

BENT FARM QUARRY LIAISON MEETING

NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON

TUESDAY 29th OCTOBER 2019

Attendees:	J Carter	Astbury Parish Council
	S Fern	Brereton Parish Council
	H Baker	Smallwood Parish Council Clerk
	B Jelf	Astbury Parish Council
	G Wells	Local Resident
	L Williams	Sibelco
	R Davenport	Sibelco
	A Green	Sibelco

The meeting was chaired by J Carter.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from D Muir (local resident), D Brown (Cheshire East Council) and M Davies (Sibelco).

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting (11th June 2019)

The minutes were accepted as a true record subject to the following amendments:

- Inclusion of A Sutton on the attendees list
- Correction to item 7 as B Jelf understood the ownership status of the land in question.

3. Matters Arising

J Carter indicated that the issue surrounding the weight limit on Wallhill Lane had been discussed at recent Astbury Parish Council meetings. R Davenport indicated that Sibelco continues to put pressure on hauliers to use the correct route into and out of the site, however the issue often occurs when the hauliers contracted the haulage out to a third party. G Wells highlighted that he recently followed a truck from the northern end of Wallhill Lane through the weight limited area and acknowledged that this was not just Sibelco.

R Davenport indicated that he had contacted E Williams (Principal Planning Officer, Cheshire East) about this issue and moving the weight limit but had received no response. L Williams indicated that E Williams had recently been out of the office.

J Carter indicated that Cheshire East Council has received funds for mitigation to slow traffic in the area. He added that the obvious place to reinforce signage would be on the A34.

4. Quarry Developments

R Davenport outlined the current quarry development. He indicated that operations were currently in the south-east corner of the site and working is about to turn westward in preparation to take the last field within the quarrying boundary. Overburden stripping is planned to take place shortly on the north-eastern corner of this field, to allow for the conveyor to be moved into a more efficient position. This would be the last time the conveyor would be moved. The overburden shifted would be placed directly onto the slope on the eastern boundary of the site directly into restoration.

R Davenport added that three small lagoons had just been created north of the current area of extraction to clean the quarry's water circuit and increase freeboard levels. A dredger had been temporarily operating to pump tailings (silt and clay) from the quarry's current water circuit into the three new lagoons. Here the tailings are deposited while the water decants over and through the lagoons where it eventually returns to the water circuit and discharges into Loach Brook. R Davenport added that this was a new innovation which had not been tried before, but had been effective.

G Wells asked whether the approach was working as he had not heard anything. R Davenport confirmed that it had been in operation, however the dredger worked on an electric motor so he would not have heard it.

R Davenport indicated that Sibelco's hauliers had been informed again about the weight limit imposed on Wallhill Lane. He added that the weight limit should be imposed, not just on Wallhill Lane, but roads which have used to access this one. J Carter outlined that there were lots of entry points to restrict.

Environmental Monitoring

L Williams indicated that a noise monitoring survey had taken place on the 31st July and that all recorded levels were in accordance with the site's planning permission. L Williams clarified that the levels indicated in green on the table presented (reproduced below) were the key levels that the site was assessed against. The noise level at the monitoring position was the level taken within the site and the results highlighted in green were the calculated levels at properties in close proximity. These results were well below the 55dB limit.

LOCATION	Grid ref at nearest perimeter to quarry	Grid ref at noise source	Grid ref at Monitoring Position	L1-Noise Level at Monitoring Position dB(A)	R1- Distance from Monitoring Position to Noise Source (m)	R2 – Distance from Noise Source to Location (m)	L2 – Calculated Noise Level at location dB (A)	L2 – Calculated Noise Level at this location Inc – 10 dB (A) screening	Permitted Noise Level dB (A)
Less a tree Cottage	SJ 82768 61567	SJ 83420 61522	SJ 83422 61499	65.9	10.0	660	29.5	19.5	55
Brownlow Farm	SJ83259 61243	SJ 83420 61522	SJ 83422 61499	65.9	10.0	320	35.8	25.8	55
Bent Farm	SJ 83510 62015	SJ 83420 61522	SJ 83422 61499	65.9	10.0	500	31.9	21.9	55

L Williams indicated that the that testing undertaken at the Loach Brook discharge point showed that parts per million (PPM) were below the Environment Agency (EA) limit and pH was in the acceptable range (results reproduced below). T Green added that testing is undertaken on a weekly basis and that the 'zero' results were due to a technical fault. R Davenport highlighted that it had become common practice for the EA to undertaken unannounced spot checks to take samples. He added that the 20.00 PPM limit was particularly stringent on a country-wide basis, but that Sibelco worked hard to comply with it.

Date Range from: 24/06/2019 to: 24/10/2019

CN WATER

	Off site Water Solids	pH
Limit	<= 20.00	5.0 9.0
	ppm	
28/05/19	5.00	7.6
11/06/19	2.40	7.2
17/06/19	3.60	7.3
25/06/19	3.60	7.5
02/07/19	4.40	7.7
21/08/19	Zero	8.4
29/08/19	Zero	8.2
16/09/19	Zero	8.0
23/09/19	3.20	8.3
27/09/19	2.20	8.0
07/10/19	5.60	8.0
17/10/19	7.20	7.9

Planning and Estate Matters

L Williams outlined that the majority of the consultation responses on the Bent Farm West planning application had been received and it was Sibelco's intention to provide a comprehensive response to all of the matters raised very shortly. He added that that key matters to address mainly related to hydrological and ecological impacts and some additional survey work had taken place.

L Williams highlighted that as part of this submission of additional information, Sibelco were proposing to introduce revisions to the application. One related to a dedicated site access for plant vehicles which was discussed at the last liaison group. This would mean that plant and machinery would not have to travel along Wallhill Lane. The existing site access would remain in operations for HGVs.

S Fern asked how often the new access would be used. R Davenport indicated that it would mainly be used during periods where earthworks were taking place which would last approximately 4 to 6 week campaigns.

J Carter queried whether the various representatives in the Highways Department were communicating with each other, due to the number of highways related development activities taking place (Congleton Link Road, Wallhill Lane traffic calming measures, responses the planning application consultations requests).

L Williams went on to highlight that the revision would also include provision of a sand soils blending area. This was required as the blending area at Chelford Quarry would be removed as the site was closing. R Davenport indicated that this sand product was used for sports pitches and golf courses. R Davenport added that the product is made blending specific grades of sand with compost using a screen. The compost would be imported from an external source

G Wells highlighted a concern regarding traffic impacts relating the importation of compost for the sand soils operation. He outlined his view that Sibelco were attempting to sneak this additional operation through the planning system by including it in the Bent Farm West operation. G Wells believed that Cheshire East Council had refused an application for importation in the past and that the Council refused this to restrict the site to the processing of indigenous materials. He highlighted his concern that the consent of the sand soils operation could lead to even greater diversification of site operations in the future.

S Fern asked how many vehicles would enter the site to and where the compost came from. L Williams indicated that he did not know the exact figure yet as the Transport Assessment had not been completed but would share this with the Group once it was finalised. R Davenport indicated that compost was likely to be delivered from Liverpool, so traffic would approach the site from junction 17 of the M6.

G Wells queried the proposals for restoration and what was planned for the plant site. J Carter indicated that the site's restoration was bound in a s106 agreement and that restoration would be to a large lake. L Williams indicated that the concrete within the site would be broken up and returned to grassland. He added that the status of the site would be considered greenfield and it would not be previously development land (brownfield).

G Wells queried why Sibelco were not pursuing mineral extraction to the south of the currently consented quarry, as had been highlighted in the past. J Carter highlighted that this land was omitted from the planning application which secured the current reserves at Bent Farm Quarry. R Davenport indicated that this may have been the previous intention, but that currently Sibelco did not have an agreement with the landowner.

G Wells indicated that the sand to the south of the site was industrial sand and this was of higher quality than the sand contained within the Bent Farm West planning application.

5. Council Matters:

Parishes

Smallwood Parish Council – no issues.

Brereton Parish Council – no issues.

Astbury Parish Council – J Carter indicated that Wallhill Lane was a current ‘hot topic’. He added that as part of the Congleton Link Road (CLR) scheme Cheshire East Council were required to monitor traffic on Wallhill Lane for one year. There was potential for its closure. J Carter added that a condition on the planning permission for the CLR required Cheshire East Council to outline mitigation measures for traffic calming measures along Wallhill Lane prior to its opening.

T Green indicated that Sibelco had requested alterations to the road before but the Council had not implemented any. J Carter indicated that there were draft proposals, but no finalised scheme.

G Well asked had there been any reported incidents along the road involving Sibelco’s site entrance. T Green indicated there had not been but there had been many near misses and that the 60mph speed limit created an issue. G Wells suggested that it was unlikely that alterations would be passed by Cheshire East Council on this basis.

Cheshire East Council

No representatives present.

6. Community Engagement

R Davenport indicated that Sibelco had provided some labour support to Cranage Village Hall. T Green suggested that if the Group had any ideas for community then Sibelco would consider this.

J Carter indicated that Astbury Parish Council were implementing a tree planting scheme to help combat climate change. He added that the provision of tree stocks would be appreciated. J Carter also mentioned that daffodil bulbs would be planted on the 9th November. T Green suggested that Sibelco’s Groundsman may be able to assist. Further contact would be made to arrange this.

7. Any Other Business

None.

8. Date of next meeting

12th May 2020. 5.00 pm for site tour followed by 5.30 pm liaison meeting.