



|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>SUBJECT</b>  | Runfold Community Liaison Group                         |
| <b>DATE</b>     | 1st October 2014  |
| <b>LOCATION</b> | Farnham Town Council Offices                            |
| <b>RECORDER</b> | Emma Jordan, Communications Manager South East, SITA UK |

#### PRESENT

|                     |    |   |
|---------------------|----|---|
| Iain Lynch          | IL | Clerk to Farnham Town Council<br>(Independent Chair)                |
| Steve Ratcliffe     | SR | Governor, Barfield School   |
| Bill Nelson         | BN | Chair, Seale & Sands Parish Council                                 |
| Matthew Kendall     | MK | PPC Officer, Environment Agency                                     |
| Catherine Powell    | CP | Crooksbury Residents Association                                    |
| Graham Middleton    | GM | Chair, Crooksbury Residents<br>Association                          |
| Gareth Phillips     | GP | Head of Planning & Property South,<br>SITA UK                       |
| Paul Hart           | PH | Senior Site Manager, SITA UK  |
| Cllr George Johnson | GJ | Shalford division representative,<br>Surrey County Council          |
| Calum James         | CJ | Environment Support Manager, SITA<br>UK                             |
| Emma Jordan         | EJ | Communications Manager South<br>East, SITA UK                       |
| Anthony Durston     | AD | Senior Customer Communications<br>Manager, SITA UK                  |
| Andy Macleod        | AM | Farnham Society   |
| Simon Elson         | SE | Principal Environment Enhancement<br>Officer, Surrey County Council |
| Nigel Ghent         | NG | Chair, Moor Park Residents<br>Association                           |
| James Reid          | JR | Acting Head, Barfield School  |

#### DISTRIBUTION

Group membership plus (TBC)



| Ref      | Note   | Action |
|----------|--|--------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>WELCOME</b>   |        |
| 1.1      | IL welcomed all attending to the meeting. He noted the formal setting but expressed his aim to keep the meetings as informal as possible. He would aim to complete the business for the meeting within 90 minutes, adding that items should be dealt with as promptly as possible. He expressed a wish for those attending to treat this as a new group as the previous community liaison group had not ended well. However, given the new people present, he hoped members would view this as a fresh start and work together to find the best solution for SITA UK's sites at Runfold.   |        |
| 1.2      | He suggested that the background papers be used as a starting point for discussions. SITA UK would draft the initial note of the meeting, he would review this for accuracy and the aim is to get the minutes out within two weeks of the meeting.   |        |
| <b>2</b> | <b>INTRODUCTIONS</b>   |        |
| 2.1      | All attending introduced themselves, giving their name, the name of the organisation they represented (see above) and where applicable, details of their involvement with the sites at Runfold.  |        |
| 2.2      | IL thanked the group members for coming to the meeting. As this was an initial meeting and not all members were familiar with one another, he asked members to complete and display a name card and to state their name before speaking.   |        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>APOLOGIES</b>   |        |
| 3.1      | EJ had received apologies from Councillor Pat Frost (who was recovering from an operation and hoped to attend future meetings), Surrey Wildlife Trust (the relevant officer had left recently and her replacement was not yet in post), and Steve Bailey of the Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership (who felt the BVCP could better contribute at the point when technical issues are discussed, he will receive the minutes and contribute to technical matters as appropriate). SE explained that in future he will be accompanied by Karen Jackson, a planning enforcement officer and asked that she be included in the apologies. |        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>BACKGROUND TO CLG AND MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 12 SEPTEMBER</b>   |        |
| 4.1      | IL invited EJ and CP to introduce the item for SITA UK and the community representatives respectively.   |        |
| 4.2      | EJ explained that SITA UK operates liaison groups at sites around the country. It finds these a useful and positive means of engaging in a dialogue with community representatives so that the company can share information about its operations which CLG members can then disseminate to the wider community. At the same time, community representatives can raise issue and queries with SITA UK, giving the company a better understanding of the views and concerns of the communities within which it operates so that it can address these  |        |

| Ref      | Note  | Action |
|----------|---|--------|
|          | more effectively. Neither EJ nor her colleagues in attendance had been significantly involved in the previous Runfold CLG and they hoped that the new CLG would be a fresh start and a positive and constructive forum for ongoing dialogue with the local community going forwards.  |        |
| 4.3      | CP expressed the importance of agreeing the objectives for the site at this meeting to give the group a common purpose. She considered the introduction of an independent chair a positive step and the Environment Agency's (EA) presence critical. Having the EA engaged in the process should allow joined up thinking going forwards. Speaking on behalf of the community representatives present, she explained they were committed to positive and active dialogue. They want to be listened to, not just talked at, and want commitments made to be fulfilled. They consider the CLG to be important for the long-term good of the site and are actively engaged to prevent the site becoming like Seale Lodge, a nearby SITA UK landfill that they consider an eye-sore. It was agreed Seale Lodge was only relevant in this context and IL requested that any queries about the site be dealt with off-line. |        |
| 4.4      | SITA UK only had one comment on the minutes of the meeting of 12 November. Regarding the 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet on page two, GP clarified that there will be a new masterplan for the whole site but it will not be the Review of Minerals Permissions (ROMP) that delivers the masterplan. The masterplan will be a new planning application for a whole site masterplan to tie up the many permissions that cover the different parts of the site.<br><br>CP queried if the masterplan was already in development and scoping was already ongoing for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for this. GP explained that a masterplan was indeed being developed. Both the ROMP application and the masterplan application will require an EIA. However, it's still to be decided whether there will be one EIA common to both applications or two separate EIAs.   |        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>   |        |
| 5.1      | EJ explained that SITA UK did not dispute either the proposed vision or objectives but felt these would be more appropriate as stand alone documents, with the terms of reference (ToR) acting as a procedural document to guide the management, organisation and remit of the group. All documents would be available to the group and she offered to investigate the feasibility of setting up an online repository for CLG members that could include both CLG documents and planning and permit documents. This could be used for reference and would also minimise the number of large documents shared by email. The group agreed this would be helpful. EJ to investigate feasibility of online document sharing.  | EJ     |
| 5.2      | SE introduced the vision statement which he had written to give the group something members could relate to and a common aim. It had been used as an aide-memoire by the technical sub-group. He believed it to be both feasible and achievable. IL asked if all present  |        |

| Ref | Note   | Action |
|-----|--|--------|
|     | could subscribe to the vision and all agreed. IL suggested the vision be truncated into a sentence or paragraph for easy reference at group meetings.  | SE     |
| 5.3 | The group objectives were those previously agreed at the meeting on 12th September with a few minor amendments. These were agreed by the group. CP explained that the community representatives disagreed with SITA UK that these could be a standalone document and that it was critical they form part of the ToR. SITA UK agreed to this.   |        |
| 5.4 | <p>A detailed discussion then took place regarding two versions of the draft ToR - the version presented by the community representatives and the version circulated by SITA UK including its suggested additions and amendments to the community's version. The following changes were agreed to the version circulated by SITA UK:</p> <p><b>Purpose</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the CLG's purpose would be amended to: ' The CLG will provide a forum for the discussion of issues, concerns and proposals between parties with an interest in the operation, restoration and aftercare of SITA UK's Runfold sites in an open and transparent way, promoting where possible a better and mutual understanding.'</li> </ul> <p><b>Remit</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reference to the different stages of the site to be reintroduced to the second bullet.</li> <li>- third bullet to be amended to read: 'Communication of clear timescales for the operation and restoration of the sites and the inter-relation of different activities on the site.'</li> <li>- fourth bullet to be reworded to indicate that discussions of proposals need to be sufficiently in advance of formal submission to allow meaningful input by the group. In relation to this point, GP confirmed that the new applications would be to tidy up existing consents and wouldn't be commercially sensitive so this wouldn't impede early discussions with the CLG and it was realistic these could take place.</li> <li>- fourth bullet also to include reference to the need for planning and permit processes and decisions to be aligned. EJ to re-word and propose to IL and CP.</li> <li>- 'For the CLG attendees to agree how the groups work will be fed back to the wider group of stakeholders' to be reinstated to penultimate bullet.</li> <li>- Insert 'in accordance with the agreed vision' to the end of the final bullet.</li> </ul> <p>In response to IL's suggestion that the CLG be named 'Runfold 2021' to keep the focus on the deadline for the site's restoration, GP explained that SITA UK is committed to restoring the site in this timescale but that aftercare will continue beyond this point.</p> <p>CP to send a list of outstanding issues not addressed by the previous CLG to SITA UK.</p> | CP     |



| Ref | Note   | Action |
|-----|--|--------|
|     | <p>In response to CP's suggestion that SITA UK was being disingenuous in sending CLG correspondence by blind copy emails, EJ and AD explained that this was best practice and used for other CLGs. SITA UK would need members' prior permission to share their contact details and not everyone was always happy for their email address to be made public in this way. EJ explained that she had sent correspondence for this meeting to all of the addresses provided by CP plus the statutory and stakeholder representatives and would continue to do so. AD commented it would be useful to know how the group would like information disseminated. Members' preference was for email addresses to be in open copy to give confidence the circulation was correct.</p> <p>A member suggested the points, where all were agreed and where there was disagreement, be noted at the end of each meeting.</p> <p><b>Roles and Responsibilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The deleted sentence at the start of this section is to be reinstated</li></ul> <p><b>Membership</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Seale and Sands Amenity Society to be amended to read Farnham, Seale and Sands Amenity Society</li></ul> <p>The need for a quorum was discussed. EJ explained SITA UK did not consider a quorum was needed as this was usual for groups where formal decisions were made and the CLG did not have a decision making role. CP explained that the community representatives felt that the attendance of the designated groups was critical. A member queried what would happen if one of the bodies named didn't attend and whether a meeting would need to be abandoned and therefore whether a quorum was appropriate in this instance. EJ commented that SITA UK couldn't compel groups to attend and that non-attendance hadn't been an issue at other SITA UK CLGs, but that a clause could be introduced to deal with non attendance. It was agreed a clause would be introduced regarding the commitment of the members to regularly attend meetings and that non-attendance without apologies will be followed up to ensure group discussions remain effective.</p> <p>It was queried if the Runfold Action Group (RAG) should be included as a member. CP explained that RAG was an umbrella group and that the member organisations present were representatives of RAG, therefore no specific RAG representative was required.</p> <p><b>Organisation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- It was agreed the position of chair would be reviewed initially every three meetings and thereafter annually.</li></ul> <p><b>Meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- If a meeting didn't cover all of the business of the agenda, another meeting may be needed more frequently.</li></ul> |        |

| Ref      | Note  | Action         |
|----------|---|----------------|
|          | <p>- hard copies of information would be provided when needed.</p> <p><b>Other Groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was agreed the technical subgroup would continue comprising GP, SE, and CP plus MK and stakeholder representatives where appropriate (BVCP, SWT, Farnham Society). SITA UK may also invite specialist consultants to present to this group.</li> <li>- GP explained the subgroup could be used to discuss issues in a level of detail that would be difficult to do with a wide audience in 90 minutes. SITA UK would outline a technical issue in the wider group meeting, then take it away for further discussion in a technical subgroup meeting who would then feedback at the next CLG meeting including on actions, if timescales allowed this.</li> <li>- The ToR for this group would be agreed off-line, in line with GP's proposal.</li> <li>- Action notes from technical subgroup meetings would be produced and circulated to all CLG members.</li> </ul> | EJ             |
|          | EJ to amend ToR and circulate to IL and CP for review.  |                |
| <b>6</b> | <b>CODE OF CONDUCT</b>  |                |
| 6.1      | AD explained that SITA UK had introduced codes of conduct for other CLGs where there is historical tension and that one may or may not be needed in this instance. It can be good to have mutual respect enshrined, to highlight that all present are listening and not judging by the past. Where communications have broken down it can be helpful to go back to basics and agree how we should treat one another. IL commented that it seemed sensible to have a code that highlighted the core values of transparency, openness, and respect and invited AD to prepare a draft for the next meeting.  | AD             |
| 6.2      | A member queried the legal standing of the group. IL commented that he saw it as an advisory, informal joint committee. AD added that SITA UK felt it was better to have these groups, which were hopefully mutually beneficial and best practice but not a legal requirement.  |                |
| <b>7</b> | <b>FORMAT OF MINUTES OF MEETINGS</b>  |                |
| 7.1      | IL suggested the minutes should be informative for someone not present, i.e. short enough to capture the key points but long enough to be understood by someone not at the meeting.   |                |
| 7.2      | EJ proposed that the minutes should be a summary of the discussion rather than a verbatim record. Comments would generally not be attributable, but the minutes would record and attribute actions. It was agreed actions should also include a timescale and that a separate list of actions should be maintained and that a record should be kept of those outstanding.   |                |
| <b>8</b> | <b>STANDING AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS</b>  |                |
| 8.1      | It was agreed a list of standing items for future agendas would be agreed offline by EJ, CP, SE and MK.   | EJ, CP, SE, MK |



| Ref       | Note  | Action |
|-----------|---|--------|
| <b>9</b>  | <b>RE-ESTABLISHING TECHNICAL SUB-GROUPS</b>   |        |
| 9.1       | This was dealt with under item 5.   |        |
| <b>10</b> | <b>SITA UK UPDATE</b>   |        |
| 10.1      | GP introduced PH as the new operational manager covering SITA UK's Runfold site and other sites in the area. There has been a re-organisation within SITA UK since the last CLG met; it was previously organised around geographical areas and regions with operational managers looking after different types of processing sites - landfills, transfer stations, etc. in each region. This has now changed and SITA UK has set up a specialist national landfill team dedicated to managing all of its landfills, covering both operational and closed sites. As part of this PH has taken over from Richard Booth as the manager responsible for Runfold.  |        |
| 10.2      | <p>GP gave an update on the ROMP area. The ROMP covers the section of the site within the green line and the blue line around the whole site shows SITA UK's ownership. The other coloured lines represent different planning areas.</p> <p>The ROMP area application is in its very early stages. This is a procedural matter to review existing mineral permissions to ensure they are updated to modern standards and remain relevant, including restoration proposals.</p> <p>The ROMP application is with Surrey County Council at the moment and will require an EIA. The next stage is scoping the EIA and SITA UK will circulate a draft scoping document to the CLG when it is produced and, if it is ready in time, in advance of the next meeting.</p> <p>ROMPs came about because the Government recognised the need to review old permissions, and any permissions existing before a specified date must be registered as such, and subject to a review.</p> <p>The restoration plan of the ROMP application only covers the part of the site covered by the ROMP.</p> <p>In response to questions from members, GP explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are various ROMPs relating to different minerals permissions.</li> <li>- The ROMP only covers part of the site because there are multiple permissions covering the site dating from different years and permissions are generally reviewed every 15 years. They are therefore not all reviewed at the same time.</li> <li>- SITA UK is the freehold owner of the land.</li> </ul> | GP     |
| 10.3      | GP explained that the Runfold North site was subject to a separate planning permission but that it is within SITA UK's ownership. He confirmed that the overall landscape masterplan will include Runfold North.  |        |
| 10.4      | PH gave an update on Area A, the area within the yellow line. SITA UK has just completed the basal engineering in cell 3, the central cell  |        |



| Ref  | Note   | Action |
|------|--|--------|
|      | <p>in Area A. This is now ready to accept waste. This will be inert rather than active waste. Funding has been allocated for reprofiling, restoring and capping cell 1 and the site is relocating the material in cell 1 at the moment. It is also relocating material from cell 2. It's anticipated that Area A will be fully filled in 2015, then capped and restored.</p> <p>GP explained that the restoration of Area A will be taken up to the soil and the remainder would need to be in accordance with the masterplan for the site in terms of grass seeding, public access etc. The masterplan is being developed to ensure the restoration of the different parts of the site ties up in a co-ordinated manner. One of the early items for discussion regarding restoration will be what will be put back in terms of general concepts.</p> <p>PH explained that SITA UK will be filling this area during 2015 and when capping can take place and soils put on will depend on the availability of suitable material, and how quickly this can be brought onto the site.</p> <p>In response to questions from members GP said that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the landscape masterplan will include contours for SITA UK's entire ownership. Thus it will tie together the various existing permissions with contours.</li> <li>- he believed one of the outstanding applications relates to contours.</li> <li>- the contours of the unworked areas of the site will be included in the masterplan to tie into the wider environment.</li> <li>- battering is still being planned and will be used for this area.</li> </ul> |        |
| 10.5 | PH explained that Area B was being prepared for restoration and a contractor had been appointed to sow grass seed and fertilise this area. This was due to be completed shortly and by the end of the year the grass should be established here.   |        |
| 10.6 | GP gave an update on Area C (outlined in red) which includes the site access road, permission for sand extraction and inert backfill. This activity is linked to the Tarmac mortar batching plant on the site. SITA UK is still extracting sand and can't give a precise timetable as to when this will end as it is dependent on demand, but it is approaching the end of extraction. SITA UK is also proposing engineering works for this area in 2015 to allow backfilling to commence.   |        |
|      | <p>SITA UK is currently extracting sand faster than Tarmac is using it, and it is keen to get in and engineer this area so that it is ready to receive inert waste. Under current projections, SITA UK will need to start filling this area before Tarmac has used all of the sand, so it is looking at stockpiling sand within the site. CP believed that planning conditions required the mortar plant to close when sand extraction ceased, GP was unsure of the planning requirements in this regard.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b> following the meeting, SE informed CP and GP by email that the pertinent permission is <u>WA/2013/0721 dated 10 July 2013</u> <i>Grant planning permission for retention of a mortar batching</i></p>   |        |



| Ref  | Note  | Action |
|------|---|--------|
|      | <p><i>plant and associated infrastructure to be supplied with sand from Area C of Runfold South Quarry; and continued importation of sharp sand, until 31 December 2016 (retrospective). Condition 5: The sand used in the mortar plant hereby permitted shall be extracted from the adjoining consented mineral workings (Area C ref. APP/B3600/A/06/2020101) and no other sand, with the exception of sharp sand for blending purposes, shall be imported from elsewhere for use in the plant hereby permitted.</i></p> <p>In response to questions from members, GP said that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Tarmac plant is there to use sand excavated on site. SITA UK will need to review their use of sand on site and may need to vary the permission to stockpile sand for use in the mortar plant, which would need a formal planning application. However, whilst extraction will be completed before the expiry of the time limit for the mortar plant to remain on site (December 2016) the first stage is to review sand extraction and Tarmac's use of this sand.</li> <li>- The market is picking up, there are more soils coming in from construction projects so more sand should be needed for construction.</li> <li>- SITA UK is not a quarrying company and Runfold is one of only two quarry sites it owns. It is therefore not well placed in the market to sell sand to other users.</li> </ul>  |        |
| 10.7 | <p>CJ gave an update on environmental issues. SITA UK will be submitting a permit variation to implement revised ground water compliance limits and CO2 action levels for Areas A and C that have been agreed with the EA. This permit variation will also need to take into account any change in contours as the permit specifically refers to these. The permit variation will therefore be submitted when SITA UK receives confirmation from the CPA on the contour application. The EA generally takes 13 weeks to determine a permit variation from the submission date.</p> <p>The permit for Area C contains pre-operational conditions for the deposit of waste, including a requirement to install additional ground water and gas monitoring boreholes. SITA UK has agreed the location and the design of these with the EA and a contractor has been appointed to install them this year.</p> <p>SITA UK has proposed that two additional ground water monitoring points be installed in Area B under the same contract.</p> <p>In response to questions on environmental matters, CJ said that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The leachate tanks are needed for compliance with the permit. GP to check the planning position for these.</li> <li>- He was unaware of any application to alter the levels in the three peaks field in Area B.</li> </ul> <p>GP added that there is currently a step change between the three peaks field (used by Barfield School) and the area to the immediate south. SITA UK had been looking at the concept of raising the levels of the three peaks field and if it were to pursue this, would need to</p> | GP     |



| Ref       | Note  | Action |
|-----------|---|--------|
|           | <p>agree how to do so with the school. IL suggested that SITA UK could leave the three peaks field at its current level in its future masterplan application.</p> <p>There was a discussion regarding the school's use of the three peaks field. Representatives from the school commented that any work to that land, including raising the levels, would result in the closure of the school. GP confirmed that there was no active proposal at present to raise this land, adding that the landscape masterplan could make that land or a wider area available for the school.</p> <p>With regard to Runfold North, a permit variation has been determined to put the site into closure. SITA UK has installed additional in-waste gas monitoring boreholes and an additional ground water monitoring borehole, and these have been signed off by the EA.</p>  |        |
| 10.8      | <p>The SITA UK representatives took questions from members and made the following points in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the sky blue area is experiencing environmental compliance issues relating to perimeter landfill gas. There are ongoing works to ensure the boreholes are in the correct locations. In terms of the long-term use of this area, SITA UK is at square one, there is an approved scheme but the new masterplan will cover the whole site and the restoration plan for this area may therefore change, depending on the outcome of the masterplan process. The area will be grass seeded soon.</li> <li>- Area A and the rest of the site will be filled with inert waste only, so there will not be any dramatic falls during the settlement process as inert waste settles far less than active waste.</li> <li>- Contours for Area A will need to be approved. It was suggested these could be discussed in the technical subgroup.</li> </ul> <p>SE commented that there was a historic contour issue with the sky blue area, known as the Old Hogs Back. This area has approved settlement contours, but what is on site isn't necessarily in compliance with these and is too high. He suggested the least worst option may be to make the most of the current landform given what's in this part of the site. He added that there were no pre-settlement contours in place for Area B leading to queries regarding overfilling.</p> <p>A member commented that the community's biggest concern was that additional top soil was being laid over the Old Hogs Back, further increasing the height of this area.</p> |        |
| <b>11</b> | <b>ENVIRONMENT AGENCY UPDATE</b>  |        |
| 11.1      | <p>MK explained that the site is regulated by four environmental permits, however these don't marry up with planning. The EA has plans showing overlays to make the permit position clearer. The permits date from different eras and therefore are of different standards, some predate the EA but the EA regulates all four permits.</p> <p>Runfold North has additional infrastructure and is in closure but still</p>   |        |

| Ref       | Note   | Action |
|-----------|--|--------|
|           | <p>has a permit until SITA UK can demonstrate that there will be no further risk to the environment, at which time it can surrender the permit. MK inspected the site during the January / February floods and didn't observe any problems with surface water drainage.</p> <p>Area A is being infilled. The EA has signed off the engineering work for the final cell and has received an engineering plan for the capping for cell 1. The EA will review this and feedback to SITA UK. This also refers to restoration soils, and the EA will check to ensure there is no inconsistency between the planning and permit contours.</p> <p>The EA previously had concerns over the wheel wash located in area A but that is used by vehicles servicing the whole site. The EA had discussed this with SITA UK who have proposals to remedy the silt going into the pond. There had been no recent discharges and this will be resolved as soon as possible.</p> <p>Sand extraction continues in Area C. Pre-operational work is being undertaken to monitor this area before it is infilled.</p> <p>The Hogs Back area to the east of the site is covered by a separate permit. There were discussions during 2013 about using waste on the three peaks field; a permit would be required for this activity but no application has yet been made. There was an issue with perimeter landfill gas at two monitoring points. SITA UK took action by drilling additional gas extraction wells, however the issue returned and needs more work.</p> <p>SITA UK has installed a leachate collection tank in Area B as levels there were above those permitted. Work is ongoing on this issue. The EA's efforts are focused on the engineering works and SITA UK has been taking advantage of the recent good weather to progress these.</p> |        |
| 11.2      | <p>In response to questions from members MK said that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The engineering works will use a clay lining system to prevent pollution.</li> <li>- The perimeter landfill gas is in the north east corner of the site (by the south west corner of the school)</li> <li>- The gas monitoring point is not valid as it is too close to the waste mass and SITA UK may need to install an additional monitoring point. The EA and SITA UK need to agree a way forward.</li> <li>- The site is uneven and not particularly well finished.</li> </ul> <p>A member commented that if the gas readings are genuine, they are near the school and not acceptable.</p>   |        |
| <b>12</b> | <b>SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL UPDATE</b>  |        |
| 12.1      | <p>The compliance and permitting team had visited the site the previous week. The CPA charges SITA UK for compliance visits throughout the year and SE had not received the report from this visit yet. There is a raft of planning applications sitting with the CPA that are yet to be</p>   |        |

| Ref       | Note   | Action     |
|-----------|--|------------|
|           | <p>determined. These include applications to amend the restoration profiles for Areas A and C, which include some feedback from the previous technical subgroup.</p> <p>Applications for Areas A and B are part of what will feed into the masterplan. These are for non-material amendments to the contour profiles of these areas.</p> <p>There is a planning application for stockpiling clay, this is a new issue that has arisen largely due to EA regulations regarding the way sites are engineered. These require a specific type of clay to be used that is not always available, therefore SITA UK has to acquire this clay when the opportunity arises, hence the stockpiles and retrospective applications for these.</p> <p>A screening request was submitted for the ROMP application and a response has been given confirming an EIA will be required to support the ROMP application. It may be useful for the technical subgroup to review this.</p> <p>There are amended details for Runfold North. The site went into aftercare as the planning obligations have been met even though the EA requirements have not.</p> <p>There is an outstanding, lapsed permission for use the of the three peaks field by the school. A new application is needed to continue this use or the use has to cease.</p> |            |
| <b>13</b> | <b>AOB</b>   |            |
| 13.1      | CP circulated a list of community concerns as per an action from the meeting on 12th September. She requested a list of current outstanding planning and permit applications and details of forthcoming applications and likely timescales for these.  | GP / CJ    |
|           | SE offered to provide a list of outstanding planning applications to be circulated with the minutes.   | SE         |
| 13.2      | A member requested details of the status of each area of the site and indicative timescales. It was agreed this would be discussed early in the agenda for the next meeting where a more detailed review of each area and related issues and concerns could be discussed.  |            |
| <b>14</b> | <b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>  |            |
| 14.1      | It was agreed the next meeting would take place on Wednesday 19 November at 7pm at Farnham Town Council Offices.   |            |
| 14.2      | CP, SE and GP to arrange a meeting of the technical subgroup.  | GP, CP, SE |
| 14.3      | IL summarised points of agreement: the ToR, the vision and the objectives, the format of minutes and the way the group wants to operate. He noted some differences in understanding of the different areas of the site.  |            |



| Ref  | Note   | Action |
|------|--|--------|
| 14.4 | SE noted there had been a bereavement and a birth since the last CLG met. It was agreed that CP would pass on the group's condolences and GP the group's congratulations as appropriate. |        |