

## **Notes of Clayton Hall Landfill Site Local Liaison Group – Chorley Town Hall**

**Wednesday 7 October 2020**

Present: Cllr Mark Clifford (MC) Chairman – Chairman of Clayton le Woods Parish Council  
David Clough (DC) – Residents' Committee  
Sue Clough (SC) – Residents' Committee  
John Neville (JN) – Environment Agency  
Cllr Neville Whitham (NW) – Chorley Borough Council Representative  
Cllr Peter Auwerx – Whittle le Woods Parish Council  
Cllr Michael Green, (MG) – Lancashire County Council  
Mike Harvey (MH) – General Manager - Quercia  
Simon Green (SG) – QSHE Manager – Quercia  
Amanda George – Note taker – Quercia

MC welcomed Peter Auwerx, Councillor for Whittle le Woods Parish Council to the meeting.

### 1 **Minutes of last meeting**

Agreed as a true record.

### 2 **Matters Arising**

No matters arising.

### 3 **Current Situation on Site**

#### 3.1 **Odour Control and Complaints**

SG reported that it has been a quiet quarter with only two complaints in July, one in August and one in September. All had been checked and found that the wind had been in a different direction to the complaint. MC stated that he had received a complaint and thanked MH for sending the weather data through.

MC raised the issue of the heavy rain on 7 October particularly with regard to Spring Meadow and flooding. MC stated that he had been contacted by residents and had visited to see for himself. MC said that the water was muddy/sandy and was coming directly from the site flooding residents' households. MH replied by giving an overview and referred to a surface water drainage plan. MH explained that there were two discharge chambers that were not on Quercia's land and that they were blocked, this meant that the water in the chambers overflowed as there was no outlet. Quercia staff had undertaken an investigation and conducted minor works throughout the day to hopefully improve the situation however as the outlet pipes were not on Quercia's land it was difficult for Quercia to conduct all work that was required but they would carry out further works the following day. MH also stated that because of the volume of rain running into the brook from surrounding areas Quercia's discharge consent was turned off so no water was being discharged from site into the brook. MH said that he would forward a copy of the plan onto MC. **MH** MH explained that rainwater from the east of the site is directed towards the country park and the leachate treatment and discharge system was sealed and unaffected.

MC asked JN if he would like to comment. JN stated that he couldn't comment as he had not seen any evidence regarding the flooding but would speak to the regulatory office in terms of surface water management to identify any issues. **JN** MC said that he had reported it to the EA.

With regard to complaints received JN reported that they were the same as that reported by Quercia.

### 3.2 Engineering Works

MC said that he had not been able to visit site due to Covid restrictions. MH reported that the capping works on 3b and 3c were complete and the land was being restored, this involved placing soil with an excavator to a depth of 30cms which was time consuming. MH reported that sourcing soil was currently difficult due to a slowdown in construction generally and the availability of soil; this is a national problem.

MH continued that the next cell is formed and the lining material placed and that going forward there will be an additional cell. MH went on to say that local contractors were being utilised to avoid any problems with social distancing and accommodation but it would be difficult to say how long the engineering would continue as it was weather dependent.

MC asked about the “mountain” that was visible. MH stated that this was part of the restoration and that the sand had now been moved.

MH said that as there were no site visits that he would arrange for some photographs to be taken and sent to MC. **MH**

### 3.3 Waste Inputs

MH reported that around 1000 tonnes per week were going into landfill, this was predominantly trommel fines from a single customer which were tested in excess of requirements for tax and compliance purposes. Fragmentiser waste was also being taken from Recycling Lives. Apart from that the only inputs were soils for restoration purposes.

### 3.4 Communications

MH stated that the site update had been released and was available on the website and that nothing had changed in terms of operations to the MRF or the landfill since the last meeting.

## 4 Environment Agency Update

### 4.1 Multi Agency Group

JN said the number of reports were not where they used to be and in terms of the liaison with LCC and Public Health England this had not been needed but if there were any concerns going forward then he would take them forward.

### 4.2 Inspections/Data

JN reported that visits had been limited due to Covid but that inspections had been maintained with the last inspection on 9 September where the feedback from the officers on site was that there were no concerns. JN assumed that as there was a lack of birds that the cover material was going on quickly.

JN said that the EA would maintain a presence on site with a sensible frequency due to Covid and that Clayton Hall was still being treated as a compliance priority.

### 4.3 Complaints

MC stated this had already discussed at the beginning of the meeting and JN said that he had nothing to add other than complaints were typical of a landfill site. The complaints were around about the same times when the weather had changed and that other landfill sites had also seen the same complaints.

#### 4.4 Communications

JN reported that the enforcement process was, what he would class, as being close to completion. The process had taken longer due to Covid and the fact that staff were not allowed in the office; they had returned mid-August. However there had been emphasis over the last few months of physically reviewing paperwork. JN stated that the EA had received some direct enquiries from the public.

#### 5 Local Community Groups

MC suggested that 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 be combined.

DC stated that it had been quiet, that there had been a couple of mentions with regard to Town Brow and Sheephill Lane which he encouraged to be reported but noticed from the figures given by Quercia and the EA that they hadn't otherwise the figures reported would have been higher. The most serious complaint was with regard to the soil on top of the landfill as it was felt that this was over height. DC said that he had noticed two years ago that there was a black wall of waste where the haul road was but all that could be seen now was soil and commented that this was good to see. The number of birds also was less than some time ago but acknowledged that there would always be some.

MC asked MG if he had any questions. MG stated that as it had been some time since he had been and that he had an opportunity to attend. MG said he was going to ask about the rain but that had been covered and said that if there were any problems just to get in touch. MG finished by saying it was pleasing to see that everything was much better than last time.

MC asked NW if he had any questions. NW replied that he had not received anything including about the rain the previous day.

MD asked PA if he had any questions and PA replied he had none.

#### 6 Any other business

6.1 MC had been asked if there was any chance that Quercia could look to make good the path that runs around the site to make it more accessible. MH replied that he would need to look at ownership and said he would send a plan to MC to define exactly where the path was. Once this was received it could be considered. **MH**

6.2 MH updated the meeting with a report in the local press that stated it was a Neales site that had gone on fire in Blackburn in September. This was incorrect as Neales had not owned the site for 2.5 years. The relevant newspapers were contacted to retract but they had not replied.

#### 7 Date of Next Meeting

13 January 2021, 6.00pm, venue to be confirmed nearer the time.