

CEMEX Southam Liaison Group

September 7th, 2010

Present

Len Gale	Chair
Mike Andrews	CEMEX
Miren Fernandez	CEMEX
Nigel Rock	SDC
Bransby Thomas	STC
Ian Southcott	CEMEX
Bob Stevens	WCC
Matthew Williams	WCC Planning
Wendy Charles	LIPC
David Cobley	LIPC

1. Introductions and Apologies.

MA introduced himself as the Quality Manager at CEMEX Rugby and explained that Southam and Kensworth Quarries were now responsible to his department. Apologies were recorded for John Appleton.

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting.

These were agreed as a true record.

3. Matters Arising not Elsewhere Covered.

BT wanted it clarified that it was the planter and not the roundabout; LG confirmed that the sign had been replaced.

4. CEMEX Report

- a) **Operations.** MF confirmed that production year to date was 398,000 tonnes, approximately 2,000 tonnes per day equivalent to 74 loads. Forecast until the end of the year was a total of 525,000 tonnes, between 70 to 75 loads per day. For BPD, the volume was 100 tonnes per month which was considerably less than last year when the figure was 1600 tonnes per month.
- b) **Planning – Landfill.** IMS reported that CEMEX had been investigating a beneficial after-use for BPD. It had been working with a partner company and in conjunction with the Environment Agency to develop such a use and to avoid land-filling this material. The use was a soil conditioner or

fertiliser which the high lime content and presence of other elements made it particularly suitable.

- c) **Parkfield Road/Southam Quarry Planning Applications.** IMS explained that these applications concerned the removal of 132,000 cubic metres of cement waste from Parkfield Road quarry (a disused site adjacent to the Rugby works) and its transportation and deposit in the Cell 3 at Southam with the aim of restoring the Parkfield Road site to nature conservation and completing and restoring Cell 3. Two applications are required – one for Parkfield Road and one for Southam and these had now been submitted to WCC. If the applications are successful, the project would be undertaken over a twenty week period in the Spring and Summer of 2011. IMS explained that this project would not result in any additional traffic as the material from Parkfield Road would be back-hauled to Southam in the vehicles delivering clay to Rugby. Hard copies of the Non Technical Summary were available and the application would be on the WCC website imminently. BT asked if the Parkfield Road site adjoined the restored Newbold Quarry. It was explained that the sites were some distance apart. NR asked what the material was and IMS explained that it was cement dust from the manufacturing process. Parkfield Road had ceased to be used as a site for this material in the 1990s. MW reported that the applications would be registered as soon as possible. There was a statutory consultation period of 21 days but WCC would receive comments up until the Committee date and he thought it likely that the applications would go to Committee late 2010 or early 2011. DC noted that if there were two applications, they were four possible outcomes. MW agreed but he was yet to examine the applications and in due course he would have the responses from statutory consultees. BR asked if RBC would be involved and MW replied that it would be a consultee.
- d) **WCC Minerals Plan.** MW reported that the current Minerals Plan was under review as previously advised and would become the Minerals Development Framework. It is working towards identifying and allocating sites for mineral extraction or at least providing policies to indicate where mineral extraction might or might not be appropriate. A lot of responses have been received. Currently WCC is awaiting a meeting with the Government Office of the West Midlands. The aim is to go to for a further consultation draft by next April.
- e) **Southam Quarry – Application to extend.** IMS reported that the application had been submitted and was out for consultation. Slides showing the application area and the proposed working and restoration areas were shown. MW noted that local parish councils, residents and

other stakeholders and consultees had been informed. Few comments to date but it was early days. A display of the proposals had been held in April for two days and 24 people were recorded as attending. A presentation had also been made to Stockton PC by IMS. IMS suggested that if the group wished a further meeting could be convened once more responses had been received. NR mentioned that a special meeting for residents could be convened in Stockton. IMS offered the company's attendance at this meeting if required.

LG wanted to know what impacts there might be on water abstractions in the area as referred to in the EIA. MW explained that surface water and ground water are covered in the ES and the EA were being consulted. There was local concern about any impacts on water sources such as the Holy Well and reassurance was required. In respect of traffic, he asked about 'the Straight Mile' and any impact and the possibility of that road being widened. It was confirmed that the application did not involve any increase in traffic movements. BR noted that the verges were being eroded by heavy traffic. IMS noted that a review of the impact of the new routing and the WRR would be undertaken one year after the opening of the southern section in June 2010. BR thought it should be done 12 months after the opening of the complete WRR i.e. September 2011 as it was believed that additional traffic would be more apparent when the complete WRR was open. BT believed that 'B' roads should not be the recipients of additional traffic from the WRR – the 'A' roads should be used. There was a wider discussion on lorry routing policy and enforcement in the county. MW confirmed that the review would only concern itself with CEMEX traffic. BR thought this unfair to the company – any review should be more wide-ranging. IMS believed the review would cover numbers, incidents, transgressions etc. The review would be undertaken by CCC and MW reported that since the opening of the WRR in June, there had been no incidents reported. BS thought that two reviews were needed – one in respect of CEMEX and one a more comprehensive analysis of the impact of the WRR. DF agreed that the bigger picture needed to be considered. He was also surprised that there had been no assessment of the impact beyond Rugby. MW advised that any concerns that his colleague Roger Newham (WCC Highways) was the person to contact.

- f) **Climafuel Plant.** The resolution to approve the Malpass Farm application was made last November. There were two outstanding issues – the 106 agreement in respect of highways which was now ready to be signed and a noise condition required by RBC.

g) **Stacker/Reclaimer Consultation.** This equipment facilitated the blending of the various qualities of clay. WCC ruled that it did not require planning because of permitted development rights but decided that local consultation should be undertaken. BT asked if this would mean any additional employment. IMS responded that it did not – the aim was to improve efficiency. LG asked if there would be additional noise. It was not considered to be an issue. Consultation was now complete and there were no negative responses. However, there was concern as to whether all the relevant parish councils had been consulted; MW would check.

5. Stockton to Southam Cycle Route.

NR reported that, in John Appleton's absence, he had chaired a meeting in July of the group concerned with this project. A certain amount of progress had been made in respect of the route and design and a report would be made to the East Area Committee next week. The key issue would be finance. BT reported that there was a study underway for the Ufton to Harbury cycle route and he hoped there should be some degree of coordination. NR was concerned that, although officer support was good, it didn't seem to be a priority for them, more an 'add-on' to their 'day job.' LG suggest NR write to HC informing him of the Ufton route and to make sure he was aware and that if there were any opportunities for better coordination, to take them.

6. Community Projects.

IMS had nothing additional to report. A number of projects had been supported in Rugby recently but there had been no applications for projects in this area recently. DF asked if the recession had affected the ability of the various sources of funding to support applications and IMS agreed that this was the case.

7. Any Other Business.

There were no other matters raised.

8. Date of the Next Meeting.

It was agreed that the next meeting be arranged when more responses to the planning application had been received and a committee date was proposed.