

Pendock Environmental Liaison Group

Minutes of Meeting

held on Thursday 13th November 2014, at 6.00 pm
at Eldersfield Lawn School

Present:	Bronwen Behan (Chairman)	Malvern Hills District Councillor
	Harold Davis	Eldersfield Parish Council
	Edward Philipson-Stow	Pendock Estates (part time)
	Charles Rush	Pendock Parish Council
	Sally Rush	Representative of Public
	Barbara Weaver	Representative of Public
	Peter Bishop	Worcestershire County Council

District Councillor Bronwen Behan took the chair at 6.03 and declared the meeting open.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Tom Wells (Worcestershire County Councillor) and Emma Munday (Environment Agency).

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The Chairman asked if there were any comments on the draft minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 10th July 2014 and circulated before the meeting. There were two. It was proposed that the day of the previous meeting be corrected from Monday to Thursday and that the sentence 'In future this would no longer be the case' be deleted. Subject to these changes, the minutes were adopted as a true record of that meeting, *nem con*.

3. Matters Arising

Plastic waste had been mentioned at the previous meeting and its continued presence outside the site, by the gate, was noted. It was recognised that an explanation could be provided only by Mr Philipson-Stow and, given his absence, it was decided to postpone the matter.

4. Report from Neighbouring Residents

Mrs Rush advised the meeting that Mrs Felton had moved away from the area and would no longer participate in the Liaison Group but that Mrs Weaver would assume her place during the present meeting.

The Chairman asked to be placed on record the thanks of the Group for Mrs Felton's enthusiastic support of the task the Group had assumed and to wish her well in her new abode. At the same time, the Chairman offered a warm welcome to Mrs Weaver.

Odour

Mrs Weaver opened by advising members that she had not yet decided whether she would be a long term member of the Group.

With respect to odour she said that she was aware of no complaints being made since the last meeting and that odour, although occasionally detectable, had not been problematic.

Mr Rush said that there were piles of odoriferous apples. In discussion the view was adopted that any run off from the apples was within a bunded area and was therefore confined to site.

The Chairman said that this performance represented an improvement on the previous year and she wondered whether this had been the result of improvements in processes at the site.

Mrs Rush said that flies had not been a problem but that there had, however, been a problem with water ponding on the road at the entrance to the site. Mr Davis suggested that this might have been caused by a depression in the road surface caused by heavy vehicles turning into the site and asked Mr Bishop to request that Highways investigate the matter; Mr Bishop undertook to do so.

It was remarked that there was erosion of the verges.

Mr Davis then said that the A438 at the point where a bridge carries the M50 over it had been closed in order that repairs to the bridge could be undertaken safely. This, he said, had caused the diversion of traffic and this diversion would have contributed to an increase in the traffic passing the site. Because bats had been discovered hibernating under the bridge, repair work had been suspended until the bats came out of hibernation. He thought that if an effective bat survey been carried out prior to the repairs being started, the period of closure of the road could have been better managed. Mr Bishop concurred.

Mrs Weaver then raised the question of bio-aerosol monitoring and asked who was responsible for performing it. She noted that Mr Philipson-Stow had agreed to perform such monitoring every six months but she had not seen any reports. The Chairman was unable to assist.

Mrs Rush advised that there was an obvious deficit of attention to weed control and cutting. She had no confidence that Mr Philipson-Stow would respond to a request to rectify these matters.

Mr Bishop advised that planting was dealt with in Condition 18 of the permission and he agreed that maintenance and required. This was the appropriate season for such action.

6. Pendock Environmental Report

[Mr Philipson-Stow arrived.]

Mr Philipson-Stow apologised for his late arrival, caused by traffic jams in Gloucester.

Plastic Waste

Mr Philipson-Stow was invited to comment on plastic waste.

He said that what he believe had been referred to as ‘plastic waste’ was in fact ‘oversize’ material, only some of which was plastic. It would be treated again and the plastic would be sent to landfill.

He noted that the site was now receiving less plastic in waste than previously because of better controls by the despatching authorities – he suggested that the proportion was less than 1%.

Throughput

He gave the following throughput figures for 2014 (which had been advised to the EA and were in the public domain):

	MT
January to March	326
April to June	509
July to September	649
October	350

Mr Davis invited the meeting to note that from Q2 to Q3 there had been a 30% increase in throughput but that there had been no reported problems from local residents.

Mr Philipson-Stow then explained that he expected his PAS 100 status shortly to be confirmed. Such confirmation was contingent upon his providing two further samples which met the required standard.

He noted that as part of the certification process the inspectors had been shocked by the version of the operating procedures which the EA had approved. The EA had made a number of recommendations, e.g. that he should monitor temperatures and leave a 12” gap between windrows but the new recommendations went further and required him to take additional measure, such as recording rejected loads. He believed that the process of applying for certification had been highly beneficial.

Plastic

Mr Philipson-Stow said that there had been a delivery of green waste which contained a large number of plastic sacks. This would have to be dealt with and the plastic placed in a skip. The charge would be sent to the operator who delivered the load.

Bio-aerosols

Mrs Weaver enquired about bio-aerosol monitoring.

Mr Philipson-Stow replied that he was under no obligation to perform such monitoring, unless required to do so by the EA or WCC. He had performed such monitoring in the past – at a cost of £3,000 and he had no objection to performing such monitoring again but would expect others to bear the cost.

He remarked that bio-aerosols were not necessarily odoriferous and that when the odour had been most acute the bio-aerosol reports indicated that bio-aerosol pathogens (*Aspergillus Fumigatus*) were within tolerable levels.

Mr Rush said that the cost of bio-aerosol monitoring was the sort of cost which was properly associated with the business.

The Chairman asked when the testing had been done and asked whether it had been done on the day of shredding. Mr Davis asked whether such testing was crucial and whether the EA should not make it mandatory. Mr Rush said again that bio-aerosols were not necessarily accompanied by odour.

Mr Philipson-Stow repeated the comment which he had made earlier, viz. that he was under no obligation to perform bio-aerosol monitoring.

The Chairman said that the confidence of local people was at stake and that in her view it was necessary to refer the matter to the EA.

Mr Rush said that at the time the bio-aerosols were tested many local residents were complaining of health problems. Although there were now no health complaints, this was against a background of a throughput of ca 2,000 MT pa and not the 9,000 MT pa for which permission had been given. As the higher figure was approached he thought that perhaps bio-aerosol testing should be implemented; he noted that a local farmer had been very concerned about his livestock. He regretted the fact that the Planning Committee had appeared unconcerned by these matters.

Mr Davis expressed his desire for the EA to comment.

The Chairman asked that these matters be minuted.

Activity

Mr Philipson-Stow said that the year had been quiet. Activity had slowed dramatically. He had taken 65MT from Castlemorton Common. He expected to be treating reeds from the waterways. He had received two loads of apples during the week.

Mr Rush asked why Mr Philipson-Stow had applied for permission for 9,000 MT pa if his throughput was only 2,000 MT. Mr Philipson-Stow responded that he had applied for the higher figure in 2011 when he expected throughput to increase; that increase had not materialised, in part because of lower than expected volumes from Severn Waste, his principal customer.

Mr Rush suggested that the Planning Committee members had been 'taken in' by his application for 9,000 MT.

The Chairman reminded the meeting that all councils had recycling targets, and that such targets included green waste. The capacity to deal with that waste must exist before councils undertook collection.

Mr Rush said again that all findings were on the basis of a throughout of ca 2,000 MT and not the 9,000 MT pa for which permission had been granted.

Water

Mrs Weaver asked Mr Philipson-Stow what he had done to prevent water escaping the site.

Mr Philipson-Stow asked that new members familiarise themselves with the minutes of previous meetings in order to avoid wasting the time of members on matters which had already been dealt with. Those minutes were available from the secretary.

He then explained that water was stored on site in an underground 55,000 litre tank; at some not inconsiderable cost, he had bought a water tanker and emptied that tank when appropriate.

7. Regulatory Authorities' Update

7.a Worcestershire County Council

Mr Bishop said that Kirk Denton and Lucy Yates had left the Council and that their replacement, Mark Lean, was expected to be in post with effect from 1st December.

Meanwhile, his department had employed a consultant who earlier in the day had visited the site unannounced. The consultant reported that

- the landscaping was overgrown;
- some material on the right hand side of the gate appeared to be over the permitted 3m in height;
- wooden pallets were being stored;
- fruit (apples and peppers) were on site and he wondered if they were contaminated with much plastic (Mr Philipson-Stow said that if severely contaminated they would be rejected);
- he had not detected odour on the site;
- there was no evidence of fly-tipping at the lay by (which Mr Philipson-Stow said he had banded off).

For clarification, Mr Bishop said that the protection of human health was the duty of the EA and he was certain that, if that protection was compromised, the EA would have no hesitation in closing the site.

7.b Environment Agency

Not represented

8. Parish Councils' Report

8.a Pendock Parish Council

Mr Rush noted that there had been in the past one incident of an illegal discharge of water into ditches and asked what action had been taken by the EA to detect any further breaches.

Mr Philipson-Stow said that he was unable to reply for the EA but that he was aware of no further breaches. He also commented that the EA, when investigating the incident mentioned, had said that it was likely that a greater threat to the health of local residents was posed by their septic tanks than by the water that had been discharged.

Mr Rush also asked what action had been, or could be, taken to prevent water spilling out on to the road. Mr Philipson-Stow said that he was unaware of flooding on site, which he visited almost daily.

8.b Eldersfield Parish Council

Mr Davis confirmed that he had no further comments.

9. Date of Next Meeting

After discussion it was provisionally agreed that the next meeting would take place on Thursday 5th March 2015 at 6.00 p.m.

[The date and venue will be advised by the Secretary].

There being no further business the meeting closed at 7.20 p.m.

JLG
15.11.14

Previous Meetings

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Venue</u>
1	31 st May 2012	10.00 a.m.	
2	10 th July 2012	5.00 p.m.	Eldersfield Lawn School
3	20 th September 2012	5.00 p.m.	Berrow & Pendock Hall
4	8 th November 2012	5.00 p.m.	Eldersfield Lawn School
5	7 th March 2013	5.00 p.m.	Berrow & Pendock Hall
6	19 th June 2013	5.00 p.m.	Berrow & Pendock Hall
7	12 th September 2013	6.30 p.m.	Eldersfield Lawn School
8	4 th November 2013	6.30 p.m.	Eldersfield Lawn School
9	17 th March 2014	7.00 p.m.	Berrow & Pendock Hall
10	10 th July 2014	6.00 p.m.	Eldersfield Lawn School