

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>SUBJECT</b>  | Runfold Community Liaison Group                         |
| <b>DATE</b>     | 11 <sup>th</sup> February 2015                          |
| <b>LOCATION</b> | Farnham Town Council Offices                            |
| <b>RECORDER</b> | Emma Jordan, Communications Manager South East, SITA UK |

|                |                  |    |  |
|----------------|------------------|----|--|
| <b>PRESENT</b> | Iain Lynch       | IL | Clerk to Farnham Town Council<br>(Independent Chair) |
|                | Bill Nelson      | BN | 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                         |
|                | Calum James      | CJ | Environment Support Manager, SITA UK                 |
|                | Emma Jordan      | EJ | Communications Manager South East, SITA UK           |
|                | Andy Macleod     | AM | Farnham Society                                      |
|                | Karen Jackson    | KJ | Planning Enforcement Officer, Surrey County Council  |
|                | James Reid       | JR | Head, Barfield School                                |
|                | Cindy Griffith   | CG | Moor Park Residents Association                      |

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

| Ref      | Note  | Action |
|----------|---|--------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>WELCOME</b>  |        |
| 1.1      | IL welcomed the group to the meeting.   |        |
| <b>2</b> | <b>INTRODUCTIONS</b>  |        |
| 2.1      | All attending introduced themselves.  |        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>APOLOGIES</b>  |        |
| 3.1      | Apologies were received from Cllr George Johnson, Steve Ratcliffe, Mike Denham (Cindy Griffith substitute) and Simon Elson. |        |

#### 4 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

|     |   |          |
|-----|---|----------|
| 4.1 | IL apologised for the long delay in circulating the minutes and any inconvenience caused.   |          |
| 4.2 | The group reviewed the minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2014.   |          |
| 4.3 | <p>CP requested a number of amendments to the minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amend the description of the first planning application listed at 7.2 in line with the supporting table of applications and condition requirements</li> <li>- Amend the final bullet at 7.3 to reference ground water quality and gas migration, insert that clay was being stored in a number of areas where the community had concerns (including historic landfills) and delete the penultimate bullet</li> <li>- Add an action at 7.9 for CP to send GP a consolidated response</li> <li>- Amend 'facilitate' to 'inform' at 7.10</li> <li>- Amend 7.21 to 'Area B and the Old Hogs Back' as the second part of this item refers to both areas</li> <li>- Amend 'was an issue' to 'is an issue' at 8.1</li> </ul> <p>EJ to amend and circulate updated minutes incorporating these changes.</p> | EJ       |
| 4.4 | Re: item 9.2, GP reported that SLR had undertaken a topographical survey. SITA were awaiting a copy; it was noted that the site wasn't surveyed to the OS grid. SITA had therefore asked the landscape consultant to translate the survey to an OS grid to make it easier to relate it to offsite contours. A copy would be sent to SCC.  | GP       |
| 4.5 | Re: item 9.3, KJ queried how best to make her reports available to the Group. It was agreed that these would be sent to EJ to add to the drop box and a pdf copy would be sent to CP. EJ expressed concerns about available storage and will investigate options for increasing online storage with colleagues in MIS.  | KJ<br>EJ |
|     | IL observed that FTC hadn't received hard copies of recent planning applications submitted by SITA UK. GP to provide FTC with hard copies of planning applications.   | GP       |

#### 5 TECHNICAL SUB GROUP UPDATE

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 5.1 | <p>GP explained that the TSG had met the previous week. SITA UK is working on a whole site landscape masterplan and has engaged Rick Bright Associates for this purpose. Meetings have taken place with internal stakeholders to feed into the process with a view to developing a draft to present to the group. The process is looking at the site afresh in terms of its restoration and is also considering the economics of restoring the site, as the market has evolved since previous applications for restoration schemes were submitted.</p> <p>E.g. planning permission was granted for Area C on appeal in 2007 and the classification of inert materials has since changed. The Environmental Permit requires SITA to put an engineered barrier on the base, side walls and cap of Area C at a cost, in order to fill it with</p> |  |
|-----|--|--|

inert material as defined by the landfill directive (clean sub soils). Inert material is material that is chemically stable and will not degrade in any way. This contrasts with Area A which has the same engineered barrier but can accept a wider range of material that falls in between non-hazardous and inert material, e.g. bricks, rubble and concrete. Rick Bright and the internal team are therefore considering different scenarios: filling Area C to the approved level, filling to a lower level and not filling it. Rick Bright will provide contours for each option and how these would tie into the wider landscape. The same exercise is also being undertaken for the low point of the site where the Tarmac mortar plant is located.

SITA needs to consider the economics and also the availability of material, as it would be competing with sites that are permitted to accept waste for restoration (e.g. golf courses, polo pitches) for inert material, which don't have the same engineering costs or restrictions as a site operated under a landfill permit.

SITA is also considering applying to vary the permit to change the waste types that can be accepted into Area C to the same as those for Area A, which has the same engineering requirements but can accept a broader range of wastes. The permit for Areas A and C is for non-hazardous landfill, however the types of waste they can accept are different. Area A can take non-hazardous waste with the types limited by the permit and waste acceptance criteria, whereas Area C can only accept truly inert wastes. The difference is in the chemical composition of the material and it wouldn't result in a noticeable difference to the landform or the impacts, and the engineering specification would remain the same. If SITA applies to vary the permit it would need to undertake a risk assessment and review the other work undertaken for the original permit. MK advised that the guidance on landfill disposal and recovery were changing.

As a result of this work, the timescales for developing the masterplan have extended to allow these fundamental issues to be considered.

- 
- 5.2 In response to questions from members, SITA said:
- It was possible that no fill material may be used, however in the area of the current Tarmac mortar plant SITA would need to ensure that the area would drain sustainably, i.e. a lake or a pumped drainage system wouldn't be permitted.
  - Changing the type of waste Area C can accept would increase the available material in the market place, allowing it to be filled and restored in a shorter timeframe.
  - SITA doesn't purchase inert waste, the producer would usually pay SITA to tip this material. In order to attract more of this material to compete with other outlets, SITA would have to offer a free tip but even in this instance, it would still be competing on the costs of transporting the material. No decision has been made and SITA is having initial discussions with the Environment Agency.
-

- SITA is also considering a low level restoration scheme for Area C and the Tarmac plant area that would require a recovery permit to bring a brownfield site back into use with low level fill and capping, rather than a disposal permit. MK highlighted that the EA's approach to these permits is subject to change with a consultation underway. More supporting information is required for disposal and there are also landfill tax implications. CP suggested there could be an issue with a recovery permit for the three peaks field as it's an historic landfill and the community would want all necessary surveys and studies completed to assess potential risks.
- The options for the Tarmac plant area are to fill to level, a 2m recovery fill or not to fill it and identify a way for it to sustainably drain.

5.3 Summarising, GP said there were a limited number of sources of the waste Area C can currently accept and SITA is competing with polo pitches and golf courses for this, which are not restricted in the same way. SITA's ability to attract material to fill this area is therefore a concern and the options are: to fill to a lower level if the contours are reasonable and SITA can solve drainage; to fill to the same contour but with material that is available within the time available; or a third option would be in between these two.

GP added that Rick Bright was due to come back to SITA in early March. His findings will be considered in terms of landscape impacts and what is possible from an economic perspective, and refined to produce a first draft masterplan for discussion with the TSG and then the CLG in late April / early May.

5.4 The group discussed the merits of 3D modelling as OS maps can be difficult to interpret. GP cautioned that 3D models can sometimes be misleading and GM felt a small scale printed 3D model showing the current position and the proposal could help people envisage the final landform and how issues such as the gas plant will be addressed.

5.5 CP added that the TSG had discussed the Runfold North application and confirmed that it hadn't addressed the issues raised by SE and the community. GP to arrange a site meeting to rethink the proposed fencing, planting types and ways to protect existing planting. If this were on 6 March, CP could attend.

GP

5.6 In summary, the TSG meeting was positive with agreement that there were issues to resolve around Runfold North, Area A and Area C that had previously been raised by the community but not yet addressed.

## 6 SITE UPDATE

6.1 **Area A:** The EA has objected to the application for details of the landscaping scheme (WA/2013/1020). The surface water modelling was calculated to allow for a one in 75 year event and the EA have specified it should provide for a 1 in 100 year plus a 20% allowance for climate change. The surface water has been remodelled, which has shown a slight impact affecting the pond. SITA expects to submit

updated modelling to the planning authority and the EA in the next week. This also applies to the application for Area C.

SITA has begun moving material from cells one and two into cell three following EA approval of the basal engineering works recently completed in cell three. The remaining void in the central cell will be filled, and HGVs will begin delivering material to site for this purpose in the next few weeks.

SITA is liaising with the EA on the design of the permanent engineered cap for cells one and two. The EA has commented on a draft construction quality assurance (CQA) plan and SITA is addressing its feedback. Once SITA submits a plan to the EA it has up to four weeks to process this.

A permit variation for Area A is outstanding whilst SITA considers applying to change the type of waste Area C can accept, in order to wrap up all of the changes to the permit for Areas A and C in one application.

- 
- 6.2 GP highlighted that the EA is due to move to a 60 year aftercare plan for landfills. Planning will provide a landscape scheme and an aftercare management plan for a 5 to 25 year period depending on the use of the site once in aftercare. The landfill infrastructure will still be on site once the planning aftercare period expires and will be in place until the permit is surrendered, which could be up to 60 years if the EA regulations change. The two regimes therefore need to align.

CP commented that SE had raised this previously and suggested that a plan showing the infrastructure to be retained post aftercare and a plan showing all the infrastructure removed should be required and these then linked to the permit and the planning permission.

GP suggested this approach could have legal complications, adding that the Government and the EA need to work together at a national level to resolve this.

CP emphasised that the community doesn't want infrastructure to remain when it's no longer required. GP suggested this could be achieved through a unilateral undertaking and a charge against the land rather than attempting to address this through the masterplan as there was a legal issue around when planning permission ceases to have effect.

IL suggested that SITA identify the infrastructure to be retained into and post aftercare, and continue discussions on how to achieve its eventual removal.

GP

MK offered to raise the issue with technical colleagues in the EA's national landfill team and feedback to the group.

MK

GM suggested the community was expecting the site to return to its original form in 2021 and was now concerned pipework would remain after this. CP thought this would depend on the area concerned, she

believed the Old Hogs Back was a potential eye sore, Area B was difficult but that there would be little impact to Areas A and C, with the area close to homes and the school the worst affected.

GP confirmed that pipework and manifolds would remain within fenced off areas of the site after restoration. Most of the pipework is buried but some is on the surface and needs to remain there so it can be easily accessed for monitoring and regular maintenance. There is some flexibility over what would be retained, where it is located and what can be done to minimise the visual impact. This will be addressed in the landscape masterplan process. In CP's opinion, it wasn't necessary to retain this pipework and she expected SITA to consider this again. IL identified this as a subject for discussion by the TSG at the appropriate point.

MK added that infrastructure is needed to control landfill gas and its climate change impacts. SITA will monitor gas concentrations and leachate levels and infrastructure can be removed when these fall and the EA is reassured there is no residual risk. If SITA sold the site, the permit would transfer to the new owner and there is financial provision to continue monitoring and maintenance if the owner is made bankrupt. Planning permission also runs with the land.

- 
- 6.3 **Area C:** As discussed, a permit variation is being considered and SITA will keep the group informed. New gas and ground water monitoring points have been installed under the current permit to establish background concentrations of contaminants in order to put appropriate compliance levels in place.

Sand will be exhausted in the next few months and SITA is currently only supplying Tarmac. Sand is excavated, processed then stored at the other end of quarry in Area C and adjacent to the Tarmac plant.

CP highlighted previous concerns that SITA look at stockpiling if the sand extraction rate was exceeding the rate of use, and apply for planning permission. KJ confirmed that it was acceptable to store sand within Tarmac's redline boundary. GP didn't believe that planning permission was needed to stockpile sand within a sand quarry. KJ thought this was correct and undertook to check and confirm.

KJ

CP suggested that the planning conditions for Area C were timescale based and that if sand extraction was completed a year ahead of the deadline, the deadline for restoration could also be brought forward. GP confirmed this could be the case subject to previous discussions on waste types and engineering and SITA needs to notify the planning authority when sand extraction ends.

PH explained that Tarmac blend the sand with sand brought into the site to make mortar. Production at Tarmac's Runfold plant will increase when it closes another plant at Gerrards Cross. The plant serves a fairly local market.

- 
- 6.4 **Area B:** CJ explained there were issues with landfill gas and leachate levels in an engineered part of Area B adjacent to the Old Hogs Back
-

area. Gas migration had been detected at one monitoring point at concentrations of 1 – 2%. SITA are reviewing the compliance limit as the monitoring point is located 15m from the waste mass but should be at 20m. If SITA's monitoring team identify a permit level has been exceeded, they carry out an assessment at the school with a hand held gas analyser that can detect even very low levels of methane measured in parts per million (ppm). Only trace levels of methane have been detected at concentrations of up to 30ppm, so 0.003%.

The compliance limit review taking into account the proximity of the monitoring point to the waste mass was submitted to the EA on Friday. Neither SITA nor the school want to move the borehole as this would put it on the school's land.

- 
- 6.5 CP asked if the integrity of the pipework leading from G5 had been verified after stockpiling took place in this area. CJ explained a report by a specialist contractor had recommended camera surveys of the wells and SITA was awaiting feedback. MK added that new pipework for additional extraction wells had been installed last summer in an attempt to the address issue.

CP was concerned that pipework below ground had been damaged by clay stockpiles. There was disagreement as to whether there was any pipework below ground in this area, GP suggested SITA confirm the position with Infinis.

PH

CJ

MK suggested SITA look at the gas flow into the engines.

- 
- 6.6 CJ reported that there had been an issue gaining access to leachate wells for maintenance. All monitoring points were compliant apart from one that was 3cm over the permitted level. SITA carries out ongoing maintenance on pumps to repair them, remove any build-up of silt, and is continuing to remove leachate by tanker once a day.

PH confirmed that the site shouldn't need to maintain the hardcore access road across Area B and GP confirmed this won't be shown on the masterplan.

MK added that one leachate well was damaged so a drilling rig would need to come on to site.

Area B had been grass seeded in 2014. KJ observed that the restoration for this area hadn't been signed off. CP commented the area should have been restored by 2011. KJ explained that the planning authority is aware there are issues and is working to address them. It hadn't deemed it appropriate to take enforcement action as restoration had been affected by bad weather, and whilst there are other issues, provided SITA is progressing the restoration, the planning authority would rather work with SITA.

The group discussed ongoing maintenance at the site and the need to keep the community informed of this. EJ explained SITA's corporate website wasn't currently set up to include detailed site specific information and confirmed she was happy for members to share her contact details with other residents if they had queries. IL suggested

---



FTC could include information on its website and also S&SPC. EJ to explore with IL.

EJ&IL

- 6.7 **Old Hogs Back:** Some gas migration is occurring with a monitoring point in the woods showing levels over those specified in the permit. SITA is reviewing whether additional extraction wells, either inside or outside the waste mass, can be used to target this. It will develop a proposal and discuss this with the EA.

Expanding on this, CJ added that there are monitoring points for landfill gas around the site, all with a 1% compliance limit for methane. If the monitoring team get a reading over this, it's reported to the EA, who issue a score against the permit and action is taken to address the issue. The first step is to check the infrastructure, if this is working effectively, additional wells may be needed within the waste mass, and if readings over the compliance limit continue, wells outside of waste mass may be installed to capture gas migrating.

CJ confirmed that wells outside the waste mass are a last resort; pin wells are generally used first. MK suggested a well outside the waste mass may not be effective.

MK added that a CCTV plan of the gas infrastructure may identify a need to improve the existing infrastructure or introduce additional. It was possible some pipes had failed or sheered leading to gaps in coverage.

CJ to check with contractors to confirm the timescale for feedback on the CCTV investigation.

CJ

- 6.8 **ROMP:** The ROMP planning application is held in abeyance pending the progress of the landscape masterplan.

Operationally, SITA will shortly begin to use clay from the large stockpile in this area to cap Area A. Some clay will also be used to engineer Area C. If SITA's plans for Area C change and the clay is no longer required, SITA will have to remove it from the site. CP recalled the community's earlier concern about the impacts of storing clay on a former landfill and traffic from bringing clay into the site that may not be needed.

PH confirmed clay was still being brought into the site but at a lower rate. SITA is currently reviewing how much clay it has and how much it is using, as it is close to having enough for use on site. There is currently a readily available source of clay well suited for use on site and SITA has a responsibility to ensure it has enough to fulfil its current planning and permitting requirements.

CP highlighted that SITA doesn't have planning permission to store the clay and has submitted a retrospective application. GP added that the least likely option of those being considered for Area C is no fill and the other options will require clay for engineering.



GP confirmed investigation works had been ordered for the risk assessments for the stockpiles but he didn't have a date for these.

SITA anticipates being able to put the clay cap on Area A in April. The amount of clay required will depend on the design of cap. MK added that SITA has submitted two specifications and once it had chosen one, the EA will need to see the plans ASAP.

GP confirmed the design of the cap would be decided by the next TSG meeting but couldn't give an undertaking on the risk assessment as this was dependent on a third party.

SITA will aim to cap both cells one and two simultaneously and will look to instruct a contractor on that basis.

GP confirmed dispersion modelling will be undertaken when drafts are received from Rick Bright.

6.9 **Runfold North:** GP, KJ and CP to meet on site at 10am on Friday 6<sup>th</sup> March. SE to attend if possible.

MK reported that new monitoring wells were being installed and data from the last quarter was due to be reviewed that month.

GP asked for any feedback on the horse track to the rear of site adjacent to the A31. MK had walked the perimeter last February and saw no flooding. It was agreed to check this on 6<sup>th</sup> March.

## 7 AOB

7.1 GP had met Barfield School representatives. The discussion had provided an understanding of the school's view on the site's operations and restoration options. This would be taken into account in the landscape masterplan and SITA's current and future use of the three peaks field.

7.2 At the end of the last meeting, a proposal for sports pitches on SITA's land in the neighbourhood plan had been mentioned. GP had looked into this and noted a proposal to designate the land as Green Belt by Waverley Borough Council. However, SITA had not been approached for its views on this as a landowner, as would usually happen. This was being raised separately with the borough council. The issue was with the process rather than the designation.

IL confirmed FTC would be pleased to discuss the neighbourhood plan with SITA and suggested GP contact Paul Wenham at the borough council regarding the local plan.

7.3 GM had received a number of reports about the speed of lorries on Guildford Road and asked SITA to remind drivers it is a residential road and to be particularly careful on the narrow stretch. PH offered to write to all contractors.

PH

JR reported lorries arriving before 7am and parking in the school entrance.



GM noted the cleanliness of the road had improved and he had received fewer complaints. GP explained there was a sweeper based at the site that is being shared with the Seale Lodge site whilst drilling works take place there.

---

7.4 The group passed on their best wishes to SE.

---

## **8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

---

8.1 Wednesday 22 April at 7pm at Farnham Town Council Offices. The technical sub-group would meet on 15 April. **Post meeting note: The CLG meeting was subsequently changed to 29 April.**

---