

**BRADLEY SURFACE MINE  
LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETING**  
CM/N/4000/COM-1

Held on Monday, 16 April 2018 at Leadgate Methodist Chapel  
Commencing at 6.30pm

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:**

Cllr Alan Shield (Chair)	Durham County Council
Cllr Ivan Jewell (VC)	Durham County Council
Fr John Bagnall	Brooms Church
Colin Bell	Medomsley Residents Assoc.
Cllr Joanne Carr	Durham County Council
June Davison	High Stables Resident
Derek English	Medomsley Ward Partnership
Tracy Gillman	High Stables Resident
Steven Hanlon	Banks Group
Andrew Heron	Banks Group
Christine Hogarth	Banks Group
Michael Jongs	Dipton Resident
David Marrs	Dipton Partnership
Lea McConnell	Pont Rd Resident
Paul McNally	Resident
Andy Plant	Leadgate Partnership
Lewis Stokes	Banks Group
Claire Teasdale	Durham County Council Planning
Insp Keith Wardle	Police

**APOLOGIES:**

Jim Donnelly	Banks Group
Carol Rocke	Resident
Julia Triston	Resident

**ACTION/DATE**

- 1 **Minutes from Previous Meeting**
  - 1.1 The Minutes were a true and accurate record of the meeting.
  - 1.2 A Shield commented that the Constitution would be discussed under Any Other Business.
  - 1.3 J Davison mentioned that there was a typo and that the attendee list should show as Burnopfield Community Partnership and not Burnhope.
  - 1.4 AP1 – Complete.

1.5 AP2 – Complete. A Heron brought plans with him showing the S278 (highways) works.

1.6 AP3 – Ongoing. L Stokes to notify the committee of the Community Dig Days for the archaeological works.

**AP1 – L Stokes**

1.7 AP4 – Complete

1.8 AP5 – Complete

1.9 AP6 – Complete

## 2 **Community Engagement**

2.1 L Stokes ran through the details of the community engagement which typically, Banks conduct as part of the liaison committee meetings.

2.2 It was acknowledged that limited information had been circulated so far however once work on site commenced, there would be a significant shift in the information distributed and circulated to the committee and the wider community.

## 3 **Site Update by Banks Mining Staff**

3.1 As previously mentioned, as no significant site activity had taken place to date, C Hogarth discussed what information is typically included within a liaison meeting presentation. This would normally be an update on site progress, total coal tonnage extracted, future planned site operations, environmental monitoring results, complaints, HGV movements, planning and community updates. Unfortunately, C Hogarth experienced a technical issue with the projector so a copy of the presentation will be sent with the Minutes.

**AP2 – C Hogarth**

3.2 C Hogarth mentioned that she would give an update on what traffic movements had taken place and if there had been any issues.

3.3 A question was asked if Banks could arrange a visit to one of their current sites as suggested in the previous liaison committee meeting. L Stokes commented that he would be happy to arrange a visit and interested parties should contact him to arrange.

3.4 A Plant asked if the findings of the dust monitoring conducted to date could be shared with the committee. C Hogarth agreed to include these in her presentation at the next meeting.

**AP3 – C Hogarth**

- 3.5 J Davison asked how many monitors had been installed to date and what action is taken if it indicates a problem. L Stokes responded that three had been installed so far and the fourth one would be done within the next week. C Hogarth ran through how the real time dust monitors worked and that the kits have an hourly trigger system on them. If a monitor triggers, an email alert is sent to Banks staff, investigation and action taken if site related i.e. deployment of additional water bowsers. If the same monitor triggers a second time due to site operations then it may be that the site has to relocate to another tipping area. C Hogarth mentioned that the filters in the monitors are changed approximately every three months (this does vary depending on the atmospheric conditions). J Lomax added that the site will have a weather station and wind speed and direction are taken into account when planning daily activities.
- 3.6 J Davison said that Banks will only have approximately three months' worth of dust monitoring when it would be better to have a full 12 months. A Heron replied that the situation is that this is all the data that is possible to collect however the monitoring that Banks is conducting is significantly more technical and thorough than what UK Coal were proposing.
- 3.7 J Carr asked what engagement Banks had done with Gateshead Council regarding water quality. A Heron replied that Banks had submitted an application to the Environment Agency relating to the onsite water treatment and that they govern the quality of any water discharged to the watercourse.
- 3.8 A Shield raised the point that he had concerns that Banks had not made their most recent ecology report available to the local community. L Stokes commented that he had received a number of requests to share the ecological report. However, following a post on social media, several people had called and left abusive messages to a local contractor for working on the Bradley site. As a result of this, Banks had taken the decision to not share this information as the report contains the details of the local ecologist who conducted the work and there is a real risk that similar unacceptable action would be taken against them too. Natural England are the regulatory body for this work and they had approved the methodology and the findings of the work. J Lomax added that there is also sensitive information in the report relating to protected species on the site which could not be shared. J Lomax also said that it is disappointing that Banks could not share the information as it details lots of positive

information about the work Banks have done and will continue to do.

- 3.9 L McConnell said that he had evidence that Andy Whitehead (who is the Team Leader at Natural England) said Natural England had never seen the reports at all. J Lomax replied that the report was submitted to A Whitehead in November 2017 and that they are happy with the methodology and the findings of the report. A Heron recapped that several EDNA surveys were done and these along with the terrestrial refuge traps found no evidence of great crested newts.
- 3.10 M Jongs commented that he wanted to make sure there was no confusion between the Pont Valley Network site and the Campaign to Protect Pont Valley group.
- 3.11 D Marrs said that he had concerns about the methodology of the newt surveys and asked if they were conducted within fenced areas. A Heron responded that terrestrial surveys were conducted there. A second question was received about how wide the survey was done and A Heron again replied that the same surveys were done at Brooms Pond as in other areas.
- 3.12 J Davison said that the Facebook page is Campaign to Protect Pont Valley.
- 3.13 L McConnell added that there are laws, rules and regulations to abide by and he had not seen any evidence to suggest there were no newts on site. C Teasdale replied that Durham County Council (DCC) had received confirmation that Natural England had raised no concerns about the ecology report.
- 3.14 A Shield asked if Banks would consider sharing the report with selected people. L Stokes agreed to speak with the team and would let the Chair know.

**AP4 – L Stokes**

#### **4 Planning Update**

- 4.1 J Lomax advised the group that all of the required information had been submitted to Durham County Council to discharge all pre-commencement planning conditions however additional information is still to be submitted on other matters.
- 4.2 A Shield asked if any further pre-development applications were to be made. J Lomax confirmed that final ecology mitigation needs to be submitted.

4.3 D MARRS asked if further information could be given on the other mitigation. J LOMAX agreed to produce a note which would be included with the Minutes.

**AP5 - J LOMAX**

4.4 A HERON confirmed that barn owl boxes would be installed on the site. L MCCONNELL commented that the 2014 report indicated that the site was of local interest.

4.5 C TEASDALE said that there were one or two other pieces of information to be agreed including the financial details. D MARRS asked if there had been any application to amend the planning date, C TEASDALE confirmed not.

## **5 Policing Issues**

5.1 INSP KEITH WARDLE updated the group and said that specialist liaison teams were visiting the site regularly and had been met with a mixed response. There had been one arrest and had been charged with assault. There had also been a re-arrest for the same person due to breach of bail conditions.

5.2 A SHIELD said he was aware that senior Durham County Council officers had visited the site and had raised concerns about traffic issues and road safety. Insp KEITH WARDLE commented that there had been an incident of people throwing something from a car at the camp.

5.3 J DAVISON confirmed that a beer can was thrown from a car.

5.4 T GILLMAN said that her friend's children had been shouted at by passing vehicles.

5.5 J DAVISON commented that the protestors had helped an elderly gentleman suffering from dementia.

## **6 Views of Local Residents**

6.1 A PLANT asked what noise levels had been set for the site. C HOGARTH replied that the planning permission gives noise level conditions at three locations; Pont Road, Douglas Terrace and Brooms Farm. Monitoring would be done through the operational phase using hand held monitors.

6.2 J CARR said people from Dipton had raised concerns regarding dust and noise from the site due to the prevailing westerly wind. S HANLON replied that Banks trucks were fitted with rubber mountings to dampen noise and mitigation would be in place across the site

as a whole. Also, Lorries would turn left out of the site onto the A692 and then turn right onto the A693.

- 6.3 T Gillman asked what was in place to protect residential amenity, especially as she regularly works from home. C Hogarth confirmed that there are strict conditions and monitoring for blasting and other environmental levels. L Stokes said that there would be times when residents will be aware of site operations. J Davison said she would look to get a survey done on her home.
- 6.4 C Teasdale said that residents should be aware that they could view all of the planning documents relating to the site on the Durham County Council website using reference number CMA/1/37. All of the information is available for people to view. C Teasdale also commented that the planning conditions for the site including the environmental ones were typical to a site like Bradley across the country.
- 6.5 A Plant said that there should be some protection for the church as well as the other listed buildings in the area.
- 6.6 J Davison said that only a few of the planning documents on the website were labelled. C Teasdale replied that the information was migrated from a different system meaning not all docs are labelled. However, the most important and all most recent documents are at the top.
- 6.7 J Davison said she had asked L Stokes for the non-technical summary (NTS) for the site and L Stokes had refused to send her it. L Stokes replied that Banks had not produced an NTS which is why he could not locate one. This had been produced by UK Coal before Banks had an involvement in the site.
- 6.8 T Gillman raised a point about the planning permission and that the same Inspector who had approved the Bradley site had recently refused a similar site in Derbyshire. A Shield said that planning applications had to be considered on their individual merits at the time of consideration.
- 6.9 D Marrs said that there was a general issue with the lack of information being sent out by Banks. He had concerns about the wildlife, particularly curlews and barn owls. He would like assurances from Banks that these things would not be overlooked due to the tight timescales. J Lomax said that the ecology checking service is very thorough, would be done in accordance with Durham County Council ecology officers and Natural England. J Lomax also said that the restoration

scheme will also ensure there are many long lasting benefits for wildlife on the site. D Marris also said he and others are sceptical about Banks and other developers.

- 6.10 J Davison said that other than the discussion she had with L Stokes on 3 January 2018, there had been no other consultation which was disappointing. J Davison also said that the Inspectors decision to approve the scheme could be overturned and they had wrote to the Secretary of State to ask him to revoke the planning permission for Bradley.
- 6.11 J Davison asked what Banks would do to dispel myths about the project. Several people had commented that the residents had cut the hedges down and Banks had not rectified this. Also L Stokes had commented on Facebook about the site on 23 January 2018 which was unacceptable. L Stokes confirmed that he had posted on social media about the site and had been appropriately reprimanded.
- 6.12 T Gillman asked why Banks had an issue with redacting information. L Stokes reiterated the points previously made in the meeting and that the team would discuss this.
- 6.13 M Jongs said that traffic lights had been placed on the road near the site for three days and this had caused severe traffic issues. A Shield confirmed that this was down to an issue with utilities. M Jongs also said that people were using the back lanes as rat runs and that this was very serious as well as dangerous. A Heron confirmed that a traffic management plan (TMP) would be agreed with Durham County Council about the highways works and these were likely to last approximately six weeks. D Marris asked if pro-active policing could be done on the site. Insp K Wardle replied that this could be a drain on their resources. J Davison also added that Pont Lane is a designated quiet lane.
- 6.14 M Jongs said that the communication from Banks needs to be proactive, not reactive. L Stokes replied that at the first meeting he had offered to come and speak with the residents, groups and organisations if requested and this offer would stand throughout the life of the project.
- 6.15 L McConnell said that he wanted to highlight the road issues too.
- 6.16 Father John Bagnall said that people were concerned with getting their vehicles to and from the church and

what would Banks do about funerals. L Stokes replied that a system could be set up so that someone from Banks rings up the church on a Friday to confirm what services etc are scheduled for the next week. Details to be agreed with L Stokes and Father John.

**AP6 – L Stokes**

- 6.17 A Shield said that it is important that fake news is not shared from this group and also clarified that the site is located in the Leadgate and Medomsley Division.

## **7 Any Other Business**

- 7.1 A discussion was held about the Constitution and how this did not allow for substitute members. It was also agreed that any substitute members should be fully up to speed on the site and previous meetings. The Constitution was amended accordingly and L Stokes to distribute the new document with the Minutes.

**AP7 – L Stokes**

- 7.2 A Plant asked if a newsletter could be produced. L Stokes said one could be done as per the Minutes of the previous meeting. D Marris said that he would like to see it as a factual document only. L Stokes replied that Banks do have an agreed format for producing their literature however members could produce their own newsletters too if required. L Stokes to produce a newsletter for the next meeting.

**AP8 – L Stokes**

- 7.3 It was agreed that Brenda Surtees and Liam Carr could be added to the group. A Shield to send L Stokes their contact details to be added to the distribution list.

**AP9 – A Shield**

## **8 Date & Time of Next Meeting**

- 8.1 The next meeting will be held on Monday 21 May 2018 at 6.30pm. A Shield to agree venue. Food will be provided.

**AP10 – A Shield**

Minuted by L Stokes  
16 April 2018

Prepared by D Newby  
23 April 2018