

# CEMEX Southam Liaison Group

## Meeting Notes

July 26<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

### Present

Len Gale	Chair
Bob Stevens	WCC/SDC
Chris Spencer	SDC
Jason Ward	Southam TC
David Knee	Princethorpe PC
Bill Ratcliffe	Princethorpe PC
Steve Kittendorf	SDC
David Fry	Marton PC
Matthew Williams	WCC – Planning
Clive Wall	EA
Juan Maury	CEMEX
Martin Lithgo	CEMEX
Ian Southcott	CEMEX

### 1. Introductions

As there were several new members, LG asked all present to introduce themselves.

### 2. Apologies.

IMS had received apologies from Howard Collerson (Stockton PC) and Jeremy Wright MP.

### 3. Notes of the Last meeting.

LG explained that the long gap between the last meeting and this one was due to the need to convene the meeting after specific events had taken place. With regard to the notes of the meeting held on September 7<sup>th</sup>, 2010, BR noted that it was stated that the CKD from Parkfield Road would be back-hauled using the vehicles that transported the clay to Rugby. He reported that this did not seem to be happening and IMS responded that this issue would be addressed in detail later in the meeting.

The notes were agreed as a true record.

**4. Matters Arising not elsewhere covered.**

Notwithstanding the issue raised by BR above, there were no other matters arising.

**5. Operational update.**

ML confirmed that output remained at circa 2,000 tonnes per day; this equated to between 70 and 75 loads per day. The stacker/reclaimer had been fully commissioned in April. Planning permission for the extension had been approved in April by the Regulatory Committee. Pre-commencement conditions were being executed. The project to bring CKD from Parkfield Road, Rugby to the engineered landfill at Southam had commenced. This involved 70 loads of material from Parkfield Road per day. LG asked when this project had begun and ML responded that there had been an establishing phase prior to the movement of material which had begun on June 27<sup>th</sup>.

**6. Southam Cement Plant – Proposed Demolition Project**

IMS stated that the company was now proposing to demolish the majority of the redundant buildings on site. This decision was prompted by two key aspects, these being health and safety and the economics of the exercise. With regard to the former, some of the structures were becoming increasingly unsafe; in respect of the former, he reported that, as the scrap value and the recycling value of the materials concerned had for some time been such that it was a viable project to pursue, the safety factor had become the deciding issue. Discussions had been held with WCC in respect of the requirements of such a project and these were continuing. A contractor had been appointed and the contract duration was estimated to be 20 weeks. Four vehicle movements a day were projected. The project would not involve the chimney as the new stacker/reclaimer facility was in the blast range and any other method of demolition would be too expensive.

BS asked when the project was likely to start. IMS responded that this depended on the WCC requirements but he thought something like six weeks from today would seem reasonable. MW explained WCC's position; in the past demolition had not been considered development and therefore planning permission was not required. However, case law from earlier in 2011 had established that more demolition projects were now subject to planning procedures. He confirmed that the company would notify WCC of the proposal, outline the methods to be utilised and the environmental controls to be employed. The Council would then consult on these proposals. CS asked whether this was a county matter or one for the District. MW confirmed that it was a county responsibility as it was the relevant authority for the cement works and mineral extraction. It was confirmed that the necessary ecological surveys had been completed. DF asked whether it would be possible for a photographic survey could be undertaken from an industrial archaeological perspective. DF would try and identify who might

be interested in carrying this out; MW would also consult with the relevant colleagues. MW sought to establish that there was no opposition to the principle of the demolition occurring and this was agreed. LG thought that such a recording was a good idea but it should be carried out as soon as possible so as not to delay the project.

JW asked whether there were any short, medium or long term plans for the site. IMS replied that although the brown-field site was identified in the Stratford Local Plan, there were no plans for any development on the site due to its continuing use as a quarry and processing site. DF asked about the longer term future of the chimney and BS asked whether its stability or integrity would be affected when surrounding buildings were demolished. It was confirmed that, at present, its integrity was good but obviously its status and condition would be kept under review. It was, in effect, a stand-alone structure and the demolition of any surrounding buildings would not have any effect. MW observed that he could not detect any opposition from this group and that the necessary processes of consultation would proceed.

BS asked where the rubble would go. IMS believed that most of the scrap metal would probably end up in China. He would ascertain where other materials would be disposed of. DK asked if there were any hazardous materials involved and it was confirmed that there was asbestos and the disposal of this was subject to very stringent regulation.

IMS added that information on the progress of the project would be placed on a new micro-website to keep this group and the wider community informed. Details of this site would be distributed in due course.

## **7. Planning Update**

**Landfill.** CW of the EA gave an update of the recent history of the landfill cells on site.

Parkfield Road/Southam Project. IMS confirmed that planning permission had been granted earlier in the year and that the project commenced on June 20<sup>th</sup>. As CW had pointed out, material was being transported to Southam from Parkfield Road in Rugby and from his perspective, the project was proceeding satisfactorily.

The aim was to restore the Parkfield Road quarry to nature conservation through the removal of CKD deposited there for many years and its placement in the engineered landfill, Cell 3, at Southam. In turn this would see the completion and restoration of Cell 3. In response to a query from LG, IMS explained that the management of Parkfield Road was considered unsustainable in the longer term and this project represented a viable option that would see both sites restored.

In response to the earlier query from BR and DK on lorry movements in respect of this project, IMS explained that the original intention was to utilise the vehicles carrying clay to Rugby to back-haul the CKD to Southam. However, it soon became apparent that, because the vehicles carrying clay were articulated, loading at Parkfield Road and unloading at Cell 3 would not constitute safe practice. As a consequence, it was decided to employ a tipper fleet to move both

the clay and the CKD. As the capacity of a rigid tipper is less than an articulated vehicle, and in order to maintain the required supply of clay to Rugby, the tipper fleet was supplemented by a small number of articulated vehicles which just carried clay. However, this approach created a number of problems and meant that the whole project was going to take much longer to effect if this method was continued to be employed. After explanation to WCC of the complete situation, it was agreed that a stand-alone logistics would be preferable in order to effect a more speedy completion of the project. Naturally this would result in more vehicles on the road but it remained consistent with the granted permission of 70 loads a day being delivered to Southam.

Originally the project was due to begin in early April but did not commence until June 20<sup>th</sup> and was therefore more almost three months behind schedule. This meant that the target finish date of November 1<sup>st</sup> set out in the permission would not be met. The late start exacerbated by the lengthy resolution to the logistics problems were the principal causes. LG asked what the net increase in vehicle numbers was and IMS confirmed that it was 70 extra deliveries per day but this was for a limited period only. He also confirmed that it had been made very clear to the contractors that their behaviour and consideration must be exemplary. BR was concerned with the volumes of vehicles and DK had carried out a two hour HGV traffic survey on the B4453 and he presented these figures to the meeting. He concluded that there was an HGV recorded every 2 minutes and 15 seconds and the concern was that the road would not be able to support such a volume of traffic. BR was concerned that the increase in volumes generally were unsustainable although he did accept that the Parkfield Road project vehicles would only be for the duration of the project. DK noted that the project vehicles were travelling faster and were guilty of tail-gating which he assumed to be because they were being paid on a per load basis. IMS responded that immediate action would be taken to prevent such behaviour. DK added that the behaviour of CEMEX liveried drivers was very good. DK was asked, as were all members, to take registration numbers of transgressors and they would be dealt with.

BR repeated that traffic volume was the main problem. He also added that he had been advised that the promised traffic survey to assess the impact of the opening of the RWRR was not now going to be undertaken. MW addressed a number of issues in his response. Backhauling was a good idea in theory but had not worked in practice. The overall restoration benefits and the limited duration of the project hopefully outweighed the short-term pain of additional traffic. With regard to the traffic survey, he would refer this to Highways colleagues but their view was that normally such assessments are carried out a few years into the project and not after 12 months. The review of CEMEX clay vehicles routing could be carried out but he was unsure what it might reveal.

CS wished to echo the fact that CEMEX drivers were exemplary in their behaviour and he wished this conveyed to the company.

MW also commented that the WCC staff who normally carry out such surveys had been made redundant. LG requested that information on any survey be reported to this group in advance of

the next meeting. MW responded that the review of the impact of the CEMEX clay vehicles can be carried out and would involve assessing the number of complaints, incidents, accidents etc of which, he added, he was aware of none. The traffic census was a different matter.

DK asked what the time restrictions on CEMEX vehicles were. ML responded that the clay vehicles could run from 7 a.m. until 6 p.m. and the project vehicles 6 a.m. until 5 p.m. Tankers and curtain sided vehicles had no restrictions.

JW wanted clarity on a couple of issues. The specified period for the contract was quoted at 26 weeks and would therefore be due for completion by November 1<sup>st</sup>. IMS explained that the project should have commenced in April but did not actually commence until late June. He also asked why there was such a 'panic' to complete the project and IMS explained that there was a landfill tax exemption until the end of March 2012. Also it made sense to complete the project as soon as practicable. The number of vehicles would return to just clay movements, circa 70 per day, as soon as the Parkfield Road project was complete. BR added that, in his view, it was best to get it completed sooner rather than later.

With regard to the Minerals Plan, MW explained that both the Minerals Local Plan and the Waste Local Plan were being reviewed and would become the Minerals Development Framework and the waste Development Framework. WCC is currently focussing on the Waste Development Plan and Core Strategy and this would take up the next 12 months and therefore the Minerals Plan was on hold for at least this period.

**Southam Quarry Extension.** The Regulatory Committee had approved in March and work on the pre-commencement conditions was underway. MW confirmed that only a relatively small number of local residents might be impacted; the Committee had made a site visit and toured the perimeter to observe the proximity of this small number of residents. Some of these nearby residents had spoken at the Committee meeting. He also explained that there were conditions relating to noise and dust. SK asked if monitoring data would be available and MW didn't that would be a problem and it could be placed on the microsite. LG thought this a good idea. IMS added that, historically, there had been few complaints about noise and dust.

#### **8. Stockton to Southam Cycle Route.**

IMS reported that regular meetings had taken place chaired by John Appleton. In April, IMS, HC, Nigel Rock and representative of CEMEX Contracting had walked the route from Stockton to Southam. One aspect that was discussed was whether Sustrans would accept a variation to their specification of an asphalt surface in favour of a cement bound surface. HC had circulated today a minor variation to the route at the Southam end. Finance was always going to be the problem and as economic conditions had deteriorated, this was made more difficult.

#### **9. Community Projects.**

IMS had received one request for funding to complete the outdoor learning area at Stockton School which had already been supported with a grant of £30,000.

He added that the CEMEX Foundation had limited additional funds available for projects up to £5,000 and that any applications should be sent to him for consideration.

**10. Any Other Business.**

DF was interested to know on average how many CEMEX vehicles – tankers and curtain side, use the A423 in a 24 hour period; this was prompted by the night-time logistics operation from the Rugby plant.

CS asked about cleaning of the pavement. It was not a problem at present but might become so when wetter weather became more apparent.

At the entrance to the quarry, there was a dropped kerb on only one side. LG asked for this to be an agenda item for the next meeting.

**11. Date of the Next Meeting.**

Tuesday, October 25<sup>th</sup>, 6 p.m. at Southam Quarry.