

## **RUDHEATH LODGE QUARRY COMMUNITY LIAISON MEETING**

### **NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON**

**TUESDAY 6<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2020**

### **HELD VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

Attendees:	J Clowes	Holmes Chapel Parish Council
	D Roberts	Goostrey Parish Council
	E Williams	Cheshire East Council
	M Davies	Sibelco
	K Jinks	Sibelco
	L Williams	Sibelco

#### **1. Apologies**

Apologies were received from G Morgan (Cranage Parish Council), Pam Adlington (Allostock Parish Council) and Hazel Honeysett (Cheshire West and Chester Council).

It was agreed that L Williams (Sibelco) would chair the meeting in the absence of A Kolker (Chair) and G Morgan (Vice Chair).

#### **2. Minutes from Previous Meeting (21<sup>st</sup> July 2020)**

Approved.

#### **3. Matters Arising from Previous Meeting**

D Roberts (DR) made reference to the note sent to Sibelco earlier in the day indicating that he would discuss the enclosed points under the appropriate agenda items. He asked whether the Councils had undertaken any monitoring visits. E Williams (EW) indicated that a monitoring visit had taken place on 29<sup>th</sup> July 2020. This allowed both Councils (Cheshire East Council and Cheshire West and Chester Council) to observe the site operations.

#### **4. Site Operations including Compliance with Planning Conditions**

K Jinks (KJ) provided an operational update via PowerPoint.

KJ indicated that, whilst construction works had finished, commissioning was still ongoing with final snagging being undertaken. The dredge, however, was fully operational. At the current time the site were focussing on supplying the main customer base with sand.

KJ went on to discuss the recent issues that had been raised regarding HGVs parking on the A50. She confirmed that hauliers had been contacted and drivers had been spoken to directly. They had been

directed not to park on the A50. In addition, since 1<sup>st</sup> October, supply to certain customers had been drawn back. KJ highlighted that this seemed to have addressed the issues.

KJ also provided an update on the haulier feedback received regarding the upgraded A50/New Platt Lane junction. She confirmed that no issues had been raised and that drivers had commented on the fact that the junction had been widened allowing for better visibility.

KJ indicated that over the next few months the site would be going into full production.

DR asked about current lorry movements. KJ confirmed that current movements were between 45 and 65 per day. J Clowes (JC) asked whether 65 was the maximum allowed. KJ confirmed that 65 movements was correct as outlined in the planning permission.

JC asked what proportion of HGVs were travelling north or south from New Platt Lane on to the A50. KJ indicated that Sibelco do not have control over this and that this ultimately depends on where the customer is based.

DR indicated that a lot of HGVs have been travelling straight across the A50 to Northwich Road. M Davies (MD) indicated that Sibelco would do some observations, highlighting there is clear signage preventing HGVs from travelling along the section of New Platt Lane to the west of the A50.

DR highlighted that some HGVs were travelling left onto the A50 (southbound) then turning right onto Northwich Road, indicating this might be associated with the roundabouts in Holmes Chapel. He also suggested that some HGVs were exceeding 40mph.

JC asked whether the observations would provide the proportion of HGVs travelling north or south along the A50. KJ confirmed this.

KJ then presented drone footage of the site, identifying the rumble strips, haul road and Phase 1 extraction area. She highlighted that Phase 2 had now been stripped and two trees within the working area had been removed under Ecological supervision.

DR asked about the depths of extraction. KJ confirmed this was 4m below the surface.

LW provided an update on planning conditions via PowerPoint, highlighting the activities that had been undertaken in compliance with the planning conditions, the status of the discharge of condition of planning applications and forthcoming submissions.

## **5. Results of Conditioned Monitoring**

As per Powerpoint detailed by LW.

LW indicated that calculated noise levels in accordance with condition 12. LW presented dust deposition results, highlighting that results had reduced since the event discussed at the last liaison. The latest result for dust gauge 4 was above 200 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/d (limit above which complaints are likely), however this gauge is next to a field recently ploughed for potatoes. All other results are much lower so unlikely to be the result of quarrying.

LW outlined that one further group of stability monitoring results had been collected since the last liaison meeting and Sibelco's Geotechnical Specialist had confirmed there were no concerns. DR indicated that a local resident had raised a concern about stability, but he could see from the graph that this was closely monitored. LW indicated that the y axis of the graph was at 2mm intervals.

LW presented groundwater data, indicating that results were as expected.

## **6. Site Development**

As per Powerpoint. KJ indicated that Phase 2 had now been stripped (due for completion by 9<sup>th</sup> October). She highlighted that there had been a slight delay due to recent wet weather. KJ outlined that the material stripped had been placed in bunds on the perimeter of the site.

## **7. Council Matters**

### **Cheshire East Council**

EW indicated that a joint monitoring visit had taken place on the 29<sup>th</sup> July 2020. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, CEC would do as much desk-based work as possible. EW confirmed the update provided by LW regarding planning conditions was accurate.

### **Cheshire West & Chester Council**

No representatives present.

### **Cranage Parish Council**

No representatives present.

### **Allostock Parish Council**

No representatives present.

### **Holmes Chapel Parish Council**

JC indicated he had nothing significant to add, highlighting that no issues had been raised in the village and that Sibelco operations must not be having a major impression on residents. JC indicated that he was not expecting HGVs to travel along Northwich Road if they were doing. MD highlighted that Sibelco would take observations.

JC asked whether Sibelco had a Community Fund. KJ highlighted that Sibelco did get involved with local initiatives and said that representatives would join in with a tree planting activity which formed part of the Goostrey Wildlife Project.

MD added that, as a company, Sibelco did not believe in having a 'slush' fund for such things, but take a view that requests would be reviewed as and when received. He encouraged parties to approach Sibelco with such opportunities, highlighting the support provided to the Goostrey Rose Festival in 2018.

JC agreed that it was up to local organisations to ask.

**Goostrey Parish Council**

DR referred to the note sent to Sibelco, highlighting that he had nothing to raise further to this. DR raised the issues of the conditions of roads locally, indicating that a 'booming' noise was being experienced by a local resident. KJ indicated that the state of the roads locally was not the responsibility of Sibelco.

DR asked when the next testing would be undertaken for Jodrell Bank. LW confirmed that this would be around 12 months' time, after which the frequency would be reviewed by the Councils and Jodrell Bank.

DR indicated that there had been one report of movement. LW referred to the stability results and ongoing monitoring undertaken by Sibelco.

DR asked about the community link and suggested that school children might be interested in learning more about the quarry. KJ indicated that a talk at Goostrey Primary School had been arranged, however this had been postponed due to COVID-19. She acknowledged that children seem to be interested in the quarry machinery. MD indicated that a talk with a local youth group had also been arranged but similarly this had been postponed due to COVID-19.

KJ indicated that Love Goostrey had asked for an update to be provided. She also highlighted that the Community Board had been installed on the permissive path along New Platt Lane and that this would also be used to communicate with locals.

DR indicated that this was all excellent, suggesting that many people will just see a bund on Goostrey Lane and not understand what is going on in the site.

DR asked about what environmental impact assessments had been undertaken, acknowledging the environmental monitoring that had been undertaken. LW outlined that, as part of the planning application, an environmental impact assessment had taken place. This was assessed by the Councils who considered it appropriate to grant planning permission for the development. EW added that it is always useful to make reference to the planning permission which includes several conditions relating to the environment.

DR asked whether any sand or stones had been extracted. KJ confirmed that material up to 60mm in size had been extracted. This is then cut at 5mm and 1mm. Some stone and finer grit is produced. DR indicated that he asked this question due to the need to fill some gabion baskets. JC highlighted that large boulders had been produced at Chelford Quarry. KJ indicated that nothing of that size is likely to be produced at Rudheath Lodge Quarry, with the largest material being 80mm.

**9. Any Other Business**

None.

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

DR asked about the frequency of meetings. JC suggested that arranging meetings in the spring and autumn time, outside of school holidays, would be a sensible way forward. LW agreed highlighting that



this is the practice across our other sites, with the usual frequency being every 6 months. DR indicated that this is practical and that if there was ever a reason to, other meetings could be arranged.

LW indicated that Sibelco would monitor the situation regarding COVID-19 with a view to holding future meetings in person.

Date of next meeting: Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021 at 4pm via Microsoft Teams.