

Please note these are draft minutes until approved and signed at the next meeting.

**NORTH PARK QUARRY COMMUNITY LIAISON COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN THE  
BLETCHINGLEY COMMUNITY CENTRE  
WEDNESDAY 20 JANUARY 2010**

P R E S E N T

Cllr Marian Myland (MM)	Tandridge District Council (TDC) (Chair)
Mike Hurley (MH)	Sibelco UK
Keith Harrod (KH)	Sibelco UK
Tony Green (TG)	Sibelco UK
Jason Young (JY)	Sibelco UK
Alan Stones (AS)	SCC CPA
John Phillips (JP)	TDC Planning Dept.
Cllr Tony Elias (TE)	Surrey County Council (SCC)
Cllr Gill Black (GB)	Tandridge District Council (TDC)
Ann Butler (EAB)	Bletchingley Parish Council (BPC)
Keith Knox (KK)	Godstone Parish Council (GPC)
Felicity Gresser (FG)	Godstone Village Association (GVA)
Len Lelliott (LL)	Godstone Village Association (GVA)
Simon Terry (ST)	Quarry Observation Group (QOG)
Ralph Jones (RJ)	QOG
Angela Balfour (AB)	QOG
David Balfour (DB)	QOG
Ed Muller (EM)	Bletchingley Historical and Conservation Society
Kim Wantling (KW)	Secretary

**01/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**Action**

No apologies were received.

**02/10 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING** held on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2009.

2.1 These were approved and signed by the Chair.

2.2 FG enquired as to whether the sample dust complaint form had been circulated. KW would check and AS would resend the dust form in any event. No other matters were raised from the minutes.

KW/  
AS

**03/10 REPORT OF THE DUST SUB-COMMITTEE**

KH noted that a meeting of the Dust Sub-Committee was held on the 18<sup>th</sup> January. Matters arising from the previous meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2009 were reviewed and new data reported on and discussed. There have been no dust related issues since the last meeting. Three mobile water sprays are now deployed in the quarry area. This is in addition to all the sprays around the plant site, raw sand and product stockpile areas. An action log has been produced and actions will be reported back at the next Dust Sub-Committee planned for 10 March 2010.

LL stated that there was some confusion over the differing Dust Plans. The

**Please note these are draft minutes until approved and signed at the next meeting.**

Company's Dust Control Plan (2008 – revised 2009) set out various dust levels and triggers, which were in turn included in the Liaison Group Terms of Reference (TOR). The dust scheme submitted to SCC by the Company did not refer to these dust levels. AS stated that dust scheme was a requirement of the plant site consent and the Company would be required to submit a scheme under Condition 8 which satisfies the wording of that condition. SCC Case Officer had requested additional information since the County Council dust consultant (RPS) has advised that in his opinion the scheme is not adequate as submitted. The scheme would be expected to cover both monitoring proposals (Dust Monitoring Scheme) and management methods (Dust Action Plan). AS confirmed that the scheme for dust (and other schemes required for bio-diversity and archaeology) would be taken to Committee, possibly in late March, pending the provision of the requested additional information.

AS confirmed that the Council was satisfied, after advice from its dust consultant, that the conditions attached to the Power Screen consent were appropriate to be dealt with separately.

AB asked what dust monitoring results could trigger investigations/action under the required scheme. AB noted reference to background dust levels in the North Park Quarry extension planning application. AS noted that possible criteria options are noted in Condition 8, including background and when the additional information is submitted by the Company the scheme as proposed will be assessed by the Council dust consultant. The figure of 2.5 x background data will apply if there is background data, otherwise the fall back figure will be that of the national recommended level.

AB said that she would wish to see any conditions that may be attached to the schemes before going to Committee. AS noted that the schemes are in themselves required as part of a condition and therefore there will be no conditions attached, rather the scheme will define the performance levels required. A committee report will be prepared by the Case Officer and this will be available prior to the committee in the normal manner. Members note that the TOR has stated that any agreements between the Dust Sub Committee and the Company will be reflected in Sibelco's Dust Control Plan.

DB contended that the dust data does not meet the TOR levels or Surrey standards but acknowledged that Sibelco is working to reduce wind blown dust. DB felt that the some dust levels were essentially derived from an urban rather than a rural environment and contended that there were PM10s coming from the quarry. DB said his view was that the standoff from quarry workings to houses should be 100m as measured to the property boundary.

AS said Surrey County Council view was not to set standard distances but rather look at each site on a case by case basis and assess potential impacts from operations (not only for dust). If results showed levels over appropriate limits then a reasonable assessment needed to be made and agreed action taken. Encouraging the operator to be responsible and proactive in keeping to conditions was felt to be the correct approach. AS was asked if SCC receives the dust data from the quarry. AS said that SCC does receive the data but does not store the data long term.

AB contended that data shows regular exceedences of agreed levels. MH said he had not attended the Dust Sub-Committee meeting but had received Tony Entwistle's

**Please note these are draft minutes until approved and signed at the next meeting.**

factual report. MH said he would ask Tony Entwistle to prepare a summary report and this may be useful for the full liaison group members going forward.

AB said that the buffer from the quarry extraction limit needed to be increased. RJ said that buffer zones of 100m up to 400m were imposed at some quarry sites and Mineral Planning Statement 2 (MPS2) sets out the distance for potential dust fall at 250m. RJ said that dust has been an issue from the quarry faces but acknowledged that the company has reacted to past events.

MH said that in his experience stand-off distances from occupied properties were not uncommonly in the order of 50 metres, with the distances being agreed with Mineral Planning Authorities on a case by case basis using the results of various studies (noise, dust etc).

#### **04/10 QUARRY OPERATIONAL UPDATE**

**4.1 Quarry Plan for 2010** - MH presented slides to show the plan of the quarry site as at today's date and best estimate of the situation at the end of 2010. Quarry activities would be carried out on both the southern and western faces with roughly half annual production from each area.

#### **05/10 PLANNING UPDATE**

**5.1 Plant site planning scheme** – In relation to the plant site consent dust scheme, Sibelco would be responding to SCC's request for further information in the next couple of weeks. Further information has also been requested by SCC in relation to the Bio-Diversity Action Plan, which is to concentrate on the North Park site. A scheme for archaeology on the pipeline route, already submitted to SCC several years ago will be re-submitted.

**5.2. Update on approvals for minor amendments (powerscreen, substations, pipelines)** – These had all been approved.

**5.3. County Council Monitoring Reports** – The next visit was expected to be in the near future. There were no changes since the last meeting.

**5.4. Bridleways 148 and 142 diversions** – The diversions had been approved and would be implemented once surface specifications had been approved. The actual diversions may not take place until late 2010/early 2011. Fencing proposals are available. Discussions will be held with Place Farm residents before any works on the diversions commence in order to advise on timetables and discuss details of fencing arrangements. Bridleway 148 diversion is tied to the current mineral consent and is required to be put back on its original line by the end of 2014.

Concern was raised about the condition of some of the quarry boundary fences alongside Place Farm Road. This would be looked at by KH/JY.

KH/JY

#### **06/10 NORTH PARK QUARRY EXTENSION AND PLANT SITE TIME EXTENSION UPDATE**

MH confirmed that two planning applications have been submitted as required. One is for the proposed extension of North Park Quarry (into the Pendell area) and the other is a Section 75 application for an extension of time for the operation of the plant site, access, pipelines and water circuit to coincide with the expected life of the

**Please note these are draft minutes until approved and signed at the next meeting.**

proposed quarry extension.

In answer to a question from TE, MH said that if the applications are approved development is not likely to commence until late 2011/2012 and this would begin with the access arrangements between North Park Quarry and the extension area. Mineral extraction from the new area would be anticipated in 2013.

KK asked if restoration would be completed before new areas are opened and about the timing of phases in terms of dates/years. MH referred members to the proposed quarry phasing plans, which show areas being restored progressively as the quarry advances. This restoration includes replacement of overburden and soils and tree planting/seeding etc. Putting actual dates on phasing plans is not likely to be accurate due to potential small scale quality variations of the sand and being based on sales assumptions which may differ from actual sales. However, any consent will have an end date and based on the proposed completion for the North Park Quarry extension (end 2020) the phasing plans submitted each necessarily represent about 2 years development.

In answer to a question from RJ at the previous meeting, MH confirmed that the gradient of the proposed conveyor belt in North Park Quarry (on the northern slope) was achievable. AB asked about the overlap period between the current and proposed site and later working in North Park Quarry. MH said that an overlap period would be required and was stated in the application as a likely period of between 12 and 18 months. Areas of North Park Quarry which are proposed to be worked later (after removal of the conveyor and re-instatement of Bridleway 148 onto its original line) are shown on Plan 15 of the extension application. AB said that Plan 15 was not referred to in the text of the application. MH would check this and clarify proposed timing of works. The western part of North Park Quarry would be largely worked out by end 2014 and final or interim/temporary restoration would be undertaken so no bare sand areas remained, this included the two areas proposed to be worked at a later date. The rest of North Park Quarry will be restored by 2016 in accordance with current conditions.

A query was raised as to whether there was an enforceable restoration phasing programme and whether the progressive restoration of the present quarry was in keeping with the approved plans. AS said that the works in North Park Quarry were on plan and noted that conditions of a consent require a phased restoration programme and therefore variation from approved phasing and restoration can be an enforceable matter. Reasonable controls need to be imposed, i.e. dates for restoration will be expected in restoration timings but they need a degree of flexibility.

DB said that he had serious concerns over dust if the extension area is opened as the dust could then blow from either the East or the West. MH noted that the majority of the North Park Quarry site would be worked and restored before the proposed extension area was significantly developed and predominant winds from the south-west (which are not normally dry winds) would not take a route towards Place Farm properties, which are located to the south-east.

AB asked why the application boundary (red line) for the quarry extension application was drawn to cover much of the western end of North Park Quarry rather than just the conveyor route. The red line as drawn would mean that there would be a permitted mineral consent over the area for several years to come. FG asked if Sibelco would consider submitting a revised plan of Figure 2 to show a reduced red

**Please note these are draft minutes until approved and signed at the next meeting.**

line. MH said that the Company sees the requirement to work the western end of North Park Quarry with a different phasing to that currently permitted to allow the conveyor to be installed and correct quality sand to be accessed. This revised phasing is shown on the submitted plans. This phasing would be conditioned if the application is approved so there would be safeguards over restoration and timing of restoration.

AB asked about the archaeological studies undertaken in the area to the west of Kitchen Copse, including to the immediate south-west of Kitchen Copse where no trenching has taken place. MH said that several trenches have been excavated in the field to the west of Kitchen Copse along the proposed line of the access track, conveyor and screening mound. No trenches were requested by the County archaeologist in area to the south-west of Kitchen Copse which has been looked at a few years ago as part of the plant site development (pipelines route). AB said that no trenches were dug in this area at that time. AS said he will check SCC requirements with the County archaeologist.

*RJ left the meeting.*

## **07/10 ENVIRONMENTAL UPDATE**

**7.1. Complaints register review** – MH briefed the members on the 2 reported complaints since last October. One related to driving of tippers on 06/10/09. These were not found to be related to Sibelco. The other related to an HGV complaint (08/10/09), which had been passed on to the haulier and customer.

DB contended that all complaints were not being logged by the Company. KH said that all complaints received at the site are logged and acted on immediately and the suggestion that they are not being logged is regarded as unjustified. DB said that his view was that some people may think that complaining is of no value. KH said that it is acknowledged by liaison members that the Company has responded and improved performance and anyone who has concerns/issues must contact the site so these can be resolved.

ST noted that at times, high level cab lights from some HGV's on part of the private haul route could be seen from Tylers Close. This issue had been reported previously and was once again becoming an issue. KH confirmed they would act on this matter by again reminding hauliers and drivers and reiterating the policy and signage. ST also said that there was some build up of litter along the haul route probably from HGV drivers. KH said that the Company regularly undertakes collections of litter along the haul route. These would be stepped up and drivers will be disciplined if they are caught discarding litter.

**7.2. Noise & Hydrology Results** – The results of a noise monitoring undertaken on 16/12/09 for both the plant site consent and the mineral consent were shown. These are all within permitted limits.

MH showed the location of the boreholes within North Park Quarry in which groundwater levels are required to be monitored. The water levels from 2007, 2008 and 2009 were shown and no unexpected levels are evident. Due to previous confusion over the meaning of the planning condition relating the level to which the Company can extract sand, MH explained that working to no closer than 2 metres to the level of the highest seasonal watertable, does not mean the highest level of groundwater recorded on the site, rather it means no closer than 2 metres to the

**Please note these are draft minutes until approved and signed at the next meeting.**

recorded/interpolated level in each part of the site based on the known recorded levels. This is done by contouring the groundwater table from the known points (boreholes).

**08/10 COMMUNICATION**

KH will forward any new site contact details to KW who would arrange for them to go on the Bletchingley website and to be published in both the Godstone and Bletchingley Parish Magazines. The next Dust Sub Committee meeting was scheduled for the 10<sup>th</sup> March.

KW

MH reiterated that the Company would welcome any visits to the quarry and MH would be happy also to give talks on the quarry/industry to any local groups. The Company is particularly keen to get local school groups to the site for talks and use of the new safe viewing area. Further efforts to make contact with the local schools would be made. Members agreed to forward contact names at local schools to MH.

**09/10 COMMUNITY MATTERS/NEWS**

It was brought to the attention of the Company that there was a pile of rubbish by the Barn near Kitchen Copse. KH would arrange for this to be removed.

KH

**10/10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

MH confirmed he would review recent dust results and report back.

In answer to a question by RJ at the last meeting, MH noted that the distance quoted in paragraph 6.3.31 and 6.3.32 of the Environmental Statement recently submitted with the planning application related to the distances from the current permitted quarry extraction limit to houses on Brewer Street and Becks Cottage respectively and not to distances from Place Farm.

*Edd Muller left the meeting.*

**11/10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Wednesday 21 April 2010 at 6.30pm in the Community Centre. KW to confirm the availability of the Community Centre.

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm.