

SUBJECT	Runfold Community Liaison Group
DATE	29 th April 2015
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)
	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
	Emma Jordan	EJ	Communications Manager South East, SITA UK
	Karen Jackson	KJ	Planning Enforcement Officer, Surrey County Council
	Steve Ratcliffe	SR	Governor, 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
1	WELCOME	
1.1	IL welcomed the group to the meeting.	
2	INTRODUCTIONS	
3	APOLOGIES	
3.1	Apologies were received from Pat Frost, James Reid, Andy Macleod, Cindy Griffith, Roger Steel and Calum James. Going forwards, James Reid and Steve Ratcliffe will alternate attendance on behalf of Barfield School unless the agenda requires both to be present.	
4	MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING	
4.1	IL apologised for the long delay in circulating the minutes. CP expressed concerns about the time taken and requested that for this meeting minutes be produced and circulated in a reasonable amount	

of time, which she considered to be ten working days. If this were not possible she would like an alternative secretary.

IL noted that when the timescale of ten working days had previously been discussed and included in the terms of reference he had expressed concerns that it was ambitious. EJ added her apologies, explaining that shortly after the last meeting an urgent matter had arisen that took up most of her time for several weeks, followed by a close family member being admitted to hospital. These combined had prevented her from completing the minutes in the agreed timescale. She stressed the delay was unintentional.

4.2 The group reviewed the minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2015.

4.3 **Points of accuracy:** CP was concerned that the minutes contained information and detail not discussed at the meeting and repeated her frustration at the time taken to produce the minutes, which she had not read in full as a result. EJ confirmed that the minutes were produced from her abbreviated typed notes taken at the meeting.

EJ offered to check her notes of the meeting for mention of the items queried and also to share these with IL. CP queried the following items:

EJ

- Item 5.2, the reference to a recovery permit which wasn't included in her note. KJ and IL had both noted this at the meeting. *Included in notes taken at the meeting, minutes unchanged.*
- Concern that the penultimate paragraph of 5.1 did not reflect what was said. *Notes taken at the meeting reflect the content of this paragraph, minutes unchanged.*
- Item 5.4 reference to CP should be to GM. *Minutes amended.*
- Item 6.2 should make clear that the plans referred to in the second paragraph should be linked to both the permit and planning. *Minutes amended.*
- Item 6.1 should refer to a 1 in 100 year storm plus 20%, not a 1 in 10 year storm. *Minutes amended.*
- Item 6.2, the penultimate paragraph should note that in CP's opinion it wasn't necessary to retain the pipework. *Minutes amended.*
- Item 6.4, the reference to gas concentrations. *Included in notes taken at the meeting, minutes unchanged.*
- Item 6.5 should state CP's concern that the pipework could have been damaged by clay stockpiles. *Minutes amended.*
- The reference to specific leachate levels at item 6.6. MK and IL recalled this. *Included in notes taken at the meeting, minutes unchanged.*
- Item 5.3 amend CP to GP. *Minutes amended.*

EJ to circulate updated minutes.

EJ

It was noted that the time elapsed between the meeting and the circulation of the minutes could made it difficult to recall the discussion,

and that the minutes of this meeting would be produced more promptly to assist with this.

4.4	Matters arising: Updates on progress were provided for outstanding actions from the previous meeting:	
	Item 4.4 – GP to send copy of the topographical survey to SCC by the end of week.	GP
	Item 4.5 – CP noted that the amendments to the stockpile application hadn't been circulated to members. GP apologised for this oversight. EJ confirmed she had been given two options for document sharing by colleagues in MIS and GP suggested it may be easier to make applications available online. GP and EJ to explore and confirm in the minutes how application documents will be made available going forwards.	GP/EJ
	Item 4.5 – CP noted that she hadn't received any planning enforcement reports. KJ has allowed the statutory ten days for SITA to comment on her last report and had then gone on leave. She therefore hadn't had the opportunity to circulate the report yet but had brought hard copies to the meeting. The supporting information which lists the relevant planning applications wasn't included in order to save paper as there had been no change to these from the previous report.	
	Item 6.2 – the action to identify ways to ensure the eventual removal of infrastructure post aftercare to be carried forward.	GP
	Item 6.3 – KJ had consulted Alan Stones who confirmed SITA did not need planning permission to store sand in this location.	
	Item 6.5 –SITA's landfill energy manager had confirmed there was no gas infrastructure in the area where the stockpile was located and that it was to the north. CP challenged this, stating that a drawing supplied to her by SITA in June 2013 showed infrastructure under the stockpile. MK suggested any pipework in this location would be identified by the CCTV survey and PH confirmed this was planned for the following week (item 6.7); he would ensure this area was included. GP to check the June 2013 plan and report back the findings of the CCTV survey to the Technical Sub Group (TSG).	GP
	Item 6.5 – in CJ's absence it was agreed that the action to look at gas flow into the engines be reported back to the TSG.	CJ
	Item 6.6 – EJ, IL and his colleague responsible for the FTC website proposed creating a page in the community news section of the website where a brief description of the site, its history and its current status could be provided, together with information about the liaison group and contact details for SITA UK for any queries about its operations. If specific works were being undertaken at the site that may impact on the community, information could be added here or to the events calendar. The group agreed this should be taken forward. IL asked members if there was any information they wished to	EJ&IL

contribute. CP asked for the document she had prepared the previous year outlining the community's concerns about the site to be included together with her contact details. BN asked that the information be linked with the SSPC website.

CP

Item 7.3 – PH reported that the site had been monitoring lorries and that drivers had been issued with a memo about speeding and parking. He asked members to inform him of any issues with vehicles using the site so that he could address these.

5 TECHNICAL SUB GROUP UPDATE

5.1 **Runfold North site meeting:** GP and a colleague had met CP and SE to agree actions to get the site into a better condition.

It is a closed landfill in restoration but not fully restored, so is not yet in aftercare. Restoration works were carried out last year, some of which are sufficient however others need to be replaced, e.g. the sycamore planting replaced with a more appropriate species.

The TSG's Discussions related to drainage works, fencing and planting; actions were identified with mechanisms and timescales for delivery.

Drainage

Following the meeting, SITA sent an updated drainage plan to the Environment Agency for review. This contains elements of the approved scheme together with a number of improvements and additions.

CP added that there were fundamental differences between the drawing previously submitted by SITA to the planning authority and both the installed drainage scheme and the one to be installed. The drainage scheme isn't working e.g. low points have been created in the wrong location or are absent, areas need to be culverted to allow the farmer access. The TSG had identified these issues and she assumed the updated plan submitted to the Agency reflected its discussions. GP confirmed that the updated plan would be sent to the TSG once SITA had received the Agency's feedback.

GP

In response to IL, GP explained that the current drainage scheme doesn't meet the approved plan, as not all of the works have been done and some works were done that were not on the plan. The TSG had agreed the areas to be reviewed and modified, and SITA had drawn up a plan addressing these and sent a draft to the Agency (a consultee in the planning process). Once SITA had received feedback from the EA and then from the TSG, it would submit a revised drainage scheme to the planning authority. If approved in time, the works will be undertaken by October this year. The plan submitted to the Agency dealt only with drainage and not the other issues discussed by the TSG.

CP had observed a trailer containing bags of aggregate parked in the layby at front of site at 6.30am that morning as if works were about to be undertaken. PH agreed to look into this. PH

IL suggested that if the TSG were happy with the revised drainage scheme, further consultation with the wider CLG wasn't necessary. CP was satisfied with this approach if it was acceptable to the community, but suggested the revised scheme be distributed to all members. GP

Fencing and Planting

The timescales for preparing an updated fencing plan and addressing the planting issues were longer as SITA wish to involve landscape advisors Rick Bright and need input from the TSG.

With regard to timescales, SITA hoped to circulate the draft drainage scheme by end of the week, subject to feedback from the Agency. The TSG's comments on the fencing plan had been taken on board and the planting plan would be reviewed over the next month. The TSG would then meet RB to address issues across both sites. GP to coordinate a date with his colleague EC. EC

SITA hopes to submit a revised application this summer in order to start the drainage works by late summer to finish them by October, and to start planting in the autumn season, but may need to finish the planting in the spring season.

SE hoped to conclude Runfold North by spring 2016.

Of greater concern to CP was the potential for damage to existing planting when the current fencing is removed. She suggested that the fencing is replaced before the new planting to prevent any damage to this.

SE considered an eight week determination period realistic if the various parties were satisfied with the submitted scheme.

CP advised that GP had agreed to produce a plan showing the infrastructure to be retained. This will be attached to the planning application so it's clear what needs to be removed, and will be kept up to date to ensure any additional wells needed are included. The mechanism for keeping this plan up to date needs to be confirmed. GP

SE added that the planning authority will approve a plan showing the retained infrastructure and another with it removed to reassure the community. The SITA site at Albury is going through this process now and the plans are close to being approved. Once the principle of this approach is established for Albury, it can be used for other landfill sites in Surrey. The Albury submission includes a plan showing the retained infrastructure, a plan showing this removed together with an indicative timescale for its removal and photographs of the infrastructure so it is clear in the future what needs to be removed,

MK did not believe the removal of infrastructure would be a permit requirement however there was financial provision to replace any damaged infrastructure and restore the site in the event an operator went bankrupt.

GP confirmed that depending on the timescales for the planning submission, fencing works would begin in 2015 but may continue into the first quarter of 2016. SITA was sympathetic to the community's desire to see the fencing replaced promptly and if possible will complete the works by the end of 2015, but needs to retain the flexibility to continue to March 2016 if needed.

SE concluded that once restored, Runfold North would show how the rest of site could look when restored.

5.1	Main TSG meeting: GP apologised for not sending CP an electronic copy of the draft masterplan.	GP
-----	---	----

The TSG discussed two main issues at the recent meeting:

Revised Area A restoration details

There wasn't opportunity to review the revisions to the Area A restoration details in advance of the TSG meeting. CP advised that the TSG had raised issues that affect both the landscape masterplan and the Area A details and suggested members wait until the issues are resolved before reviewing the plans for Area A.

GP added the plans circulated for Area A were for information and wouldn't be submitted to the planning authority imminently. CP noted that the date at the bottom right of the drawing should be amended to March 15.

GP

Landscape masterplan

The TSG had identified issues in the landscape masterplan that need to be addressed and followed up by the TSG before a draft is made more widely available.

As outlined in February, SITA was undertaking an economic review of the site's restoration looking at the engineering requirements, the depth of fill, and specifically in relation to Area C and the central area of the site around the Tarmac plant, whether to fill to the approved level, a low level restoration scheme or a middle way.

Following this review, SITA is still proposing to fill Area C to the approved level but will seek to change the waste types for this area to the same as those permitted for Area A, which are non-hazardous and largely inert but would not fall within the landfill directive definition of inert. This would provide a bigger market from which to source the material to fill this area.

Areas A and C were originally approved to accept the same type of waste, inert waste, but due to a change in legislation in the intervening period, the definition of inert has been narrowed to only

waste that is biologically stable. As an example, the former definition of inert would have included building rubble but not plasterboard.

The planning permission for Area C specifies that it can accept inert waste and therefore the current, narrower landfill directive definition of inert applies rather than the definition of inert at the time planning permission was granted. E.g. under the current landfill directive definition, topsoil wouldn't be classed as inert but would have been under the previous definition

SITA therefore needs to apply to vary both the planning permission and the permit for Area C in order to change the type of waste it can accept.

-
- 5.2 GM queried why the community would support this change. GP explained that if Area C could only accept inert materials, it would compete for this with other sources e.g. golf courses, which don't have the same engineering requirements as a landfill and don't pay landfill tax and can therefore charge lower rates than SITA. Broadening the types of waste Area C can accept would widen the market and enable SITA to fill this area more quickly. CP concurred, adding it would help avoid a hole in the ground.

Responding to a follow up question, CP explained that if SITA isn't granted permission to change the type of waste for Area C then it could apply not to fill this area. Whilst the community could object to these applications, in her view, changing the type of waste for Area C was the right option for both the community and SITA. It would result in a similar profile or a profile slightly lower than currently permitted but high enough to avoid leachate issues, and getting the site closed as quickly as possible was probably the best course.

SE emphasised that if the waste type for Area C were changed, the waste going in would essentially be inert and would not be like the waste tipped in Area B. CP added that the landfill directive was aimed at stopping landfill by making it less economically attractive and by decreasing the types of waste that can be landfilled. For a site as old as Runfold, the decisions made in 2008 were correct at time but probably wouldn't be permitted today, however, there is now a hole in the ground that SITA needs to fill.

GP emphasised that SITA was applying for something that already existed at the site i.e. to fill Area C with the same type of waste as Area A.

-
- 5.3 Landscape masterplan continued: Following the economic review SITA is proposing a low level restoration of the central area where the Tarmac plant is located, as to fill this area to the currently consented levels with the required engineering wouldn't be economically viable. A fill of 2m would probably be sufficient to achieve appropriate flows to the pond to the north, although a drainage culvert would still be needed which would need the Environment Agency's approval to ensure there were no issues on site or backing up.
-

CP suggested that SITA present both options to the Agency, justifying the culvert and outlining the risks of filling this area to the currently agreed level over a historic landfill.

In response to a question from BN, GP explained that reducing the fill in the central area would reduce truck numbers compared to the currently consented scheme.

GP concluded that this was the overall approach and that a lot of detail needs to be filled in.

-
- 5.4 CP considered that the best option for filling and restoring the site so it no longer looked like a landfill was to change the type of waste for Area C and proceed with a low level fill of the central section of the site. GM wasn't comfortable putting this to the community as an agreed proposal and suggested the community's view was sought.

CP explained to IL that once the masterplan is sufficiently developed, a meeting of the Runfold Action Group will take place where the various community groups will attempt to reach a consensus.

-
- 5.5 In terms of the treatment of other areas in the first draft of the masterplan, the area used by the school is left untipped. Cut and fill works would need to be undertaken to the bank and the overgrown area to slacken off the bank but inerts wouldn't be brought in. SR noted this would be much appreciated by school. GP added that the technical issues hadn't been explored for this area yet.

CP noted that the planning authority's reports continue to highlight that the school's use of the field is without planning permission and queried if this could be addressed by SITA informing the planners of its intentions for this area. GP explained that the use of this area would be regularised through the masterplan and KJ noted that the enforcement reports have to note this as a breach until an application is made, however no enforcement action would be taken whilst discussions on the masterplan are taking place.

-
- 5.6 GP advised the next step is a further TSG meeting with Rick Bright so that CP can relay issues with the draft masterplan directly to him.

CP noted that the community's issues outlined in the document she had prepared had not been taken into account by the masterplan and was not prepared to agree a date for this meeting until she had seen a revised draft that took account of these.

GP confirmed that Rick Bright had received this document and would check if it had been taken into account when preparing the draft masterplan. SITA was willing to address the issues raised or if this were not possible, to explain why, ensuring that whilst it may not be possible to reach agreement on all points, there would be a level of understanding.

GP

CP expressed disappointment that the draft didn't take into account the profiles left in existing areas of the site, showing what was permitted rather than what existed.

SE considered that the draft was moving in the right direction. CP disagreed and considered this only applied to the area around the school playing field.

- 5.7 Clay stockpiles: clay is no longer being brought into the site and SITA is awaiting approval of the COA plan for the Area A cap in order to start moving the clay. SLR is responding to questions from the Environment Agency on the plan; as soon as this is approved work on the cap will start and is due to finish in September.

MK confirmed that the Agency was awaiting a finalised version of the COA plan to incorporate its last few comments.

With regard to an error in the amendments submitted to the planning application for clay stockpiles, which stated that no further clay will be brought into site (when clay will be needed to engineer Area C), GP confirmed to CP that SITA had not yet submitted an amended version but would do so.

GP

GP suggested the clay currently stored at the site would be sufficient to cap Area A and line the base and side walls of Area C. PH concurred, adding SITA would probably use a GCL liner in Area C, in which case the stored clay would be used to start developing Area C and to lift the side walls.

CP noted the need to link the timescales for the planning and permitting applications to change the waste type for Area C to avoid a retrospective application. GP noted that changing the waste type for Area C wouldn't alter the engineering requirements, which could therefore still be progressed. SE to debrief case officer.

SE

Once Area A is capped, SITA will know how much clay remains for Area C. GP anticipated the change to the type of waste for Area C being led by the Environment Agency, as it was not a planning issue although the planning permission needs to be varied, as the same void space and engine requirements apply. MK informed the group that a permit variation has been submitted to the Environment Agency. CP noted the community hadn't been informed. SITA will circulate the application to the group.

CJ

MK explained the permit variation would be subject to consultation and, if MK informs colleagues there is public interest, there would be a public consultation. GM requested that the community is consulted and MK will notify colleagues who will undertake consultation once the application is duly made.

MK

CP noted that the original Area A restoration described capping the section furthest away from the road, followed by the section nearest to the road and lastly the central section but that the current plan was to do the reverse. PH explained that changing the order in which different sections are capped had reduced the overall length of the programme to eight weeks.

6 SITE UPDATE

6.1 **Area A:** The Environment Agency has received a permit variation and SITA has re-profiled cell one in anticipation of the capping works, cell two is 70% re-profiled and waste to infill cell three will start being accepted in the next two weeks.

6.2 **Area B:** SITA is investigating the areas around two hot spots to ascertain if there has been any damage to the cap. A report is expected imminently and will be used to develop a scope for a tender for remedial works. Once the hot spots are extinguished and the cap repaired, the leachate wells will be re-drilled.

The gas extraction system, which is under a vacuum, was temporarily switched off to allow the site to pressurise, and the site was surveyed with a gas analyser to identify any areas with potential for air to enter the landfill. Following this, the leachate wells have been de-silted and a bentonite seal applied around some of the wells to prevent air entering at these points.

PH confirmed to SE that these were hot spots in terms of temperature rather than pollution.

6.3 **Area C:** SITA is supplying sand to Tarmac. Some reserves remain in the quarry and SITA hasn't yet decided if it will remove these.

CP suggested SITA needs to inform the planning authority when extraction stops. KJ replied that whilst reserves remain which SITA has permission to extract, she isn't expecting notification from SITA, adding that lulls in extraction are not unusual. The timescale for removing the tarmac plant begins when the planning authority is notified that extraction has ceased. The planning authority monitors the site and is in regular contact with PH so would ensure notification was given when extraction ceases. KJ had last visited the site in March and extraction was still taking place at that time.

GP anticipated SITA would make a decision on when to cease sand extraction in the next couple of months and by September, when works to contour the base are due to start. He confirmed SCC would be notified with the decision is made.

SE to confirm the wording of the planning permission to CP who was concerned SITA could be allowed additional time to restore this area and felt this wasn't in the spirit of the discussion at the last CLG meeting.

SE

6.4 **Hogs Back:** revised gas compliance limits have been informally agreed with the Environment Agency and a permit variation submitted to incorporate these into the permit. A CCTV survey is taking place next week and flow monitors installed this week. PH agreed to send CP a plan of the area being surveyed.

PH

Monitoring point G15 in the woods and G5 by the school are compliant with the revised limit.

MK added that two streams of work had taken place, one looking at the efficiency of the system in place and the other at G5. SITA had identified that G5 was too close to the waste mass. It had looked at the gas flows and the concentrations have been consistent over four years. It had considered a new monitoring point but this would need to be on school land. Further work is being undertaken on the efficiency of the gas collection system but the Agency is comfortable that the gas limit can be revised. The revised limit is still conservative. With regard to G15 there are no issues with its location and the Agency is awaiting the results of the CCTV survey as the extraction wells may have been damaged over time.

PH

PH to confirm with Infinis if the survey will include the piping from G5 to G15.

In response to IL, MK explained that the compliance limit in the permit still applies until this is changed by the permit variation and the Agency has no issues with the revised limit. The site is currently in breach of the permit but compliant with the revised limit.

-
- 6.5 **Environment Agency:** The Agency received an application to change the waste type in Area C at the end of March and this has been allocated to an officer for determination. The application also seeks to regularise the revised gas and ground water limits, which have already been informally agreed. It also includes changes to the contours of the site and MK noted that the plan that forms part of the permit variation hasn't been approved by planning. He was therefore liaising with the case officer to ensure planning and permitting are consistent. The Agency is providing comments on the flood risk assessment to the planning authority.

Once the Agency has approved the CQA plan for Area A, capping work can commence.

There has been no further discussion on filling the ROMP area however it is not covered by a full landfill directive permit so varying the permit is a simpler process.

The Agency is starting to receive results from the new monitoring equipment at Runfold North. This has identified landfill gas within the body of the site, which is not unexpected given when it was tipped, but nothing of concern at the perimeter monitoring points. Given the proximity of the pub and a residential property, the Agency has asked SITA to review the gas management plan to give reassurance.

-
- 6.6 **Surrey County Council:** SE reported close liaison between the Environment Agency and the Planning Authority thanks to MK. A new case officer has been allocated to the site, Samantha Murphy. Two applications are being determined, one for Area A and one for Area C. These are outstanding whilst discussions take place to ensure consistency with the permit and there may require more amendments.

The case officer is writing a report on the stockpiling application.

The ROMP application remains in abeyance.



Further amendments to the Runfold North application are awaited from SITA before this can be determined.

6.	It was suggested the TSG meeting with Rick Bright would be more productive if the Environment Agency attended to address issues covered by both planning and permitting. GP agreed to arrange this.	GP
7	AOB	
7.1	GP explained a colleague had met planning officers at Waverley to discuss the Local Plan and had been informed that the proposal to designate the site and surrounding area as Green Belt had been withdrawn due to community pressure. Community representatives present were not aware of any community opposition. IL noted FTC hadn't been informed of the latest position on the Green Belt review and would follow this up with WBC.	IL
7.2	EJ informed the group that SITA was rebranding as Suez Environnement, as were the other subsidiaries in the Suez Group. There will be a soft roll out of the new brand and for now the SITA brand is still in use but will gradually be phased out.	
7.3	CP congratulated MK on the birth of his daughter.	
8	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	
8.1	Wednesday 8 th of July at 7pm at Farnham Town Council Offices. A date for the technical sub-group will be agreed separately.	