

# **Someone Asked! What is the update at The Saxon Pit**

After some 3 front page articles in The Cambs Times™ over the past 6 weeks, various updates on this web-blog and being asked by residents to help (since 2018).

I can confirm the following....

**Fact** – It has been confirmed by the Environment Agency that 122,858 tonnes of non-conforming waste has been buried/deposited on the site between October 2017 and February 2018 in the Saxon Pit.

**Fact** – 50 bore holes sunk by the EA have shown results that 42 of them produced hazardous samples.

**Fact** – Just found out this week (after nearly 2½ years) that the illegally dumped material is from mechanical treatment of waste, believed to be Automotive Shredder Residue (ASR). ASR is a waste by-product of material recycling and end-of-life vehicle sector following shredding, shearing or fragmentising and is mostly comprised of mixed plastics, foam rubber and glass.

**Out of the 50 samples submitted for analysis 42 are considered to be hazardous. This was due to Copper, Zinc and total petroleum hydrocarbons exceeding hazardous thresholds.**

**Fact** – The original planning permission of 03<sup>rd</sup> January 2003 gave consent for only 'INERT' material to be brought on site. All subsequent Planning Consents have included that requirement.

**Fact** - Initially the EA asked for all non-conforming i.e., NOT INERT waste to be removed. However on the 10<sup>th</sup> of June 2020 they gave consent for the waste to remain and to be capped. No reason was given, or details of this capping has been made public. The EA say once capped they would monitor any build-up of gases.

**FACT** – Occurring problem – Water ingress into the pit, has been so bad this year that emergency permission was given by the EA to pump excess water into the nearby drainage connecting into the Kings Dyke, in reality the water passes through third party land without permission.

This discharged waste may contain contaminates.

**Fact** – The EA have a mission statement to uphold public health which they are legally required to do. Numerous residents who have written to the EA have been quoted the following.

1. Stop illegal activity from occurring or continuing.
2. Put right the environmental damage (also known as restoration or remediation)
3. Bring illegal activity under regulatory control and therefor into compliance with the law.
- 4 Punish offenders and deter future offending.

**Many residents/Councillors believe The EA have failed in their responsibility.**

MP Stephen Barclay is now very much involved and has been kept up to date from residents, he has had various contacts with the EA – The regional director (Simon Hawkins).

The site actually comes under Cambs CC as the planning authority and The EA in granting the permits. Fenland District Council leader/Cambs CC & Whittlesey Town Councillor Chris Boden is driving the lobbying for answers and the way forward on this site.

continued .... next page

Here are some headlines from various publications in regard to Enforcement from The Environment Agency.

Home News & Analysis Fines Monitor 2021 Preview Compliance Brexit Jobs Directory | ACCOUN

Fines Monitor, Waste

## New waste fine - total payout £2,101,708

04 Jan 2021

Persistent waste offender John Bruce, of Pershore, Worcestershire, has been told to pay a £21m confiscation order for operating an illegal waste site. Failure to pay within seven months would leave him with a seven-year jail sentence, on top of an existing 26-month sentence imposed in May 2018.

Our trackers help you to monitor risk, identify new opportunities, manage key deadlines and benchmark best practice

LAUNCH

Fines Monitor, Waste

## New waste fine - total payout £42,721

17 Dec 2020

Haulage and waste management business Scott Bros was contracted to raise the level of a former landfill site in Stockton-on-Tees, but did so using contaminated waste and without a permit.

## Compliance Deadlines

Plan ahead with our Calendar feature highlighting upcoming compliance deadlines

-Choose an area-

NEW FEATURE



British Utilities

12 January at 05:16 · 🌐

Waste criminal told to pay £2.1m for operating illegal site: A convicted waste crime lawbreaker has been charged to pay over £2.1 million for conducting an illegal waste site at Ridgeway Park Farm in Worcestershire.

It comes after a confiscation case served by the Environment Agency at Worcester Crown Court, where Judge Nicholas Cole charged John Bruce, 48 years of age from Pershore, to pay the #Efficiency&Environment #EnvironmentAgency #illegalwaste #jail #RidgewayParkFarm #UK #wastecrime #Wastesite

Fines Monitor, Regulation

## EA heads blame budget cuts for decline in enforcement and monitoring

By Rachel Salvidge, 20 Jan 2021

Budget cuts have led to a drop in Environment Agency enforcement activity and monitoring, and that 'our ability to see what's happening in the environment is starting to decline', the regulator's chair Sir James Bevan has told a committee of MPs

Fines Monitor, Prosecutions

## The largest environmental fines handed down in 2020

## Strengthen EA enforcement and make polluters pay, DEFRA told

By Rachel Salvidge, 27 Jan 2021

The Environment Agency should be given stronger powers and more resources to tackle pollution so that it can make polluters pay a high price for damaging the environment, respondents to the government's wide-ranging water quality consultation have said

## EA heads blame budget cuts for decline in enforcement and monitoring

By Rachel Salvidge, 20 Jan 2021

---

## Someone Asked! What is the update at The Saxon Pit

### The proposed application by Johnsons Aggregates & Recycling Limited.

This is totally a separate business and operation.

**FACT** - Johnsons (J) wish to set up a processing plant on the Saxon Pit to deal with 500,000 tonnes of BOTTOM ASH - (B.A)? If approval is granted this material will be imported by Lorries at the rate of 1000 lorry movements per week as the site is proposed to be operational 24 hours a day, 6 days a week with Sunday for maintenance. The A605 is already stressed.

**FACT** -There will be public nuisance from the operation by way of noise, dust, noxious smells, vibration, and light pollution. Housing on Peterborough Road is within 220m of the site and housing at Priors/Snoots Road 360m distance.

**FACT** - It is acknowledged that Hydrogen Sulphide (H.S.) is released when B.A. is disturbed and moved from storage to the onsite filtering process. H.S. has a bad egg smell which is very unpleasant and can be dangerous to human health.

**PROBLEM** - We do not know the chemical makeup of the B.A. it is likely to come from several sources and with the excess water problem on the site could cause pollution to be passed to the Kings Dyke. We just do not know.

**FACT** - As previously described under the existing situation Saxon Pit; ground water ingress is a real problem which can only get worse. (See comment under present situation at Saxon Pit).

**FACT** - Based on the past efforts of the Environment Agency (E.A.) there is no guarantee that the extensive controls promised by Johnson Aggregates will be provided in that they will be monitored by the E.A. based on their track record to date it is not likely.

As I have posted on this website – that a consultation is taking place by The Environment Agency regarding this proposed Recycling Plant, it finishes on 22<sup>nd</sup> February and is clear what and what cannot be commented on.

<https://consult.environment-agency.gov.uk/psc/pe7-1pj-johnsons-aggregates-and-recycling-limited/>

Below is the criteria of what and what cannot be taken into account

### **We can take account of**

- Relevant environmental regulatory requirements and technical standards.
- Information on local population and sensitive sites.
- Comments on whether the right process is being used for the activity, for example whether the technology is the right one.
- The shape and use of the land around the site in terms of its potential impact, whether that impact is acceptable and what pollution control or abatement may be required.
- The impact of noise and odour from traffic on site.
- Permit conditions by providing information that we have not been made aware of in the application, or by correcting incorrect information in the application (e.g., monitoring and techniques to control pollution).

### **We cannot take account of**

- Issues beyond those in the relevant environmental regulations.
- Anything outside the remit of the EPR, e.g., the proposed location of the site, which is done by the local authority via land use planning.
- Whether a site should have a formal designation under Habitats Directive or other conservation legislation.
- Whether the activity should be allowed or not as a matter of principle. For example, we will not consider whether wood, gas, or coal should be burnt to produce electricity; only that the options and environmental impact of say wood has been considered. We will not consider whether a waste incinerator proposal should be turned into a sorting and recycle proposal, only that the incinerator options and effect have been considered.
- Land use issues when determining a permit application, even if changing the location of the activity would improve its environmental performance.
- The impact of noise and odour from traffic travelling to and from the site.
- The legally defined process we follow to determine a permit.

The granting of a permit/variation if the operator is able to demonstrate that they can carry out the activity without significant risk to the environment or human health.

e&oe RG.