

Wakerley Quarry Local Liaison Group Meeting

11th February 2016, Laxton Parish Hall

Present

Dan Szymanski (DS)

Shirley Milton (SM)

Phil McCrone (PM)

John Gough (JG)

Charlotte Spry (CS)

Mick George (MG)

Diane Baish (DB)

David Allan (DA)

Gordon Brown (GB)

Louise Boon (LB)

Helen Harrison (HH)

Heather Smith (HS)

Barbara Murie (BM)

David Pennell (DP)

Mark Oldridge (MO)

Representing

Northamptonshire County Council;

Harringworth Parish Council;

Laxton Parish Meeting;

Mick George Limited;

Mick George Limited;

Mick George Limited;

East Northamptonshire Council (Environment Protection);

Wakerley Parish Council;

Barrowden Parish Council;

Harringworth resident;

Fineshade District Councillor;

Ward County Councillor;

Tixover Parish Meeting;

Burghley House;

Mineral Surveying Services Ltd., representing Burghley House;

1) Introductions

1.1 Members of the group introduced themselves given the length of time since the previous meeting.

2) Apologies

2.1 John O'Neill Environment Agency

3) Minutes of the Last meeting

3.1 PM asked that it be noted that para 4.33 could not have been known at the time of the previous meeting.

4) Matter Arising

- 4.1 It was agreed that given the amount of time since the previous meeting, that any matters should be dealt with in the appropriate part of the agenda, which included an opportunity for Local Community Questions (pt. 9).

5) Landowner & Operator's update

- 5.1 MO explained the recent historical context of planning permission ref. no. 08/00026/MIN. At the 2011 LLG meeting, it had been expected that works would have commenced between 2012 – 2015. MO confirmed that the landowner had been out to tender in 2015 and as a result of that process had selected Mick George Limited to operate the site.
- 5.2 JG of Mick George Ltd advised that going forward there are a number of pre-commencement planning conditions to discharge. The company is also seeking to amend the approved working scheme to swap the order of working phases 1 & 2. This would lead to a reduction in the amount of overburden required to be moved and stockpiled by around 1,500,000 m³, and a start on the western part of the site. It is proposed to submit these proposals to the County Council shortly as a Non-Material Amendment.
- 5.3 In the meantime MGL will need to set about making submissions to discharge the various pre-commencement planning conditions, such as archaeological evaluation. LB asked that noise monitoring be done from the correct location as it was believed that it had not been done so for the planning application. MG advised that he would ensure that any new assessment would be taken from LB's rear garden, and that the company had achieved acceptable noise levels at similar sites with similar operations. JG advised that it was likely that acceptable noise levels could be achieved given the distances involved.
- 5.4 In response to a question MO advised that through the planning process the site access had been moved further away from the listed church.
- 5.5 In response to questions and general discussions about Public Footpath PC2, it was advised that the footpath from the top of the runway across the old working area was permissive and would not show-up on the Definitive Map, and was unlikely to require any formal diversion. JG showed the route of the proposed footpath diversion.
- 5.6 JG advised upon the general ordering of submissions in the near future, starting with the proposed amendment to phasing, followed by the discharging of planning conditions. The

company is applying to the County Council as Highway Authority for a section 278 agreement for works within the public highway such as the new access, the A43 junction, and the Fineshade Road intersection. DP advised that it was hoped that the roadworks could commence in the autumn. However, the timing of works was dependant upon the time taken to agree the s.278 agreement. JG affirmed the company's commitment to attend the LLG meetings whether they are in the daytime or evening.

- 5.7 JG advised that the company was likely to come forward with a new planning application to import restoration materials. In response to questions MO confirmed would not be a 'rubbish tip' but would involve the importation of materials such as clays and subsoils that fall within the category of 'inert waste'. HS advised that it was the County Council's policy to be moving away from landfill of putrescible waste. The source materials to be imported to Wakerley will have to have been subject to testing and accompanied by a report. As part of monitoring operations required by the Environment Agency it was confirmed that groundwater monitoring would be undertaken.
- 5.8 In respect of the private borehole at Town Wood Farm. PM confirmed that there was a legal duty of care by the District Council for boreholes. JG confirmed that the monitoring boreholes for the EA permit will be sampled for water quality to compare with Town Wood Farm borehole sampling.
- 5.9 In response to questions MG confirmed that the site was to be used only by MGL vehicles and not proposed to be open to 3rd party companies. As a result the increase in vehicle movements would be limited as the company would typically expect 90% of vehicles to 'back haul' (i.e. bring-in inert waste and leave with limestone). There is expected to be a fleet of lorries based at that site. HGVs were tracked by the company via GPS to ensure that the drivers only used approved haul routes, which has proved successful at the company's other sites. MG confirmed all MGL vehicles are fitted with white noise reversing alarms to reduce the chances of noise intrusion to the local community.
- 5.10 In response to comments from various members of the group, MO assured that there were various enforcement mechanisms that would ensure the proposed operations would be operated in an acceptable manner, such as Environment Agency monitoring under the Environmental Permit, Minerals & Waste Planning permission enforcement by the County Council, and contractual obligations with the Burghley Estate. JG explained that any infill cells are bound by an engineered liner that is subject to testing and that materials permitted to be landfilled would be cleaner than is permitted in new housing developments. In response to questions and comments from PM, JG explained that the landowners permission will be required to undertake groundwater monitoring scheme required by the section 106 agreement.

5.11 JG suggested that if it would benefit the group then the company could organise an LLG visit to one of the company's other sites such as Ringstead Quarry. There was a general consensus amongst the group that this would be of benefit.

5.12 In response to other questions about the nature of the site it was advised that fixed buildings and structures would be restricted to portacabins to provide office and welfare facilities. No maintenance of vehicles was proposed on the site. Dust would be controlled via an approved scheme and procedures which the company is experienced in implementing (e.g. use of bowsers and water misters). Mud on the road would be controlled by a wheel wash and the length of haul route. MG advised that if there were any concerns members of the group could contact CS in the first instance.

5.13 With respect to site screening MO advised that the landowner had undertaken significant amounts of voluntary planting. LB considered that parts of the planting had failed to establish.

5.14 JG explained that the residents of nearby villages would be likely to qualify for grants from the Mick George Community Fund for community projects. The fund is managed independently by Grantscape and has been used in the past to secure funding for projects such as village halls and sports facilities.

5.15 In response to questions from LB, JG and MG advised that a particular phase could be operational for up to 20 years. Changes to the proposed bunding to project amenity could be done with various agreements or changes to approved schemes or variation to planning conditions. LB considered that the provisions of the planning permission did not reflect what was agreed by the Development Control Manager at the previous LLG meeting. DS explained that he would feed this back the Development Control Manager, but that the discussion an LLG could generally not dictate the planning decision of the County Council, as this was a decision of the County Council and not any individual officer.

6) County Council Update

6.1 DS summarised the content of the planning permission and some of the main planning conditions that had not already been discussed in the meeting so far, together with the main requirements of the section 106 legal agreement.

6.2 DS advised that the site would qualify to be monitored under the County Council's chargeable monitoring regime between 1 and 8 times a year – the frequency of which would be discussed with the operator before the commencement of each monitoring year. The purpose of the visits was to carry out an audit of the site operations against the conditions attached to the planning permission. It was expected that the site would fall within the category of 3 – 4 visits per year. The fact that the County Council could charge for the visits meant that the visits were properly resourced and therefore there is assurance that they will take place.

7) East Northamptonshire Council Update

7.1 DB explained that in general ENC would propose to undertake borehole monitoring once every 5 years but that in this instance ENC will monitor with considerably more frequency. Monitoring could potentially be undertaken on a quarterly basis. ENC currently undertakes borehole monitoring at Laxton.

8) Environment Agency update

8.1 No officer present.

9) Local Community Questions

9.1 In response to questions from LB, MG reaffirmed that noise modelling would be undertaken in designing the bund which would use indigenous materials (i.e. topsoil or subsoil) and that if it was necessary to achieve acceptable noise levels then mineral would need to be sterilised.

10) Any Other Business

10.1 Debate was had around possible timings of a public exhibition by MGL with respect to the new planning application. JG confirmed that the timing would be reviewed once firm plans had been draw-up.

11) Next Meeting

11.1 Following various debate about the ideal timing and dates of the meeting. It was agreed that Tuesday 17th May at 16:00hrs was likely to be Ok for most attendees.