

3. I would refer you to my response at 1. above.
4. The legal basis for the request for information is laid out in the Environment Act 1995. You also mention that the request for information appears confused and misdescribed, I would be grateful if you could clarify this statement.
5. You will be aware of the historic concerns relating to the waste deposited at the site, which has been well rehearsed. As an example the Planning Inspectorate report of 1992 which cited surface sampling results undertaken by the Council's Environmental Health Department in 1990, would highlight the issues to the landowner.
6. See my later responses
7. I would ask for clarification from you in relation to your suggestion of limitations relating to acting under pollution control enactments. I presume, along with Section 108 (5) that you are referring to Section 108 (4) (k) (i), if so you will note the entries at (i) and (ii). Nevertheless, the Council's role in relation to pollution control has a number of enactments including for example Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.
8. The Council has been clear that the request for information relates to the waste deposited at the site known as 'Watson's Tip', this is indicated both within the text of my letters to you and in the title of the letter.
9. Your views are noted
10. Your views are noted
11. I would refer you to the letter from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] of 11th January 2017. I would confirm that the Council will not engage in a joint fact sheet with Grange Landfill Ltd. and the Environment Agency. Of course this does not prevent Grange Landfill Ltd. or the Environment Agency from producing a fact sheet that might be distributed to residents. Clearly from the above, if your company does produce a fact sheet to engage residents then it should refrain from any mention of the Council.
- 12-29. Your views are noted
30. The summary in the letter appears to be correct and your views are noted.
31. Your views are noted.
32. This would appear to be correct.
33. Your views are noted and it would appear that they are presented as verbatim quotes so possibly taken from recordings or the presence of one of your companies representatives.

34. This is an inference that Grange Landfill Ltd. has taken from what Grange Landfill Ltd. assert was said at the meeting on 8 December 2016.
35. Your views are noted.
36. It is incorrect to say that no further meetings were held between the Council and MHH Ltd./ Grange Landfill Ltd. following the meeting of 11 August 2016. Meetings were held regarding the access issue on 10th and 11th October 2016. Otherwise, your views are noted.
37. This appears to be correct.
38. This appears to be correct.
39. This paragraph accords with the Council's informal note of the meeting on 12 June 2017 and the emails thereafter.
40. This appears to be correct.
41. Essentially correct; I was (and still am) without instructions so was unable to respond on the question of the operational issues. We did have correspondence with MHH regarding the erection by Millmoor Juniors of a height barrier and grant of a further access licence however.
42. Your views are noted although I struggle to follow what is meant by this paragraph. I think by 'Meeting' you mean the meeting of 10th August 2016. By '10 June 2017', you mean 12th June 2017 as referred to in paragraphs 38-41 above. By '6 December 2016', you mean the public meeting on 8th December 2016.
43. Your views are noted. I would refer you to my earlier comments and previous correspondence in relation to the information requested of your company.

I look forward to your response and return of the monitoring information requested.

Yours sincerely,

Damien Wilson
Strategic Director
Regeneration and Environment