

# CONNON BRIDGE LANDFILL SITE

## COMMUNITY FORUM MEETING MINUTES

### **Meetings**

Tuesday 29 January 2019

2

## meeting minutes

Subject	Connon Bridge Liaison Group
Date	29/01/2019
Location	Connon Bridge
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	PM	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	CLr 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
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Welcome and apologies</b>	
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><b>Actions</b></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 data for the old site probably does not exist.</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 reiterated that the reference to other sites 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 that the RWTP (Residual Waste Treatment Plant) aka CERC was the only site that Suez had been requested to investigate and that there were a number of different options at that site which were investigated.</p> <p>Minutes were then agreed.</p>	
<b>2.0</b>	<b>SUEZ operational update</b>	
2.1	<p><b>Bulky Waste Shredder operation</b></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 comparatively large amount of waste and mattresses coming in just after Christmas.</p> <p>PJ expressed surprise 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. However, waste diversion from landfill continued to be successfully maintained.</p> <p>PJ challenged the tonnage of waste being brought to site for shredding during the trial period and raised concerns about post trial tonnages.</p> <p>PD stated that the Environmental Permit imposes a constraint of a maximum of 75 tonnes per day of processing via shredding for recovery and therefore in the order of 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 about large vehicles on the A390 driving through the village where the elderly and young children are trying to cross the roads. She</p>	

	<p>felt that Cornwall Council and SUEZ were not listening to concerns and that the whole site should have been closed at the same time as the landfill site.</p> <p>PJ agreed there had been a reduction in vehicle movements, however residents had thought that once the landfill was closed that everything would be closed with no vehicles coming to site.</p> <p>DM queried the remit of the CERC design, the size of the opening to the furnace and why a shredder wasn't considered at the design stage.</p> <p>PD explained that the design of the CERC is as it should be. As requested via e-mail he had provided DM with a link to the Authority's Requirements which are available in the public domain. The restricted opening is a common feature of all energy recovery centres. It ensures that the furnace reacts appropriately, combustion is sustained, emissions control is adhered to and that blockages are minimised thereby optimising operational availability. PJ asked if this was the same at the MVV EFW in Plymouth and PD stated it was as it was at many other similar installations</p> <p>PR updated on day to day operations. There had been a breakdown of the loading shovel. Unfortunately the replacement one sent had a reversing beeper instead of a white noise alarm. The company was contacted straight away, requesting a white noise alarm and another loading shovel was delivered within two 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 committed to ensuring that residents were notified as soon as possible.</p>	
2.2	<p><b>RTS / HWRC</b></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 a lorry parked in the lane. This means that any cars travelling along the lane need to drive on the wrong side of the road.</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 haulage company concerned was contacted regarding this particular instance and the feedback was that it was a new driver unfamiliar with the route and procedures.</p> <p>PD confirmed that as it is a public highway it is difficult to enforce parking. However he committed to ensuring all drivers were notified about not parking outside the site. PR agreed to action this and notify contractors.</p>	PR

<p>2.3</p>	<p><b>Landfill</b></p> <p>SH reported that clearing of vegetation and some tree thinning works were taking place at the very top of the site. Since the last meeting there has been gorse cleared for maintaining gas extraction pipework. There was a minor issue of a pump malfunction which allowed a small amount of leachate to enter a puddle on site. 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Landfill restoration plans update</b></li> </ul> <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><b>EA update</b></p> <p>PD informed the group that as reported in previous meetings the EA will no longer attend these meetings unless there is an issue they are requested to report on.</p> <p>PJ stated that there hadn't been any noise or odour complaints which was good.</p>	
<p>4.0</p>	<p><b>Questions/issues to be addressed</b></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 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> 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.</p> <p>PM stated that the Connon Bridge site had consent for this type of operation and that the report commissioned contained genuine detail. 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 required during</p>	

the planned maintenance shutdown 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.

PJ asked when the trial of the shredder was due to finish.

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.

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.

PD explained that the decision was made because operationally and for safety reasons, the CERC did not have the space. PD reiterated that SUEZ would not compromise the Health and Safety of their personnel.

PM 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.

SJ reassured the group that Cornwall Council had considered all possible sites and that she had suggested several herself, 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.

DM suggested that on the radio, SJ had said she felt the CERC should have included the shredder.

SJ denied this and stated the alternative to the shredder is going back to landfill instead of waste going to the CERC. Moving forward the council will look at the heat off take as an opportunity to relocate the shredder.

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

	<p>still travelling through the village and she felt the community were not being 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, 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.</p> <p>PD assured JH it was only ever going to be the CERC site that was being considered. Cornwall Council's instruction was to undertake the feasibility study specifically restricting the area of investigation to the RWTP (CERC).</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 it 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 two 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 lorries travelling 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><b>5.0</b></p>	<p><b>AOB</b></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 back really well and asked why it can't be done here.</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. PM suggested that someone from highways attend the next meeting.	VP/DU PM
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting:</b>	
	Tuesday 26 March 2019	

draft