

SUBJECT	Runfold Community Liaison Group
DATE	19th November 2014
LOCATION	Farnham Town Council Offices
RECORDER	Emma Jordan, Communications Manager South East, SITA UK

PRESENT

Iain Lynch	IL	Clerk to Farnham Town Council (Independent Chair)
Steve Ratcliffe	SR	Governor, Barfield School
Jason Butcher	JB	Seale & Sands Parish Council
Matthew Kendall	MK	PPC Officer, Environment Agency
Catherine Powell	CP	Crooksbury Residents Association
Graham Middleton	GM	Chair, Crooksbury Residents Association
Gareth Phillips	GP	Head of Planning & Property South, SITA UK
Paul Hart	PH	Senior Site Manager, SITA UK
Cllr George Johnson	GJ	Shalford division representative, Surrey County Council
Calum James	CJ	Environment Support Manager, SITA UK
Emma Jordan	EJ	Communications Manager South East, SITA UK
Andy Macleod	AM	Farnham Society
Simon Elson	SE	Principal Environment Enhancement Officer, Surrey County Council
Karen Jackson	KJ	Planning Enforcement Officer, Surrey County Council
James Reid	JR	Acting Head, Barfield School
Mike Denham	MD	Moor Park Residents Association
Cllr Roger Steel	RS	Farnham Town Council & Waverley Borough Council

DISTRIBUTION

Group membership plus Surrey Wildlife Trust, Blackwater Valley
Countryside Partnership, Surrey Hills AONB

Ref	Note	Action
1	WELCOME	
1.1	RS opened the meeting as IL was delayed in traffic.	
2	INTRODUCTIONS	
2.1	All attending introduced themselves and the organisations they represent.	
3	APOLOGIES	
3.1	Apologies were received from Cllr Pat Frost, Bill Nelson (Jason Butcher substitute) and Anthony Durston. EJ reported that Paul Ritchie has recently joined the Surrey Wildlife Trust as Community Engagement Coordinator. He had asked to be copied into information about meetings and would endeavour to attend some if possible.	
4	MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING	
4.1	The group agreed the minutes of the meeting held on 1 October 2014.	
4.2	KJ requested that her email be corrected to k.jackson@surreycc.gov.uk	EJ
5	TERMS OF REFERENCE	
5.1	IL arrived and took over the chair. CP suggested RS as a second vice chair in addition to GJ. The group agreed this.	EJ
5.2	SE informed the group that the technical sub group (TSG) had met on Friday and had agreed to operate on an informal basis initially and would review the need for a separate terms of reference if appropriate. The first meeting had worked well with a note of actions issued promptly.	
5.3	There were no further comments or additions to the draft terms of reference and these were agreed subject to the above change.	EJ
6	CODE OF CONDUCT	
6.1	EJ introduced a draft code of conduct and circulated a copy. It was intended to supplement the terms of reference to support the group's discussions and ensure the group remains a positive forum for discussion where all members feel able to contribute. She proposed that members take away and send any comments to her so that it could be agreed at the next meeting.	All
6.2	IL commented that he thought members were unlikely to disagree with the content and that a code of conduct may not be necessary, but could be called upon in the future if needed.	
7	SITA UK UPDATE	
7.1	Planning, matters arising: Re: item 10.7 of the minutes of the previous meeting, GP has been unable to find information on the planning status of the leachate tanks so assumed that this needs to be regularised in terms of both their presence on site and the length of	

Ref	Note	Action
	time they will remain in situ.	
7.2	<p>Planning, current live applications: GP provided further information on the list of applications circulated with the minutes of the previous meeting (item 13.1).</p> <p>The <u>first application</u> for landscaping details and an agricultural aftercare scheme for Area A was submitted in June 2013. This was a non-material amendment to the planning permission.</p> <p>CP suggested that this application was initially a material amendment which the County Council had changed to a non-material amendment without addressing the issues raised by residents. SE explained that two applications for Areas A and C were submitted. Following this the contour issues were raised and two further applications were made for non-material amendments.</p> <p>The non-material amendment had recently been approved. A member commented that the community was unhappy that the issues it raised had not been addressed. IL asked if these issues could still be addressed and GP confirmed that a forthcoming application for an overall site restoration and landscape masterplan would provide scope to re-address issues.</p> <p>The <u>second application</u> for Area C (which includes the haul route to the quarry) related to a December 2012 planning permission. It was for details relating to the landscaping, restoration and agricultural aftercare of this area. Issues with tying the contours into the surrounding land had again been dealt with by a non-material amendment recently granted by the County Council. As a result, a further consultation was taking place on the details for the landscaping, restoration and agricultural aftercare, and issues could still be raised.</p>	
7.3	<p>The <u>third application</u> was a retrospective application for temporary clay stockpiles (all of which would be used on the Runfold site). The planning authority is awaiting further information from SITA UK on groundwater quality and water quality in relation to the potential for stockpiles to cause contaminants to escape from previously landfilled land.</p> <p>CP outlined the community's concerns on this issue as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The quantities of clay being stored and the lack of evidence that this is the amount required for restoration - Stockpiles being moved around the site - Stockpiles on both engineered and unengineered landfills, and the potential risk to water quality, with a retrospective application meaning if there is any harm from the activity, the damage will already have been done - Other areas of the site that presented a lower risk to ground water quality and gas migration could have been used for clay storage 	

Ref	Note	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clay was being stored in areas of the site where the community had previously expressed concerns, including areas of historic landfill <p>In response to questions from members, GP confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All of the clay being stored is for engineering use at the site as required by the Permit. SITA UK needs to prove that the amount stored is not greater than the amount needed on site. - SITA UK needs to demonstrate that storing clay on historic landfills won't cause issues with groundwater quality and gas migration. - It's not usual to apply for retrospective permission. In this instance it's due to the availability of clay. Also, stockpiles on an active landfill and quarry wouldn't ordinarily require planning permission but the County Council has requested an application here. - Clay is still being brought to site. - SITA UK is due to submit the outstanding risk assessment to the planning authority in January. - Any decision to stop bringing clay into site for storage would need to be made in consultation with operational colleagues. - Regular monitoring of groundwater, surface water and gas is carried out around the site so if the stockpiles were causing any issues, the monitoring would have identified this. A member suggested this was disingenuous as the lead time between a problem occurring and it being picked up by monitoring would depend on the hydrogeology. - The Environment Agency is consulted by the planning authority. <p>KJ commented that once a retrospective application has been submitted and is being determined, it's not in any party's interest for the County to take enforcement action.</p> <p>MK added that the clay had been brought in to engineer Areas A and C. He explained that some of the areas of historic landfill are not within the Agency's remit and fall under environmental health, however, the Agency is responsible for water quality.</p>	
7.4	<p>A member asked if SITA UK would undertake a risk assessment in advance of any stockpiling of sand at the site to avoid the same concerns arising, and if planning permission would be needed to stockpile sand.</p> <p>GP explained that sand was being dug from the quarry faster than Tarmac is using it and, by next year, SITA will have finished extracting sand and will be ready to engineer Area C before Tarmac has used all of the sand. The remaining sand would need to be stored on site and SITA will discuss the best location for this with Tarmac, considering both potential environmental impacts and operational requirements.</p>	

Ref	Note	Action
	<p>SE was unsure if planning permission would be required to stockpile sand as it is site derived material, and agreed to check. GP reassured the meeting that any application for this would not be retrospective.</p> <p>GP considered that as a point of planning principle SITA wouldn't need permission to stockpile sand in a sand quarry but suggested stockpiles could be addressed through the overall site masterplan. This would need to show how the site progresses towards restoration and, if stockpiles would be in existence for longer than six months, the masterplan would need to demonstrate their location, height and the rate at which sand would be used.</p> <p>The matter is being reviewed with Tarmac. Once SITA has an indication of how much sand will need to be stockpiled, where it will be stored on site and how high the stockpiles will be, it can discuss the matter with the planning authority and inform the CLG.</p>	SE
7.5	The <u>fourth application</u> was the 2011 ROMP area application currently held in abeyance.	
7.6	<p>GP reported that SITA UK had recently submitted a Section 73 application for Runfold North to update the landscaping. This sought to: retain the existing chain link fencing around the site and later replace it with agricultural, stock proof fencing; change the planting in terms of species and the blocks of planting; change the drainage details and; reduce the entrance to give it a more agricultural appearance.</p> <p>The consultation period for this application would begin in the next few weeks and was therefore be likely to be extended due to Christmas.</p> <p>A member asked if the application would reflect SE's vision for the site. SE has not yet seen the submission so was unable to comment. He suggested recent applications be made available to the group. EJ explained that Dropbox would be used to share documents with the group. Once the application was validated, a link would be circulated.</p> <p>GP added that SITA provides 15 hard copies to the planning authority. SE to check if FTC will receive one of these, which could be made available to the group.</p>	EJ
7.7	<p>Planning, ROMP application and restoration and landscape masterplan: SE was awaiting a response from colleagues as to why the area covered by the current ROMP application (area bounded in green) differs to the area covered by the 1995 ROMP application (area bounded in light blue).</p> <p>GP reported that the current review of minerals permissions (ROMP) application had been submitted in August. Minerals permissions must be updated every 15 years to ensure the conditions remain appropriate for modern working and safeguarding of the environment. Due to the size of the application, the planning authority had required an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to determine it.</p>	SE

Ref	Note	Action
	<p>The first stage of an EIA is a scoping report to agree what it will cover and how.</p>	
7.8	<p>The technical sub group (TSG) had met on Friday to review the draft scoping report for the ROMP area. It discussed this at length and identified areas that need additional work. A key issue was the number and extent of cross over issues with the wider site - the ROMP area takes in a third of the site and the EIA would only cover that area. The forthcoming site wide restoration and landscape masterplan application will also require an EIA, which will supersede the ROMP EIA. Due to the number of crossover issues, the TSG proposed that the ROMP EIA be put on hold in favour of progressing the EIA for the site wide masterplan.</p> <p>An initial review suggested there were no planning issues that would prevent this approach and the EIA ROMP could therefore go on hold until the EIA is completed for the whole site.</p> <p>SITA is holding a team meeting to begin the process of developing a site wide masterplan on 25th November and after this will have a clearer idea of the timescales for producing the masterplan and associated EIA now.</p>	
7.9	<p>GP sought members views on the TSG's proposal.</p> <p>CP had sought the views of community groups on the proposal ahead of the meeting. She reported that the community has been seeking an integrated plan for the whole site and was therefore supportive of the proposed approach. The community was due to come together on 24th to reiterate the issues and concerns it wants addressed for each area of the site and across the whole site to inform the meeting on 25th. CP to send GP a consolidated response from the community.</p>	CP
7.10	<p>Members offered views on the proposed approach, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SE said the planning authority is currently prioritising the ROMP application. If, however, the masterplan would deliver the objectives for the site earlier than would otherwise be the case and if it covered all of the issues from the ROMP application, it would avoid duplicating work. - The proposal seemed positive for all as it would save SITA money and meet the community's aspirations. - The approach would provide a way forward for how the site will close, which is currently unclear. - The proposal sounds sensible but if it were to take a long time may not be the right way forward. - Involving the community in the process, with discussions documented and closed out, should inform the determination of the application. - Engaging the Environment Agency through the appropriate channels should help the process and avoid issues being passed 	

Ref	Note	Action
	<p>between the Agency and the planning authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CP commented that the TSG had had a positive discussion about mitigating what is on site, adding that if the masterplan can proceed on this basis it would be positive for all. 	
7.11	<p>In response to comments and queries on the proposed approach, GP said that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ROMP application can't be determined until an EIA is carried out. The site wide masterplan application would supersede the ROMP application, which would go on hold until the masterplan application is determined. If this was refused, the ROMP application would be considered. - The approach has a number of benefits: it would avoid the need for SITA UK to complete two separate EIAs; it would avoid the need for non-material amendment applications to agree details and; it would create one application covering the whole of Runfold South, which is currently governed by over 40 separate permissions. Having one permission with sub sets of plans for specific issues would make the site easier for SITA UK to operate, easier for SCC to regulate and easier for the CLG to hold to account. - The process for developing the masterplan will begin with the discussion with internal stakeholders on 25th, consultants will then be asked for views on reasonable timescales for producing the EIA and the masterplan (EIAs of this type usually take a minimum of six months, depending on the timing in relation to season sensitive background work). - GP hoped to have a draft masterplan for discussion around Easter and to be in a position to submit an application in late 2015, although this couldn't be guaranteed. The determination period would follow. GP agreed to provide an indicative timescale for the process for developing the masterplan. - The Environment Agency has introduced a formal pre-application consultation process for planning applications. - SITA UK is required by legislation to submit a ROMP application but there is no requirement that this be determined by a certain date. SE confirmed this, adding that mineral working has finished in the area covered by the ROMP so any issues relate to the final landform. - GP had not identified any negative impacts of prioritising the masterplan as the EIA for this would pick up the issues that the ROMP EIA would have addressed. The only issue for SITA was to confirm if the CLG was happy with the approach and also the planning authority, as the ROMP application will remain as an 	GP

Ref	Note	Action
	undetermined application on its records.	
7.12	<p>A further issue arising from the TSG's discussions was whether the site wide masterplan should cover SITA UK's whole landholding or be restricted to the areas of the site that have been quarried and landfilled. He suggested this would depend on whether unworked areas would be used as compensatory measures for worked areas, which he thought was unlikely but was to be confirmed.</p> <p>SE suggested the end result may be improved if all of SITA's landholding is incorporated and CP highlighted that an ongoing concern for the community is ensuring the restored site blends with its surroundings, particularly in terms of the final contours. It may therefore add value for the masterplan to include an area around the worked area if not the whole landholding.</p>	
7.13	IL concluded the discussion, summarising that the group was content to proceed with the proposal to put work on the ROMP EIA on hold in favour of progressing the site wide restoration and landscape masterplan.	
7.14	Operational and environmental compliance, Area A: CJ reported the basal engineering for cell three (the central part of area A) was complete. An engineered clay liner has been placed and waste material from cells one and two will be relocated here. The relocation of waste material from cells one and two is dependant upon the provision of a Construction Quality Assurance report for the engineering work, the agreement of this report with the Environment Agency, and weather conditions. As a result, it is likely that it will take place around the end of the year.	
7.15	Areas A and C are covered by one Environmental Permit; SITA is preparing an application to change the ground water and landfill gas compliance limits in the boreholes around the site. These revised limits have already been agreed with the Agency but need to be formally implemented by a permit variation. This application will also take account of the updated contours for site that are referenced by the permit.	
7.16	A member suggested this application could also cover the inconsistency between planning and permitting regarding the profiling of the subsoil and topsoil. GP commented that this was an area of crossover between planning and permitting where planning takes precedence as it covers aftercare, whereas the permit is concerned with protecting the capping beneath the soils. MK added that the permit refers to 700ml topsoil and 300ml subsoil. The member suggested that the planning permission is inconsistent with this as there was insufficient topsoil available at the time of the application so less was prescribed. SE explained that as full agricultural restoration isn't required for this area, the planning authority doesn't require 300ml subsoil, which is a standard reference.	
7.17	IL queried the consultation arrangements for permit applications. MK explained applications for bespoke permits are sent out for consultation and, where there is community interest, the application is advertised to the public. In this instance, the application would be	

Ref	Note	Action
	<p>treated as a minor application so wouldn't go out to consultation.</p> <p>A member expressed a desire for consistency between planning and permit conditions. SE commented that the planning authority consults the Environment Agency on applications but the Agency doesn't consult the planning authority on draft permits. IL suggested the application could go to the TSG if there were any issues.</p>	
7.18	<p>PH advised that SITA UK has progressively installed leachate wells into cells 1 and 2 and is undertaking a cost benefit analysis to determine whether to run the pipework to the leachate tanks in Area B or to install a dedicated tank in Area A. It has agreed with the Environment Agency that leachate that complies with the discharge criteria can be discharged to the pond but needs an alternative means of dealing with any leachate that doesn't meet the criteria. There are two types of leachate being pumped - from cells that have been engineered but not yet filled with waste and from cells that have been filled with non-hazardous or inert waste. This is being tested and the results will be sent to the Agency by the end of the month.</p> <p>MK confirmed that the Agency has requested additional testing to ensure there are no contaminants in the leachate. Water ingress had occurred during the operational phase and once the area is capped there shouldn't be an issue with leachate.</p>	
7.19	<p>In response to queries from members on Area A, CJ and PH explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The design and specification of the cap for cells one and two is being discussed with the Environment Agency and SITA needs to provide further information. Once the overtipped material is relocated it is likely these cells will be capped in the new year. - SITA UK has to ensure that Area A conforms with the contours specified by planning and permitting, and will appoint a surveyor to install batten boards and mark heights on these, surveying the cell to ensure it is completed to the correct profile. The amount of void that will be left to fill once the overtipped material is moved into cell three is uncertain. SITA UK will need to import material from customers tipping inert waste to bring the cell up to the correct level, and the precise volume needed will depend on the size of the cap. - SITA UK hopes to have relocated the overtipped material and capped cells one and two by May / June 2015. 	
7.20	<p>Operational and environmental compliance, Area C: Sand extraction continues and clay is being brought on to site and stored prior to starting engineering works next summer. Once a design specification for the lining system for this Area is agreed with the Agency, the base will be engineered and the void filled with strictly inert material. Additional gas and ground monitoring boreholes have been installed and are being monitored fortnightly for six months and monthly thereafter, to generate data that will be used to put</p>	

Ref	Note	Action
	appropriate compliance limits in place.	
	Two surveys have been undertaken in the last six months and these will be updated every six months to ensure the sand extraction meets the required depth distance from ground water levels.	
7.21	<p>Operational and environmental compliance, Area B and the Old Hogs Back: Grass seed has been sown and taken well.</p> <p>An action plan has been agreed with the Environment Agency to address gas migration at borehole G5 located in the corner of the site. This involves investigating the borehole and its proximity to the waste mass. The CO² and methane compliance limits are 1.5% and 1% respectively, and the monthly gas monitoring is showing methane concentrations in this borehole to be up to approximately 2.5%. This is most likely from the Hogs Back, an old 'dilute and disperse' landfill.</p> <p>SITA UK's investigations show the borehole is 10 – 15m from the waste mass. EA guidance states that landfill gas perimeter monitoring boreholes should be at least 20m from the waste mass. Investigations continue in line with the action plan; a gas contractor will carry out a survey to confirm the gas infrastructure is fit for purpose and a borehole specific compliance review is scheduled. One possible solution would be to relocate the borehole but this wouldn't be ideal as it would be relocated on land used by the school. Another option would be to install gas extraction wells outside of the waste mass.</p> <p>MK confirmed that the gas concentrations detected had been stable over the last four years. Two additional gas extraction wells had been installed to specifically target the methane observed in G5 but this hadn't resolved the issue so the collection system was being looked at.</p>	
7.22	<p>The wheel wash that drains down to the pond isn't covered by the permits in place at the site. SITA UK will be undertaking works by the end of the year, to install a screen on the drain to trap silt and solid material and ditches to act as weirs. Bales of straw could also be used to catch debris. Planting reeds had been considered but there wasn't sufficient water to sustain a large reed bed.</p> <p>In response to a member's query, PH explained that the site had been re-profiling stockpiles at the edge of the Hogs Back and Area B. It had also been undertaking some remedial work around wells. He agreed to notify the CLG when work was being undertaken to the Old Hogs Back area so they can reassure any residents who may have questions about the works.</p>	PH
8	ENVIRONMENT AGENCY UPDATE	
8.1	In addition to the matters reported by SITA UK, MK reported that there was a non-compliance for leachate levels in Area B that SITA had investigated and found an issue with a compressor. CJ expanded added that an issue with the compressor was causing the pumps to	

Ref	Note	Action
	<p>turn off. In addition cell three was non-compliant, which was thought to be due to a build up of silt in the well; contractors were due to come to site to address this.</p> <p>MK emphasised that it is important for the Agency that the leachate tanks remain on site.</p> <p>Area A is being infilled, the Agency has signed off the engineering work for the final cell and has received an engineering plan for the capping for cell one. The Agency will review this and feedback to SITA UK. This plan also refers to restoration soils and further to earlier discussions, the Agency will check to ensure there is no inconsistency between the planning and permit contours.</p> <p>The Agency discussed previous concerns over the wheel wash in Area A 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>Pre-operational work is being undertaken to monitor Area C 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 is an issue with perimeter landfill gas at two monitoring points; SITA UK took action, drilling additional gas extraction wells, however the issue returned and further work is needed.</p> <p>SITA has installed a leachate collection tank in Area B as levels there were above those permitted. Work is ongoing on this issue. The Agency's efforts are focused on the engineering works and SITA has been taking advantage of the recent good weather to progress these.</p>	
8.2	<p>A member queried the gas migration issue near to the school where SITA had reported a level of up to 2.5% against a compliance limit of 1%. CJ explained that the readings may be affected by atmospheric pressure, as when pressure is low, levels of 2.5% are detected but at other times levels are lower.</p> <p>MK explained that when a compliance limit is exceeded, the operator informs the Agency within 24 hours, the Agency reviews the data and records a non-compliance, triggering the Agency to request action to resolve the issue. In this instance, SITA UK has devised an action plan for returning to compliance. It's also important to consider the distance of the well from the waste and the flow of gas. The levels detected are safe and the borehole is monitored at different depths with the non-compliance recorded at 15m below ground. There isn't an issue at other depths. The non-compliance is very consistent and has been for the last four years.</p>	

Ref	Note	Action
	Another member suggested the wheel wash was still out of order. PH explained it had been repaired and was now fully operational.	
9	SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL UPDATE	
9.1	SE noted an error in item 12 of the minutes of the previous meeting, as Runfold North is not in aftercare and asked for this to be amended.	EJ
	An updated list of current planning applications will be provided in the drop box, and SE will confirm if the Runfold North and A&C applications have new 2014 references.	SE
9.2	Following the seeding of Area B and the Old Hogs Back, SE suggested a topographic survey to provide a benchmark and advised that these are normally carried out in November. GP to request a site wide survey. KJ to be provided with a copy.	GP
9.3	KJ last visited site in September and a colleague had visited more recently. In response to a member's request, GP confirmed SITA UK would be happy for the planning authority to share its inspection reports with the CLG once SITA had reviewed them. It was agreed KJ would send the reports to SITA and circulate them to the group ten days later, and bring any reports to the next meeting.	KJ
10	TECHNICAL SUB GROUP UPDATE	
10.1	CP noted a refreshing approach from SITA UK at the recent TSG meeting which had been very positive with an open and frank discussion. She thanked GP for the positive dialogue and suggested a site visit would be useful.	
	Another member commented that a lot of the evening's discussions had seemed technical and suggested the matters be discussed in the TSG rather than the main group. EJ commented that as the group was recently reformed, a greater level of detail had been needed at this meeting to bring members up to date with the current status of the site and that going forward updates could be more concise.	
	A member suggested that SITA provide a written update for the CLG ahead of the meeting, another suggested the agenda be organised by site area rather than by organisation and third suggested moving the TSG up the agenda.	
	IL suggested there had been a consolidation process for those new to the group and that future meetings would be more concise. He agreed to amend the agenda for the next meeting.	
11	AOB	
11.1	SE had been asked a question at another CLG meeting about proposals for playing fields on SITA's land in the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan. IL suggested that SITA UK should be included on the list of consultees for this plan. GP would review this and include the proposal for consideration at SITA UK's meeting on the masterplan on 25th. It would also be reviewed at the next CLG.	



Ref	Note	Action
14	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
14.1	Wednesday 11 February at 7pm at Farnham Town Council Offices. The technical sub-group would meet in late January.	