS / HWRC</p> <p>PR informed the group that there had been no significant changes to the operations at the HWRC.</p> <p>CM asked for clarification on why members of the public are asked to put small bags in one bin and larger bags in others at Connon HWRC which doesn't happen at Bodmin HWRC.</p> <p>PR explained that bag separation happens at 9 HWRCs but that on smaller sites there isn't space for the extra bins. Having this separation system helps to divert some of the waste from coming to the Connon Bridge transfer station.</p> <p>CM asked if there were any plans to change the smaller HWRC's.</p> <p>PR stated that Bodmin and Saltash are both small sites and that there are no plans to extend them.</p> <p>JH then went on to ask where the plastic goes once collected in Cornwall.</p> <p>PD explained that once collected by Biffa it is taken to materials recycling facilities at Bodmin or Pool. There plastic is sorted and separated from the metals and the mixed plastic is baled and sent on to reprocessors in the UK.</p> <p>DU added that the plastic will then go on from the reprocessor to produce pure products.</p> <p>PD explained how optical sorters are used to separate different plastics. JH then asked what happened to the plastic that couldn't be recycled and PD explained it would go to the energy recovery centre. He invited the group to visit the materials recycling facility in Bodmin.</p> <p>DM reported that there were continued incidences of lorries parked on the road.</p> <p>PR explained that only having one access in and out meant that there was a maximum number of lorries that can enter the site at one time.</p> <p>DM suggested that staff be placed outside to direct traffic at peak times.</p>	
<p>2.3</p>	<p>Landfill</p> <p>IM informed the group that daily monitoring and checks continue. Trees have been cut back on the main road and SUEZ is now awaiting planning consent to be given before the next stages of restoration can begin.</p>	

	<p>Planning - Landfill restoration</p> <p>AW reported that the latest plans for the restoration of the site had generally been supported from all parties. Since the last meeting further amendments had been made to the public access. AW referred to previous and updated plans to help explain the amendments that had been made. She explained that she had held a meeting on site on 16 May 2019 with parish councillors to review suggested footpaths and car parking area.</p> <p>As a result of this meeting it was agreed that the viewpoints would become wider with information boards and that the new plans also included an extension of the fenced footpaths.</p> <p>DM stated that there were no fenced areas on the original plans.</p> <p>AW explained that on the original plans, none of the area would have had any public access. She went on to explain that there had been concerns about the possibility of fly tipping and that if that were to happen in the car park area, it would have to be closed off.</p> <p>JH suggested that the tipping would happen at night which then led into a discussion about fly tipping amongst the group.</p> <p>CM raised concerns about people wanting to walk their dogs in that area if the car park was closed and that at certain times of day queuing traffic may continue to be a problem.</p> <p>PJ thanked AW for taking on the concerns of the public and stated that the new plans were a good step in the right directions.</p> <p>AW went on to explain that the location of the wildlife viewing centre wouldn't be determined until the restoration had been completed to ensure the best views. The existing solar powered weather station would most likely remain as it is part of the current permit.</p> <p>CM gave his apologies and had to leave at this point to make another meeting.</p> <p>NC reported on the parish council's suggestion of education links with the local primary school. NC had been in contact with the new Head Teacher at the local school who would welcome the opportunity to work with our education officers in school but felt that given health and safety and the risk assessments required to visit a landfill site, felt that she would prefer to make use of the visitor centre based in Bodmin. The school is due to make contact after half term to schedule a date to discuss this further.</p> <p>AW concluded the presentation explaining she hoped that the new planning permission would be in place in around a month's time, allowing the restoration to proceed.</p>	<p>NC</p>
--	---	-----------

<p>3.0</p>	<p>EA update</p> <p>IM informed the group that there had been no issues reported and that the EA had confirmed they were happy with the continued monitoring.</p> <p>KA informed the group that there was an expected monitoring inspection this Thursday.</p> <p>MS confirmed that Cornwall Council are not able to release the planning monitoring report due to GDPR but are happy for SUEZ to do so.</p> <p>JH asked why the report comes under GDPR and MS explained that it was because it wasn't a statutory function.</p> <p>DM asked if leachate levels were still being monitored.</p> <p>IM explained that all were compliant except for P4A3R but that the levels continue to reduce within an agreed action plan with the EA. Currently it is at 2 meters at a rested level and when pumped it is at 1 metre.</p> <p>KA went on to explain that leachate is all being treated on site and that none is being tankered off site.</p> <p>PD added that leachate levels are provided to the EA on a regular basis.</p>	
<p>4.0</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>HK asked who is responsible for the maintenance of existing footpaths. DU stated that it was Cornwall Council and PM explained that there are a number of arrangements in place with parish councils to maintain footpaths and that these were usually done in order of priority.</p> <p>DM stated that at the last meeting PA had attended and had agreed to cut the grass at the entrance to the site but that it had not been cut back far enough.</p> <p>DU agreed to contact PA to have the grass cutting redone and to look at the footpaths in the area.</p>	<p>DU</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Date of next meeting:</p>	
	<p>Thursday 12 September 2019</p>	