

Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Tuesday 17 October 2017
Location	Sunbury Golf Centre
Recorder	Louise Morton

Present

Name	Initials	Organisation	Title / Role
Ken Snaith	KS		Resident, Chair
John Seaman	JS		Resident
Peter Francis	PF	LOSRA	Resident
Richard Hewitt	RH	Shepperton Residents' Association	Resident
Jim Walter	JW		Resident
Andrea Koskela	AK		Resident
Peter Hughes	PH		Resident
Karen Howkins	KH	Charlton Village Residents' Association	Resident
Malcolm Robertson	MR		Resident
Peter Crews	PC		Resident
Julia Bachmann	JB		Resident
Gareth Swain	GS	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Regional Manager
Jean-Claude Sartenaer	JCS	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Project Director
Justin Hampton	JHa	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Plant Manager
Louise Morton	LM	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Communications Manager
Emma Smyth	ES	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Planning Manager

Jorge Hau	JHau	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Technical Coordinator
Sandra Dunn	SD	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Richard Smith-Ainsley	RSA	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Richard Parkinson	RP	Surrey County Council	Waste Group Manager
Richard Walsh	RW	Surrey County Council	Councillor

Distribution

Participants and: Alan Stones and Stephen Jenkins (Surrey County Council Planning); Richard James (Environment Agency); Tracey Wilmott French (Spelthorne Borough Council Environmental Health), PCSO Colin Gibbons (Surrey Police), Cllr Mike Goodman (Surrey County Council), Sandy Muirhead (Spelthorne Borough Council).		
1	Welcome	
1.1	MR requested we should consider starting the meeting earlier as the venue is closing at 9pm promptly.	
1.2	RW requested feedback is given to the venue regarding the available seating as the tables were overcrowded.	LM
1.3	Welcome to Emma Smyth, Planning Manager for SUEZ	
2	Apologies	
2.1	Jim Maxwell, Colin Barnard, Chris Lowe (Environment Agency)	
3	Approval of minutes from previous meeting	
3.1	Accepted	
4	Matters Arising	
4.1	PH asked if there was any feedback on the safety communications referenced in 4.2. JCS confirmed that this would be covered in the presentation.	
4.2	MR stated that SUEZ said the stack flues would be inserted after the stack was erected, in section 6.5, however the stack came with the flues pre-fabricated. JCS stated that this was an error in communication and in fact the stack and flues arrived on site pre-fabricated, as is best practise with multiple flues.	
4.3	Referring to 8.11, the design of the dust and odour control system for the gasification facility, PF asked if the design is now available. JCS confirmed that the design is now complete and that it can be presented at the next CLG. PF requested that this is done.	JCS

4.4	<p>PH asked when late autumn begins, referencing section 6.1.</p> <p>JCS offered to provide an update on timings in the presentation.</p>	
4.5	<p>JS stated that in 8.11 the question is 'when was the design completed?'. GS confirmed that the design was completed this year.</p>	
4.6	<p>JS referenced 8.7 and asked whether we should have started recruiting for Brian Catt's replacement on the CLG sooner.</p> <p>LM explained the communication opportunities and limitations with regards to timing and advertising the role and that the process was now underway.</p>	
5	Project Update	
5.1	<p>JCS provided a summary of progress on site.</p> <p>Recyclables Bulking Facility and Community Recycling Centre are substantially complete.</p> <p>On the AD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabling has been on going • Mechanical testing • Services <p>On the gasification facility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building cladding including windows • RDF bunker • Gasification train equipment • Turbine installation • Stack installation • Ash hall construction • Air cooled condenser installation <p>KS asked at what stage first waste will enter the AD.</p> <p>GS answered that we would be accepting first food waste in the New Year but that it would be small quantities at first, increasing over a few months.</p> <p>PF stated that the bays on the east side of the CRC still need to be completed.</p> <p>JCS confirmed that the bays are currently required during the construction project so these will not be completed until later.</p> <p>MR asked if there was another public access or exit in the event of an incident blocking the main entrance.</p> <p>GS explained that there is an emergency exit at the rear of the site that leads to the RBF area.</p> <p>MR asked why this was not signed.</p> <p>GS stated that signage was not required and that it would not be safe for members of the public to treat this as a day to day exit due to the plant vehicles in the RBF bay. However in the event of an emergency that requires evacuation from the CRC through the RBF area, staff are trained in the Emergency procedures to stop vehicles</p>	

	<p>operating in this area and make the area safe before leading members of the public to safety.</p> <p>GS advised that there is a full set of SUEZ emergency procedures for the CRC and RBF areas but that the construction site currently operates under M+W Group's emergency processes until the site is completed and handed over. Regular meetings are held where Health and Safety on the whole site is discussed.</p> <p>JHa stated that there would be a full set of SUEZ emergency procedures for the site when it was operational.</p> <p>KH stated that the pipe along the pathway adjacent to the motorway is supposed to be temporary but looks permanent.</p> <p>JCS answered that the pipe will be removed after construction but is currently still required.</p> <p>PF asked what sort of glazing is being used and is it double glazed and reinforced.</p> <p>JCS offered to check and confirm this information.</p> <p>KH asked why there were no solar panels.</p> <p>JCS stated that there are solar panels on the roof of the RBF.</p>	JCS
5.2	<p>GS provided an update on the RBF and CRC operations.</p> <p>RBF is operating well, still taking in Dry Mixed Recyclables from Runnymede.</p> <p>KS asked about the late loading of bulk freight as he had witnessed a bulk freight vehicle leaving at approximately 3.45pm the previous day.</p> <p>GS explained that we had the ability to load freight outside of operating hours but that this was only normally required when the facility is very busy. He stated that if the vehicle was going to Allington, which is open until 6.30pm, then 2 hours 45 mins was a realistic time.</p> <p>RW asked what time the CRC is closing now.</p> <p>GS confirmed that the CRC has reverted back to normal operating hours and closes at 4pm from 1 October.</p> <p>KH asked if the bulk freight vehicles are still parking in Littleton Lane.</p> <p>GS replied that they are not.</p> <p>GS stated that the tonnages into the CRC were approximately 16,500 tonnes last year and 10,000 tonnes year to date for this year. He is expecting approximately 13,000 tonnes by the end of the year. This is slightly down on last year as the warm summer meant a reduction in green waste, which accounts for 35% of waste brought to site.</p> <p>JB suggested that the volumes may be down as people are put off going to site due to the queues and charges.</p> <p>GS stated that the old waste transfer station used to take 100,000 tonnes per year, and a mixture of residual waste, dry mixed recycling, food waste, wood and green waste.</p> <p>KH asked where the trade waste has gone.</p>	

	<p>GS replied that it has been diverted to other sites, either Slyfield or Leatherhead or other non-SUEZ sites, but that we have continued to take household waste as this is the priority for Surrey residents.</p> <p>PF stated that the reduction in green waste this summer has been a national phenomenon.</p>	
5.3	<p>GS provided data on traffic flows.</p> <p>Previously, with the old waste transfer station, the total average daily movements were 453.</p> <p>Average daily movements currently are 146 with the additional construction traffic varying between 110-150 per day, depending on activities.</p> <p>When the Eco Park is operational it is expected that vehicle numbers will be 200-250 per day.</p>	
5.4	<p>RP explained the changes to the CRCs, following the recent public consultation.</p> <p>The Cabinet agreed the proposal, which was influenced by feedback from the public and the recommendations from the Select Committee.</p> <p>The result is that none of the CRCs will be permanently closed. A network of four CRCs will remain open seven days per week but some smaller sites will be closed on some days.</p> <p>KH asked if the vehicle movements presented by GS took into account the changes to the CRCs.</p> <p>GS replied that they did not as the vehicle movements relate to bulkers and RBF traffic, not cars or CRC traffic.</p> <p>RP continued that all sites would be open at the weekend, which is the busiest period, with the exception of one site which does not have planning consent to operate on a Sunday.</p> <p>In addition, the free bag allowance for construction waste will be removed from 4 December.</p> <p>Residents from Bracknell Forest and Wokingham will no longer be allowed access to Camberley CRC from 4 December and vans and trailers will be diverted from smaller, single level sites from 8 January.</p> <p>Charlton Lane will remain open seven days a week.</p>	
5.5	<p>LM talked through the recent and forthcoming communications, including the monthly updates and the e-update which is now in four local libraries as requested – Sunbury, Shepperton, Ashford and Staines. She explained the need to review the website and the project to deliver some animations to explain the four elements of the Eco Park.</p> <p>LM also talked through the numbers of recent enquiries and complaints.</p> <p>LM introduced the Code of Conduct, which was sent to CLG members with the agenda.</p> <p>AK stated she felt the word 'enjoyable' was inappropriate.</p> <p>MR objected to use of the word independent.</p> <p>RSA stated that any person acting as chair would have to come from somewhere, therefore would have a background. He states that the role of an independent chair</p>	

	<p>was to allow everyone to speak equally and that he felt the current chair was doing a good job.</p> <p>MR requested clarification on the meaning of the term 'broader community'.</p> <p>LM explained that this meant they should bring views other than their own to the meeting, for example from their neighbours and other local residents. This was part of the terms of reference along with the responsibility to also disseminate information gained from the meetings to their local communities.</p> <p>LM will update the Code of Conduct based on feedback.</p> <p>KH requested more time was allocated to discuss issues as she felt these were often left to the end.</p>	LM
6	Planning Update	
6.1	<p>ES explained that the site has more excavated soil than originally forecast when the application was submitted in 2010 SUEZ therefore are preparing a planning application to for an additional landscaped bund along the eastern site boundary, adjacent to the railway.</p> <p>The proposed bund will be 3.5m high, which is lower than the current soil stockpile and, it will have a gentler slope than the existing soil stockpile. The final bund will be landscaped.</p> <p>ES explained that the planning application is still in development but, given the CLG's request to be informed about planning applications early, we wanted to inform the group at this stage. She also stated that Surrey County Council will require the design to be of a high standard and to blend into the landscape, so SUEZ is working with the same consultant landscape architects responsible for preparing the landscape scheme for the wider environmental enhancement area.</p> <p>JW asked why it could not be positioned to the north of the site. He also added that they had previously enjoyed views of the wildlife on the site, including swallows, but that the bund would prevent their view of the landscape. He stated that they used to have views of St Anne's Hill and the beacons.</p> <p>RSA explained that residents were already unhappy with the existing bund.</p> <p>JW added that South West Trains have recently added a sign telling trains to sound their horn, ahead of the level crossing, and that the bund rebounds the sound, making it louder.</p> <p>ES offered to speak to JW separately to listen to his views on the proposed bund.</p> <p>KS stated that he has asked about the bund some months ago and was informed it was temporary. He also stated that the CLG needs to be provided with more information on the proposed planting.</p> <p>JW explained that the area is low-lying and that local landowners may be willing to accept some of the soil.</p> <p>RSA stated that it would be useful to gain the views of residents prior to submitting the application.</p> <p>PC asked whether this was to save the contractor money.</p> <p>ES answered that it was best environmental practice to leave soils where they came from. She stated that calculations estimated it would take approximately 3000 HGV vehicle movements to move the soil off site.</p> <p>JW stated that the soil was not native anyway.</p>	

	<p>RW suggested that residents in Hawthorne Way contact Cllr Tim Evans to express their views.</p> <p>ES to contact JW for discussion.</p> <p>LM to circulate link to planning application when it is available.</p> <p>MR asked for clarification on the height of the proposed bund.</p> <p>ES confirmed it was 3.5m.</p>	<p>ES</p> <p>LM</p>
6.2	<p>ES introduced the second planning update which is to change the use of Ivydene Cottage from residential to waste so that it can be used as part of the Revive reuse shops, which are currently thriving.</p> <p>AK asked where the money from the reuse shops goes.</p> <p>GS explained that it goes back into the contract, to support services. 75% to Surrey County Council and 25% to SUEZ.</p> <p>LM added that there is a scheme to introduce a charitable donation which will allow members of the public to nominate local charities to benefit.</p> <p>JW asked if the change would involve construction works.</p> <p>ES stated that there may be need to replace or renovate the existing kennels at the back of the site to be used for storage, as this is an issue the existing reuse shops have raised.</p> <p>GS added that the site would also be used for repair, recycling, upcycling or online selling.</p> <p>JB asked how many people would be employed and if SUEZ had looked at those with lower employability.</p> <p>GS answered that there would be a range of roles and that we were investigating options. SUEZ already works with and has employed people who have needed assistance with employability.</p> <p>JS asked if the planning application will be made to Spelthorne or Surrey and whether the change of use would be permanent.</p> <p>ES answered that the application would be submitted to Surrey and that it would be for permanent change of use.</p> <p>KH asked how much money the reuse shops were generating.</p> <p>GS responded that the Surrey County Council Cabinet has set a target of £300k across the network.</p> <p>KS requested SUEZ includes information on traffic impact.</p>	
7	Air Quality Monitoring	
7.1	<p>PF presented on air quality standards, explaining how they are calculated and what the UK and Scottish requirements are.</p> <p>PF showed that the data presented to the CLG previously showed that the levels recorded so far meet the UK, and the stricter Scottish, requirements.</p>	
8	Questions	

8.1	<p>SD asked if they were allowed to talk publically about the planning updates, prior to the applications being submitted.</p> <p>GS confirmed that they are.</p> <p>KH asked if Tim Evans and Colin Barnard were still members of the group.</p> <p>LM confirmed they were.</p>	
9	AOB	
10	Date of next meeting	
10.1	Tuesday 23 January 2018	