



Minutes of CLG Meeting.

Meeting title	Community Liaison Group – January Meeting	
Location	Wyre Council, Civic Centre, Breck Rd, Poulton-le-Fylde FY6 7PU	
Date/ time	Friday 31 January 2024, 10:00-12:30	
Originator	Transwaste	
Attendees	Andrew Acum – Mercury – AA Helen Ashworth – Lancashire County Council - LA Howard Ballard – Resident - HB Lorraine Beavers MP – Fleetwood Town Council / Wyre Council / Lancashire County Council - LB Mark Billington – Wyre Council – MB Cllr Roger Berry – Wyre Council – RB Jess Brown – Resident - JB Pam Diamond – Resident – PD David Graham – Independent Chair - DG Alex Hornshaw – Transwaste – AH Sam Juggins – Transwaste – SJ Corinne Mason – Wyre Council – CM Graham Millar – Environment Agency – GM Cllr Richard Rendell – Wyre Council – RR Angela Thomas – Resident – AT Victoria Wells – Wyre Council and Policy Advisor - VW	
Apologies	Barbara Kneale – Resident – BK	
Purpose of meeting	Discuss future plans and ongoing operations at the Transwaste Jameson Road facility.	
Minute of last meeting	<u>Approved</u>	
	1.	Chair’s welcome and introductions DG welcomed everyone to the first meeting of 2025, asked for declarations of interest and invited everyone to introduce themselves.
	2.	Minutes of Last Meeting The minutes of the last meeting were agreed.



3.	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>AA confirmed that the list of tests had been sent out as requested.</p> <p>DG confirmed that all items requested had been circulated.</p>
4.	<p>Transwaste Update</p> <p>Storm damage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record breaking winds caused damage to the cap and litter nets • Two days prepping cap for repairs • Two teams now repairing the cap • Litter nets bent in storm • Mobile nets are currently in place • Permanent nets now being repaired <p>Litter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the damage to the nets had litter picking teams patrolling the perimeter of the site – 11 people on Saturday and 5 people on Sunday • Also promoted the telephone hotline via Facebook and web page to report wind-blown litter • A small amount of waste was blown offsite (a couple of bin liners worth) • All wind-blown waste was recovered within 24 hours <p>Odour/January Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in levels of waste odour in January • Partially caused by work to raise the leachate chambers in Cell 6 • The leachate chambers are concrete rings, similar to drainage inspection chambers (manholes in old fashioned terminology) • There are three of these in Cell 6 and as the level of waste rises, they have to raise the level of the leachate chambers by installing more rings on top of the existing ones. • The work involved having to move some waste around to work on them and then move the waste back around them again afterwards.



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odour assessments did not indicate a problem, but the colder, heavier air caused the odour to linger. • As a result of full EA validation of Cell 6, they needed to undertake some engineering work • This involved reprofiling and levelling waste across the full cell to butt up to Cell 4 and fill in the “valley” with soft waste to prevent damage to the liner. • The benefit of this is that it means a longer gap before there is a need to extend the leachate chambers again. • They have also installed the next phase of gas capture infrastructure. • This should prevent any future recurrence of the problems experienced with cell 5. • Unfortunately some waste that needed to be moved did smell worse than usual. • Rather than wait and risk letting the smell get worse, they tried to move it as quickly as possible so that they could re-cover it as quickly as possible afterwards. <p>EA Inspection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AH said that there was an unannounced inspection on Tuesday • Inspected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Odour - Storm damage - Litter fencing - Tipping face - Site perimeter to check for litter - Rainwater run-off to estuary • AH said he would let the EA update further <p>Permit Variation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transwaste have submitted a permit variation for the site • This would allow them to use a concrete hard standing tipping bay • This will allow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Faster movement and tipping of waste - More focused emplacement of the waste • Faster turnaround of vehicles allows them to fill the site and cover waste faster
--	--	---

	<p>Community Fund / Restoration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transwaste has set up a Community Fund totalling approx. £85,000 that local groups can apply for • They will bring more details on application criteria, etc. to the February meeting • The restoration plan for site was agreed with LCC by Suez • Transwaste is currently looking at what input CLG can have within this plan or alternatives • Speaking to LCC and will bring more details back to the February meeting <p>RB asked if the litter had come from the hole in the capping or from the operational area. AH said it would have come from the operational area as this was where the nets were blown down. RB asked if it was covered at the end of the day. AH confirmed that it was well-covered but the winds were exceptionally strong – an articulated lorry was blown over offsite.</p> <p>HB asked if tipping in the bay would exacerbate the odour problem. LB felt that disturbing the waste twice would potentially make the odour problem worse. AH said that it would allow them to get the waste onto site and into the cell faster so that it would spend less time in the lorry and they could spend more time covering it over. GM clarified that Transwaste had only applied to vary the permit. The request would be considered by the EA and they would make a decision on this. There would be an advertised six-week consultation period which would start on Monday. If it was accepted, there would be a draft variation to the permit produced which would then be subject to a secondary consultation. At the end of the period, the EA would write a decision record explaining the reasons for the decision. RR asked whether views from this meeting would be taken into account. DG said details of the consultation and the variation application would be needed before anyone could form a view. VW said that LB had set up an Environmental Stakeholder Group and they would probably like to submit a response. VW said that her understanding was that any variation to the permit would require a new EIA. HA clarified that this was not the case as EIAs only apply to planning applications, not permitting. VW asked about the provision of annual monitoring reports as part of the planning conditions. HA</p>
--	---



	<p>said that they were in discussions with Transwaste about this, but that it was a different matter to the permit variation. PD asked if the waste tipped in the bay would be relocated immediately so that nothing was left overnight. AH confirmed that it would be. SJ said that all the technical details and risk assessments would be included in the application.</p> <p>CM asked whether the leachate chambers could be built higher in advance to reduce the number of times waste had to be disturbed. SJ said they could only raise it a few metres each time as it needs the support of the waste around it.</p> <p>CM asked if the gas capture infrastructure was installed in advance of tipping. SJ said that there was a three-stage approach which included progressive installation of sacrificial infrastructure with horizontal pipes and pin wells 4-5 metres deep. After tipping 4-5 metres, they are now looking to install the second layer of this infrastructure. This sacrificial infrastructure gets buried as waste is tipped. Once they have reached final profile they will install permanent deep vertical wells. All gas work is independently managed and controlled by the gas contractor rather than Transwaste.</p> <p>CM asked if they were confident they had done everything they can. SJ said that normally they would remove the capping on Cell 5 to allow them to tip up to it, but because of previous issues they have left this in place. Now that they have been able to place soft material against the liner to protect it, the process should become more normal. GM said that the valley feature was not normal but was a corrective feature due to the events of last year.</p> <p>AT asked if waste would have to be moved every time the leachate chambers need extending. SJ said that now the site was up to the level, not as much work would be required in the future.</p> <p>LB asked what the total lifespan of the site would be. SJ said that to bring it up to final profile would be 4-5 years, depending on whether they could tip at maximum permitted levels. After this, there would be a period of restoration and then ongoing site management. LB asked if individuals would be personally liable if the company</p>
--	--



	<p>ceases to exist. SJ said that the permitting process requires a financial provision/bond based on expenditure for the site for 60 years' maintenance and management. GM added that although it is right to question it, it is a rare scenario.</p> <p>VW asked on behalf of BK what the maximum topographical height of the site would be. She believed it would be 26m. SJ said that it was 26m post settlement and 30m pre-settlement. The site is at about 28m at the peak at the moment. RB said it was definitely worth taking up the offer of a site visit in order to get a better idea of the site layout.</p> <p>JB said she couldn't always make the site visits due to the timings. AH said that if she got in touch he would arrange a bespoke visit for her. This offer was also extended to other group members, subject to site operations.</p> <p>JB said that the weather is frequently used as an excuse although this didn't seem to be an issue for other landfill sites and what could be done to rectify this. AH said that increased gas capture, temporary capping and making an early start on permanent capping would all help with gas capture and odour control. The plan was to progressively permanently cap the site and install permanent gas capture infrastructure rather than wait for it to reach final profile.</p>
5.	<p>EA Monitoring Update</p> <p>In December there were 21 odour updates but this rose to 250 in January.</p> <p>Odour surveys had been undertaken for the last two weeks and these would continue for at least another week.</p> <p>They are also getting more information through from the operator and they had undertaken three inspections during January. They have agreed the appropriate level of cover with Transwaste and when they inspected on 28 January corrective action had been taken.</p>



	<p>The storm had caused some damage and when staff undertook surveys beforehand, they were getting a waste odour, but just afterwards they were picking up a waste odour with a bit of gas as well due to the damage to the liner. This correlated with what the public had reported.</p> <p>The air quality monitoring unit remained in place and they hadn't needed to use regulatory powers this month.</p> <p>HB asked if the gas from site was burnt or taken away. SJ said that the gas is entirely collected by the gas contractor and burned in the turbines to generate electricity which is then supplied to the Grid. There was therefore a financial incentive to capture as much gas as possible and not let any escape.</p> <p>HB asked whether there was a risk of fire. SJ said that the gas operator had to carefully balance gas extraction, trying to suck in as much gas as possible without sucking in oxygen. When the capped ripped off, they had to reduce extraction from that cell to avoid sucking in oxygen.</p> <p>VW asked whether the damage to the cap was weather related and what the turnaround time would be to replace them. AH said that Storm Eowyn had ripped the liner. This was extremely unusual as it had ripped in the centre rather than the wind getting under the edge. The liner had previously withstood storms with no problem and was installed to CQA standards. Repair time was weather dependent, but he was hopeful that it would be completed by the end of the week. SJ said that the work is undertaken by an independent specialist contractor who has to deliver the work which is then tested and approved by an independent assessor.</p> <p>JB asked why Transwaste were allowed to continue tipping. GM said that it was dependent on a number of different factors. Tipping was suspended last year to allow them to focus on capping. In January, the corrective action required was different. If they suspended tipping it would delay the corrective work and could make the problem worse. It was an unusual situation, but suspending tipping wouldn't have been the most appropriate or effective action.</p>
--	--



	<p>JB asked if there was a timeline for when Transwaste needed to complete the work. AH said the work was completed.</p> <p>JB said there were reports from Harbour Village of odour yesterday. GM said there is still a source of odour on site until this is capped. Whether or not people could smell that offsite he couldn't say.</p> <p>VW asked if there were any additional regulatory concerns with coastal landfills, particularly with rising sea levels, and the original permits and planning applications. DG said at the last meeting it was clarified that all necessary assessments had been done and the sea defences had been signed off. In order for there to be a requirement to revisit this, there would either need to be a new application or new legislation. SJ confirmed that he had shared via email the discussion between the EA technical specialists and the consulting engineers who designed the site regarding the assessment of the sea wall with respect to sea level rise.</p>
6.	<p>Wyre Council Update</p> <p>CM confirmed that they had also seen a rise in complaints, from zero in December to 54 in January. These figures were different to the EA figures, but this was to be expected as the council promotes the EA hotline as the primary regulator. All complainants were contacted to advise them of what they needed to do if they wanted to take the complaint further.</p> <p>HB asked whether the complaints were forwarded to the EA. CM said that all complaints are discussed at the fortnightly multi-agency meeting which is attended by the EA.</p> <p>JB said that according to BK's FOI request, Transwaste had two breaches of their contract. She wanted to know what they were and what Wyre Council had done about it. CM asked if any details had been supplied. JB said it had been posted on the internet so she would get details.</p>



	7.	Lancashire County Council VW asked about the 2022 environmental report. HA said a site meeting had taken place where the progressive restoration scheme had been discussed along with perimeter planting. The annual topographical survey and annual monitoring report are currently being carried out and these would be submitted shortly.
	8.	AOB DG proposed that the next meeting would be used to discuss the information provided for the consultation. This would not be a formal CLG meeting but would allow the EA to explain the application and consultation process and afterwards individuals could discuss their thoughts. This was scheduled for 27 February at 10:30.
	9.	Chair's closing remarks and next steps / next meeting DG thanked everyone for attending and their useful input. Next meeting is proposed for Thursday 13 March at 10:30am
Date of next meeting	Thursday 13 March at 10:30am at the Civic Centre, Breck Rd, Poulton-le-Fylde FY6 7PU	

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