



Minutes of CLG Meeting.

Meeting title	Community Liaison Group – May Meeting
Location	Wyre Council, Civic Centre, Breck Rd, Poulton-le-Fylde FY6 7PU
Date/ time	Thursday 16 May 2024, 10:00-12:30
Originator	Transwaste
Attendees	<p>Andrew Acum – Mercury – AA Howard Ballard – Resident – HB Cllr Lorraine Beavers – Fleetwood Town Council / Wyre Council / Lancashire County Council – LBe Cllr Mary Belshaw – Fleetwood Town Council / Wyre Council – MB Cllr Roger Berry – Wyre Council – RB Lynne Bowen – Wyre Council – LB Jess Brown – Resident – JB John Bunn – Environment Agency - JBu Pam Diamond – Resident – PD Neil Greenwood – Wyre Council – NG Alex Hornshaw – Transwaste – AH Sam Juggins – Transwaste – SJ Barbara Kneale – Resident – BK Corinne Mason – Wyre Council – CM Jim Ratcliffe – Environment Agency - JR Cllr Cheryl Raynor – Wyre Council – CR Cllr Richard Rendell – Wyre Council – RR Jill Scriven – Wyre Council - JS Robin Stocks – Representative of Paul Maynard MP - RS Angela Thomas – Resident - AT</p>
Apologies	<p>Paul Maynard - MP John Neville – Environment Agency Cat Smith - MP</p>
Purpose of meeting	Discuss future plans and ongoing operations at the Transwaste Jameson Road facility.
Minute of last meeting	<u>Approved</u>



1.	<p>Chair's welcome and introductions</p> <p>In the absence of an independent chair for this meeting, AA volunteered to chair. The group introduced themselves.</p>
2	<p>Minutes of Last Meeting and Matters Arising</p> <p>The minutes of the last meeting were agreed.</p> <p>LBe queried why one MP had sent a representative in their absence but the other MP was not offered this opportunity.</p> <p>AA said it was a genuine oversight. Both MPs were invited, but one decided to send a representative instead. It was agreed that in future, both MPs would be allowed to send a representative if their Westminster commitments prevented them from attending, although the preference would be for meetings to be held on a Friday.</p> <p>BK said that she had spoken to Dr Mark Spencer and there had been no communication between the EA and GP practices in Fleetwood. AA pointed out that the minutes stated that contact was being made with local GPs, so this may be an ongoing process, but the EA would be able to clarify this.</p> <p>Action: EA to clarify communications with local GPs</p>
3	<p>Aims & Terms of Reference</p> <p>AA clarified that the CLG is a representative group, not an open meeting, but the CLG members that were invited to the meeting are permanent members until they choose to resign from the group or the group ceases to exist. Specialists would be invited to attend as required if the group felt there was not sufficient expertise in the room to explain a particular topic.</p> <p>The Terms of Reference were agreed.</p>



4.	<p>Vision for the Site</p> <p>AH gave a presentation of the Transwaste vision for the Jameson Road site (see accompanying slides).</p> <p>Action: AA to circulate slides with the minutes</p> <p>AH also said that Transwaste would arrange a site visit for interested CLG members</p> <p>Action: AA to collate details of interest in a site visit</p>
5.	<p>Q&A Session - Transwaste</p> <p>BK asked whether proposed development on the site was covered by existing planning consent or whether there would be new applications for variations under Section 73. SJ said that the work was included under the original permissions.</p> <p>BK said that the original application for the site isn't on the LCC planning portal.</p> <p>BK said that one of the slides said that waste was being brought in from Lancashire but most of the waste was coming from outside of Lancashire. AH said that most of the waste coming into the site now comes from Lancashire.</p> <p>JB circulated some photos that she had taken on site which she felt breached permits. AA stated that it was not within the remit of the Group to consider permit breaches. These photographs should be sent to the EA or Wyre Council for them to take the appropriate investigations. JBu said he would be happy to look at the photographs if they were sent through to him</p> <p>Action: JB to send the photographs to JBu.</p> <p>AH said members of the public should not be entering the site. It is private land and a working site with strict Health and Safety procedures in place.</p>

HB said that the landlord of the site is Wyre Council and as such it is public land. NG clarified that Wyre Council owned the land but leased it to Transwaste under a commercial legal arrangement. As it was a private business and a live site, people should not access the land without permission from Transwaste. The council will look into the photographs, but in the future any such complaint should be brought forward through the proper channels.

RB said it his understanding that a planning condition from LCC was that the site operator would send a report by 31 March each year regarding what operations had been carried out on the site during the previous 12 months along with proposed intended operations for the next 12 months. Has this report been sent and what feedback was received? He also said that this is the old ICI site where noxious substances were used and produced, and this site may have been where a lot of them were dumped and have stayed dormant. His concern was that excavations could disturb these harmful chemicals and wanted to know if Transwaste know what was dumped there and where. His final question was what checks take place to make sure that the waste that is brought in is not harmful or would cause a problem in the future. SJ said that they had regular meetings with LCC to discuss past and future work on site AH said he would check on the Condition 25 reports.

Action:
AH to check annual reports

SJ said that there have been no excavations on the site. The old ICI settlement ponds were remediated before the construction of the landfill. The ponds were “dilute and disperse” ponds which meant the ponds diluted and dispersed into the natural rock strata below them. The site of these ponds is the old outer unlined Phase1 area of the site. The central Phase 2 area is the modern, contained active site, with engineered and lined cells to prevent any leakage. There is no excavation of any old areas and no danger of anything from ICI being released. The current site is a non-hazardous landfill site so there is a list of waste streams that are permitted. There is a rigorous waste acceptance process which is audited by the EA. Phase 2 is a modern site which only accepts non-



	<p>hazardous waste and there is no excavation into anything below.</p> <p>HB said he thought a site visit would be useful in terms of the group being able to understand the layout of the site. HB asked whether methane collected on site was burned off. SJ said that gas was captured via the gas wells and sent to the gas utilisation plant via pipes where it was burned to generate electricity.</p> <p>BK asked if this was happening now. SJ confirmed that it was.</p> <p>HB said the group needed to know what gases were being produced. Different people were smelling different things in different places at different times. Some people said it was rotten eggs, other said it was rotten onions.</p> <p>SJ said that landfill gas was generally a 60:40 split between methane and carbon dioxide with trace elements (possibly traces of hydrogen sulphide which would cause a rotten egg smell).</p> <p>HB said that the prevailing wind determined which areas could smell it. He said he would check with the hospital whether they had seen a rise in respiratory conditions.</p> <p>PD said she had read that the odour problem may have been due to the slope of the site and asked how this would affect it.</p> <p>AH said that when Transwaste bought the site, Cell 5 was on a slope and not fully finished. It only had a temporary cap on and little to no gas capture infrastructure. They had stripped the cap back, tipped to the correct profile and started installing gas capture infrastructure. He believed that as they had re-engineered the slope and drilled into it to install the gas capture equipment, this had caused the release of odour.</p> <p>PD asked if trammel fines were being brought onto the site and whether Transwaste was licensed for this.</p> <p>AH confirmed that they are.</p> <p>PD asked if they were tested before tipping.</p>
--	--



	<p>AH confirmed that they are tested by the client and by Transwaste at a laboratory.</p> <p>RS said that there are obviously extensive plans for the landfill site, but many people in Fleetwood are under the impression that the completion of Cell 5 will be the end of the process. Although it was only a mothballed site, people are expecting it to return to this status and he wanted to know what efforts are being undertaken to communicate with the community that this isn't a 6-12 month process but a re-opening of the site. He also wanted to know what plans were in place for surface water management on the site and the risk of it reaching the River Wyre, how long it would take to balance the gas wells and what monitoring of the old Phase 1 area of the site takes place.</p> <p>AH said that the company has started the community liaison group, initiated a Facebook update page, is in the process of developing a website and a newsletter, and is spending £2m on developing a new cell. The site is permitted to be operational until 2033, but it depends on how fast waste comes in. If it reaches capacity sooner, it will close earlier.</p> <p>SJ said that there are two permitted surface water discharge outlets into the River Wyre. These are monitored on a monthly basis.</p> <p>AH said he would speak to CPL (the gas contractor) to get an estimate for the time to balance the wells. SJ said CPL have monitored the wells on the site for 20 years so have a good understanding of what is there. MB suggested that they should be invited to the next meeting to explain how the system works and what more can be done to reduce odour.</p> <p>Action: AH to invite CPL to the next meeting</p> <p>SJ said that in terms of monitoring the old Phase 1 site, it is surrounded by perimeter boreholes which are tested for water and gas to show nothing is leaving the site. That part of the site is capped and fully restored. There are no records of what was dumped from the 1970s, but it is not a live site and there is no excavation work to disturb it.</p>
--	--



BK said that the Environment Agency had sent her copies of all the reports that had been sent to them, including emissions and 20 different VOCs. BK asked if AH had sent in the annual reports. AA said this was already an action for AH to check.

BK said that was a high proportion of people in the area who do not have access to Facebook or the internet. BK suggested a hard copy newsletter would be a good way of reaching a wider audience. AA confirmed that this was being developed and would be sent out via mail.

RR asked that the distribution area covered the Cleveleys where residents were also affected.

Action:

AA to report back with proposals for newsletter distribution

BK said that the Jameson Road landfill is classed as a coastal landfill and the Wyre estuary is a site of special interest. Surface water is flowing into the estuary and the old part of the land fill (Phase1) was built on the site of the dispersal ponds which drained into the natural strata. BK said she would like to know when the licence was transferred from Suez, whether any consideration was given to the special conditions of a coastal landfill which the government are now closing down due to coastal erosion. BK said she was concerned about surface water running off the site and also water from the strata entering the estuary which she felt was a significant impact which should have been taken into consideration.

AA noted that the point regarding surface water had already been covered earlier in the meeting and answered by SJ.

AH confirmed that Phase 2 is a fully lined site so there is no water dispersal from this area. BK asked if the Environment Agency could confirm this as part of their Q&A.

SJ confirmed that issues regarding climate change and rising sea levels were considered by the consultant engineers as part of the cell design proposals and CQA. AH said that the bund wall was also assessed by the Environment Agency and as part of the CQA.



	<p>RR asked what monitoring would continue on the site after it has been completed and closed.</p> <p>SJ said that under the permitting regime there is a requirement for aftercare, monitoring and investment in site infrastructure for 60 years post closure. The finances for this have to be ringfenced before the permit is issued.</p> <p>AT said that the bad smell seems to be coming from the old cell which had needed to be reopened and asked if there were any plans to open any of the other old cells.</p> <p>AH said that Cell 5 was the only one which needed reopening. Any future work would be new waste going into modern, new cells.</p> <p>PD asked how high the site could be built under the existing planning permission. SJ said there was planning consent for 30m. AA asked how high it was now. SJ said it was 28m and that is the pre-settlement contour. PD asked if it had been measured. SJ said that the site is surveyed on a regular basis.</p> <p>JB asked if Transwaste were qualified to run a landfill. SJ said that the person in each role has the relevant qualifications for that role.</p> <p>PD said that the main qualification would be a CIWM or CIWAM qualification 173 level 4. SJ said he was the TCM (Technically Competent manager) and WAMITAB (CIWM) holder for the site. He had a backup with the same qualification.</p> <p>JBu said that the requirement for the EA permit was that the site had a TCM with a suitable qualification. It was not explicit that this had to be the site manager, but it was expected that there would be somebody on site with that relevant qualification.</p> <p>PD asked if they could have a copy of an organisational chart for the site. SJ said they could provide one.</p> <p>Action: SJ to provide staff structure chart for the site.</p> <p>BK said she had submitted a Freedom of Information request to Lancashire County Council to ask where BSE</p>
--	---



	<p>carcasses were buried and they had told her they “had no idea”, but AH had told her they were in Phase 1, not Phase 2.</p> <p>SJ said they would know by the date when Phase 1 was closed down. In addition, there is no work being undertaken on Phase 1, so if there are BSE carcasses in there, they are not being disturbed.</p> <p>PD said the responsibility for monitoring this would be with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>JBu said it was a matter of timing on when the permits on the site were issued/authorisations carried out, and when the carcasses were buried. He said he couldn’t give a definitive answer, but could report back.</p> <p>RS asked when the period of time for monitoring carcasses expired. JBu said he would need to get confirmation as the requirement was originally with MAFF and the DEFRA.</p> <p>Action: JBu to report back on dates of permits and removal of requirement to monitor.</p> <p>LBe asked if Transwaste could assure the group that there would be no more smells once the lining was finished. She said that the smell had changed on Tuesday at 5:30pm from the rotten onion smell to a landfill smell. She lives half a mile from the site but there was never a smell when Suez were there. She also wanted to know what the Environment Agency were doing to enforce it. She said that they had previously had a problem with the sewerage works and the fishmeal factory, but there wasn’t previously a problem with the landfill site.</p> <p>AH said that the capping would resolve the rotten egg odour problem. As mentioned earlier, they had to move some of the old waste and drill into it to install gas capture wells. This seemed to have cause the odour problem which was now being addressed by adding the new cap. He said it was like a pie – a liner goes in the bottom to stop anything leaking out, the site is filled with waste, and then an airtight, EA-approved welded liner is placed over the top to stop any odour escaping. Gas wells then</p>
--	---



	<p>extract any gas and burn it in gas engines to produce electricity.</p> <p>PD asked whether the site would be capped on a daily basis as otherwise there would be a smell from the trammel fines. AH said it is not possible to cap every night and Suez didn't do this either. PD said Suez covered it with soil every night.</p> <p>LBe said the problem seems to have started when Cell 5 was reopened. AH said that if Transwaste hadn't reopened Cell 5, whoever else had bought the site would have to have done the same. SJ said the problem was that the site needed to be completed and it was necessary to enter a cell that had been mothballed for eight years where they had hit pockets of gas that had not been captured by the previous operator.</p> <p>HB asked when Cell 5 would be capped. AH said they need 10 working days with good weather. SJ said it was not just a case of the weather being good for one day – the surface has to be dry for welding and heavy rain can prevent machinery accessing the site, so one day of rain can lose several days of work.</p> <p>BK asked if waste deliveries would be stopped in the meantime so that all resources could be concentrated on finishing the capping. SJ said it was an independent contractor undertaking the work so the tipping was not related to the capping.</p> <p>RS said although Transwaste was confident of stopping the rotten eggs odour, could they give any guarantees about the general bin smell which seems to be around mostly in a morning. AH said that they can resolve the issue with odour coming from the old waste in Cell 5, but even new waste does have a smell to it. RS said it was never a problem previously.</p> <p>AA suggested that Transwaste's obligations to manage odour was perhaps a question to ask the EA.</p> <p>Q&A Session – Environment Agency</p> <p>BK asked for an update on the enforcement action to be taken against Transwaste as the capping was not</p>
--	---



	<p>complete. JBu said they will need to check on compliance and to what degree there was non-compliance. The next steps would be determined by this assessment. He expected that EA officers would currently be on site.</p> <p>BK said she had asked Lancashire County Council what due diligence they had done when transferring the site to Transwaste and they had told her that any due diligence would fall under the Environment Agency's remit. BK wanted to know what due diligence the Environment Agency had undertaken when transferring the permit from Suez to Transwaste. JBu said that planning was a separate issue to permitting, although a site requires both to operate. He said they would normally look for any relevant convictions in terms of their ability to run a site. BK asked what due diligence would have been done. JR said the best thing to do would be for them to speak to their permitting team and report back.</p> <p>Action: EA to check due diligence with permitting team</p> <p>RS asked whether there were any spot checks of vehicles going into the site as part of their compliance monitoring. JBu said that was not part of the EA's remit – their focus was on ensuring the operator reduces odour. RS asked who would have the power to stop vehicles. JBu said that would be the police or the DVSA.</p> <p>JB asked why the EA wasn't releasing the recent CAR form. JBU said there was a 28-day period when the operator has a right to appeal. JB said she had requested it and it was now over the 28-day period. JBu said he would follow it up</p> <p>Action: EA to check on CAR form.</p> <p>JB said that in the last minutes it stated that the EA were not health professionals, but also that annoyance alone can cause physical symptoms. JB wanted to know how the EA could make that comment about a community of thousands of people. JBu said he wasn't at the meeting but believed the EA was relaying advice received. JR said that the EA has multi-agency meetings with UKHSA and NHS England. The EA wouldn't want to give people</p>
--	--



	<p>health advice, but they are sharing information with UKHSA to understand any health implications.</p> <p>JB said there was no communication between the EA and UKHSA, and local doctors surgeries. JR said that was exactly why they were talking to UKHSA and the NHS. If JB didn't feel that information was getting through, that was something the EA could pick up.</p> <p>RS suggested inviting Prof Mark Spencer to the next meeting as lead GP for Fleetwood. AA also suggested that a representative from UKHSA is also invited to the next meeting to explain the health implications of the EA's monitoring results.</p> <p>Action: AA to invite Prof Mark Spencer (via RS) and UKHSA representative (via the EA) to the next meeting.</p> <p>PD said that many EA judgements on nuisance odour were based on olfactory monitoring and asked if this was self-defeating as one of the symptoms of hydrogen sulphide poisoning was loss of smell. JBu said that different officers were sent out at different times of the day. He didn't feel there was a risk of not being able to sense the odour due to overwhelm.</p> <p>PD said there was one case of Wyre Council sending an officer out to sit in someone's house for an hour smelling the air. JBu said that wasn't the method that the EA uses.</p> <p>PD asked what levels of hydrogen sulphide had been detected so far. JBu said that these were reported in the community update and the last level was 0.008 parts per million at the highest point. Officers were going out daily and testing across the area. They also do spot checks using the hydrogen sulphide meter. They are also monitoring on site and they have the testing unit set up in the community at the Copse Road depot.</p> <p>PD asked which gas smells like onions. JBu said he didn't know but smell was very subjective. PD said she didn't know either, but she had met people who had worked on landfill sites and sewerage works nobody knows what the smell is.</p>
--	--

AT asked whether monitoring was also being undertaken at night as this was when it seemed to be worse.

JBu said officers had been out early in the morning and he will get feedback from their results. JR said they could modify their monitoring based on feedback from residents.

Action:

EA to provide feedback from monitoring.

CR said members of her family suffer from asthma and the smell is causing breathing difficulties and sickness, whether there is a physical cause or not.

AA suggested that this should be a topic to follow up with the UKHSA at the next meeting.

JB said that EA advice was to close doors and windows but the smell still gets into the house, and in the recent hot weather this hasn't been practical. She asked what else residents could do. JBu said this advice was from UKHSA and he would ask them about any further precautions that could be taken.

LBe asked what the EA plans were and when they are going to stop the smell if there was new waste coming in. She had lived in Fleetwood for 60 years and had never smelled this smell before. At 1:23am she had to shut the windows because of the smell. At 5:30 she had to get up as the smell was so bad. Everyone else in the street had their windows shut. She asked what the EA were going to do about it as if the site wasn't being run properly, it should be closed down. JBu said he wasn't dismissive of the impacts and was looking at options following the expiry of the notice. As it was an ongoing investigation, he couldn't go into details. JR said that today was a critical day as staff were out on site and tomorrow there would be an internal meeting to look at the condition of the site in relation to compliance with the notice requirements and decide what the next steps as a regulator should be.

BK wanted to go back to the EA's comments from the UKHSA. Fleetwood is in the top ten deprived areas in England, which means it has a vulnerable population with respect to health. It has twice the UK level of COPD and

a higher than average incidence of mental health disorders and has a higher mortality rate in the under-75s. Any health advice from the UKHSA must bear that in mind. She wanted to know why the EA hadn't represented the UKHSA information correctly taking into account the background of the Fleetwood population.

JBu said the UKHSA would be able to respond to this at the next meeting. JR said it wasn't the EA's intention to underplay any partner's advice. If there was something that needed to be modified, they would look at this.

BK said that there had been problems at landfill sites across the UK and the EA gave the same advice each time. It wasn't good enough to say that it was just a smell and the hydrogen sulphide levels were low. The EA were publishing incorrect advice. She said the UKHSA updated their advice from 2009 to 2021 based on 23 scientific papers – 12 years' worth. She said 23 scientific papers were not sufficient to update advice and it would be useful to have the UKHSA at the next meeting. In her professional opinion the odour coming off the landfill site is significantly impacting on the health and well-being of the people of Fleetwood, and that the health impact was totally predictable when the site was opened, in her opinion as a registered medical health professional.

PD asked what Transwaste was licensed to take, particularly the code numbers. She said she could only find 07s and 1603s. JBu said he couldn't list them all now but they would be listed on their environmental permit. PD said she couldn't find any 1912s anywhere. JBu said he would check but he thought they could accept certain types of 1912s under the permit.

Action:

EA to report back on what waste can be accepted under the permit and whether it was being monitored.

BK asked that the EA take on board her comments about monitoring of VOHCs in the annual report that Suez used to provide.



Q&A – Wyre Council

PD asked why phone calls to the EA aren't fed through to Wyre Council and if so why. NG said that it was correct but the council has meetings with the EA on weekly basis. PD asked why the numbers for the EA and Wyre don't match up.

NG said that the EA are the primary regulator for the site but Wyre has a role.

PD said it seemed like they are both collecting information but not talking to each other. PD asked why a release clause couldn't be added to the EA questionnaire so that information could be shared with the council so that this could be used for an abatement notice.

NG said that in terms of an abatement notice, it is different legislation. The EA are the primary regulator and they control the permit. The council can check people's houses as this is what the statutory nuisance legislation is for – to check if the resident is being affected in their home. The council is communicating with the EA and they are getting information about the complaints they are receiving, but the council also needs to gather the additional evidence to demonstrate a statutory nuisance, whereas the primary legislation is much broader and the permit controls the odour issue. The EA and council meet once a week to go through the complaints and the UKHSA and NHS also attend to provide advice.

CM said the best evidence that residents can give the council is diary evidence. They don't need to report it every time they notice the smell. As soon as someone registers a complaint with the council, they are sent a diary sheet.

BN said lots of people on Harbour Village do not have a diary sheet.

CM said they had sent out a lot of sheets. Once the council had received a sheet back, they would make contact with that person and will go out to try and witness the odour at the property, as this is what statutory nuisance legislation is based on. If someone is walking down the road and they can smell it, that wouldn't constitute a statutory nuisance – it has to affect the

enjoyment of their home and the council needs to gather evidence of this.

NG said the primary legislation would take care of the general odour as this should be controlled via the permit.

BK said she couldn't see why the council couldn't just send out the diary sheets to everyone. NG said as part of the legislation, the council isn't allowed to canvass for complaints.

BK said she estimated that the council had received over 7,000 complaints, but they haven't given out any information about diary sheets and from what she could tell, not everyone was receiving them. The council had known for months that there is an odour that is preventing people from enjoying their property. It doesn't have to be harmful to health for a statutory nuisance notice. She wanted to know if the council had prepared its case for a Statutory Nuisance Notice and if they had given notice to Transwaste that they are going to issue one.

NG said they hadn't at the moment as they are as they are working as a multi-agency team to gather diary evidence.

BK asked how many diary sheets they had received back. CM said just a handful. BK said she wanted to know how many diary sheets had been sent out as she felt just a handful of responses was very low for the number of initial complaints received.

NG said very often people make a complaint about odour but then don't follow up with a diary record and that weakens their case – this is always the same with any statutory nuisance investigation. The council makes it very clear in their letter that it is important that they provide diary evidence.

JBu clarified that the EA is the primary regulator and they are taking a course of action. Wyre Council support them but they need to have discussion about who is the most appropriate agency to take action at what point.

BK asked whether it was a legal issue that the council couldn't issue a statutory notice when the EA is investigating. JBu said that he wasn't a legal professional

but he could go away and clarify. BK said that she had spoken to a legal professional already but they seemed to be going round in circles with each agency blaming each other for not taking action. CM said she could point her to the government website where it details the process.

Action:

Wyre Council to provide update on the number of diary sheets sent out. The EA to clarify the legal position regarding issuing a statutory notice.

RS said he understood that the council couldn't canvass for complaints, but he wanted to know if the council was proactively following up on complaints when diary sheets have been issued to ensure that people were completing and returning them. CM said that the council did follow up calls to people who have made a complaint and once diary sheets were submitted they contacted them again to see if they could visit them in their home. A lot of staff are local residents so they are also getting feedback from them. But they do have to collect evidence in a format that complies with the legislation. In terms of issuing a statutory nuisance notice with respect to primary legislation, this would require permission from the Secretary of State.

BK asked if she could take some diary sheets to distribute to residents. CM said she could arrange for them to be printed, but to bear in mind NG's comments that you can't canvass for complaints.

CR asked if they could publicise the availability of the diary sheets. CM said that was fine.

RB said he didn't want to understate the distress the odour has caused in Fleetwood. The council has tried to monitor the situation, to talk to officials and to talk to Transwaste, and the primary objective is to get rid of the smell as fast as possible. What they didn't need at this stage was any complex legal process that could slow this down. As far as he was concerned, the work is being done, it is being supervised by the EA and he wanted to make sure this was completed as soon as possible. That had to be the primary objective – to make this happen and ensure there are no legal processes that could hold it up.



	<p>AT asked how many completed diary sheets would be required to initiate a Statutory Nuisance Notice. NG said that they will review evidence as they receive it, but the notice has to be based on evidence. The more evidence they can gather, the stronger the case. The minimum number would depend on the case, but they have taken cases based on one complainant.</p> <p>BK asked how many cases for statutory nuisance the council had taken in the last 10 years. NG said they served abatement notices all the time and those notices tended to achieve the desired result.</p> <p>BK asked why the council is gathering evidence for a statutory notice if they could issue an abatement notice. CM explained that if they determine that a statutory nuisance exists, they have a statutory duty to issue a statutory nuisance notice within seven days. BK asked why the council didn't think there was a statutory nuisance. CM explained that at the same time they are investigating a complaint, they are also trying to resolve the problem and very often can obtain compliance through this approach.</p>
6.	<p>AOB</p> <p>RB said it would be good to arrange a site visit prior to the next meeting. AA noted that everyone would like a site visit.</p> <p>Action: AA to liaise with Transwaste to provide a series of dates that group members can book onto.</p> <p>AA suggested the next meeting should be on a Friday morning to try and accommodate MPs. LBe said it could be on another day if MP are allowed to send representatives. AA will liaise with the council to find a suitable date.</p>
6.	<p>Chair's closing remarks and next steps / next meeting</p> <p>AA thanked everyone for attending.</p>



Date of next meeting	TBC
-----------------------------	-----

Meeting Protocol	
Distribute agenda before meeting	Fix responsibilities for each item
Start on time	Finish on time
Set out your ground rules	Publish minutes / actions
Stick to the agenda	Continuous improvement