



<b>SUBJECT</b>	LAUNCESTON LIAISON GROUP
<b>DATE</b>	01.10.09
<b>LOCATION</b>	South Petherwin Village Hall
<b>RECORDER</b>	Susannah Downing

**PRESENT**

Laura Bosworth	(LB)	SITA
Susannah Downing	(SD)	SITA (minutes)
Gareth Philips	(GP)	SITA
Phil Rudin	(PR)	SITA
Lavinia Archer	(LA)	Local resident
Alan Brook	(AB)	Local resident
Graham Davey	(GD)	Local resident
Alex Emson	(AE)	Local resident
Graham Facks-Martin	(GFM)	North Cornwall Cllr
Sasha Gillard Loft	(SGL)	Launceston South Cllr
Paul O Brien	(POB)	Launceston Town Mayor/ Cllr
Bernard O Neil	(BON)	Cllr
Philip Parsons	(PP)	County Cllr/ Local resident
Neil Sandland	(NS)	Cornwall Council
Michael Screech	(MS)	Local resident
Sue Wolstenholme	(SW)	Ashley PR

**DISTRIBUTION**

All participants
------------------

Ref	Note	Action
-----	------	--------



Ref	Note	Action
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>		
1.1	<p>PR introduced himself as the Operations manager to the group, including the background of SITA and the PFI contract with CC which started in 2006. PR explained the proposals to replace the HWRC at Bangors Quarry, Launceston and the benefits of setting up a liaison group as a way of communicating with local representatives. He explained that the proposals to replace the current HWRC were similar to those recently undertaken at the St.Erth site.</p>	P.R
<b>2.0 UPDATE ON PLANNING PROCESS</b>		
2.1	<p>GP introduced himself to the group as SITA's Property and Planning manager and explained the reason behind the current proposals. It was heard that the current site at Bangors is too small to cope with the required amount of recycling. Other sites have been looked at around the Launceston area, but the site at the Pennygillam industrial estate was felt to be the most appropriate of the available sites. The planning application has yet to be submitted but GP said that it would probably be submitted to CCs planning committee within the next two weeks following revisions to landscape and visual screening.</p> <p>GP stated that it would be a democratic process and the decision would be down to the Planning Committee at Cornwall Council. The opinions of the Environment Agency, Natural England and the Highways Agency would all be taken into account. He explained that Parish councillors play an important role in consultation and consultation comments from members of the public would be reported by Cornwall Council Planning officers to the planning committee.</p> <p>The application that is sent for consultation will be received by Parish councillors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is available online on the CC planning site and a copy can be obtained as a CD format from SITA</b></li> </ul>	G.P
2.2	<p>GP explained that the reason the application had not yet been submitted was due to the fact that SITA are awaiting feedback from the County's Landscape Officer and also feedback from tonight's liaison group.</p>	
<b>3.0 PRESENT PLANNING PLANS</b>		
3.1	<p>The group were shown draft plans of the plot at the Pennygillam Industrial Estate. This includes the plan for the HWRC and the RTS. GP explained the need for the transfer station as it was not economic to transport to United Mines, Redruth. PR stated that at Bangors they are handling about 12 tonnes. An Artic could take 22 tonnes. The existing site is also in the open air. The proposing operation would be inside a building therefore dust, litter, environmental factors could be controlled.</p>	G.P

Ref	Note	Action
3.2	A member asked if there were plans to extend opening hours. GP answered that the RTS would have slightly longer hours than the existing site- possibly an hour a day. The HWRC will have the same operating hours.	
3.3	A member asked if there was the possibility for expansion and if so what proportion. GP responded that waste growth previously had slowed to 1%, sometimes it would be neutral. The size of the operation could facilitate 70-80,000 tonnes, but due to the location there is not going to be that amount. It could easily accommodate 50,000 tonnes. The proposed facility is being built to manage Launceston areas waste for the next 30 years. SITA therefore do not expect any future expansion of this proposed facility.	
3.4	A member asked what measures were being put in place to prevent possible noise control problems. GP said that a noise control assessment is taking place. As the RTS was to be contained within a building this would knock out noise and studies from operating HWRC sites had complied with British Standards. The lighting for the site will be switched off at the end of each day. There would be security lighting linked to motion sensors .This will be built into the planning application.	NS/PR
3.5	NS and PR explained the environmental permit, which will monitor volumes, dust, air and any effect on the environment. The EA will inspect periodically and if there is any cause for concern they will issue a warning. PR stated that the frequency of inspection reflects the size and performance of the facility therefore it is in SITAs interests to run properly. Monitoring will be on EAs public register.	
3.6	NS informed the group that at the end of the contract with SITA the site, as with all, will go back to the council.	
3.7	A member of the group who lives opposite the proposed site put forward his concern regarding the screening of the site, the positioning of trees etc. GP explained that this is mainly the reason why the planning application is not complete as this is currently in consultation with the landscape officers.	
3.8	The group were shown the current plans including the areas for tree planting. All mature trees will be retained and further planting of trees for screening will be controlled by the CC forestry officer.	(GP)



Ref	Note	Action
-----	------	--------

#### 4.0 OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- 4.1 AB felt concerns over the elevated position of the site when there would be strong winds, mentioning that he felt this might be a danger to members of the public with bins on site. GP answered that SITA's site at Bude is also a highly elevated site but there has been no litter problems there. GP felt that with trees and fencing providing a screening effect it would be manageable but he will look into the issue of wind and the possibility of increasing the size of the fencing.
- 4.2 The issue of traffic was raised and a member voiced his concern over whether it would increase. GP said that all traffic currently going into the Bangors site will just be relocated. There will be 2 artic lorries per day going into the proposed site and the actual hours when busy should not change.

#### 5.0 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 5.1 A member asked whether there would be a cycle/path route connecting the old site to the Pennygillam Industrial Estate, or a walking access route to Launceston College. GP stated that within the application there are a number of proposed routes although NS explained that it is would be CCs responsibility as opposed to SITAs to provide these routes.
- 5.2 The issue of the loss of the resale of goods at HWRCs was raised, and a couple of members felt disheartened that it was no longer available. PR explained that when SITA took over the contract huge areas of the sites were not being adequately used due to the resale facility. SITA has introduced a more controlled method of resale whereby items are collected from the sites by a contractor and then resold through two retail outlets. This system is effective in terms of ensuring that items are reused however access to members of the public is limited. 15,000 more tonnes of recycling had been generated in the first year of SITA operating the sites which showed the overall benefit of the change in operations. PR also explained that people needed to be encouraged not to bring items of interest into the site as when it comes onto a HWRC it immediately becomes controlled waste material. NS reiterated that the HWRC is not the correct place for the testing of material, but CC and SITA are aware of the limitations of the current system.

#### NEXT MEETING-22.03.10