

Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Wednesday 18 April 2018
Location	Sunbury Golf Centre
Recorder	Louise Morton

Present

Name	Initials	Organisation	Title / Role
Ken Snaith	KS		Resident, Chair
Peter Francis	PF	LOSRA	Resident
Richard Hewitt	RH	Shepperton Residents' Association	Resident
Malcolm Robertson	MR		Resident
Andrea Koskela	AK		Resident
Peter Hughes	PH		Resident
John Seaman	JS		Resident
Peter Crews	PC		Resident
Diane Hall	DH		Resident
Jim Maxwell	JM		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
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
Paul Sanderson	PS	Surrey County Council	Surrey Planning Policy Manager
Chris Lowe	CL	Environment Agency	PPC/RSR Officer 1

Distribution

Participants and: Caroline Smith 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	Introducing new member Diane Hall and guest speaker Paul Sanderson from Surrey Planning team	
2	Apologies	
2.1	Cllr Tim Evans, Cllr Richard Walsh, Jim Walter	
3	Approval of minutes from previous meeting	
3.1	Accepted	
4	Matters Arising	
4.1	Referencing 5.1, RSA stated that the fly-tipping data provided shows that fly-tipping has increased since charges were introduced. RP referred RSA to an email from Cllr Mike Goodman for more information but clarified that there is a delay in data coming through from the districts and boroughs and the way they record the data varies, which makes it harder to compare. RP has asked Spelthorne for more detail on the number of incidents and types of materials.	
5	Surrey planning presentation	
5.1	PS presented on the Surrey Waste plan. PH stated that the targets of 70-80% look ambitious and questioned whether this is realistic. PS pointed out that Wales is nearly achieving these figures, so it is achievable. And as a 15 year plan, the targets need to be ambitious. JM asked what the cylindrical concrete structures where near Shepperton film studios and whether they contained methane gas. KS answered that the film studios have been erecting structures as part of film sets. JS asked what happens to the rejected material. JHa responded that everything is recycled, including metals and aggregates, or it goes for energy recovery.	

	<p>MR asked if that includes fly ash.</p> <p>JHa stated that yes, it does and he is looking at options for recycling the ash, as other facilities do.</p> <p>JHo added that the ash can be stabilised with carbon and used in building materials.</p>	
6	SUEZ updates	
6.1	<p>JCS presented on construction progress.</p> <p>KS requested JCS address question three at this point.</p> <p>JCS answered that the Independent Certifier is Amec Foster Wheeler, now called WOOD. They are acting on behalf of Surrey County Council. They attend site every three months and report back to SCC and SUEZ. There are also two tests they will witness and issue certificates for. The two tests are the readiness test, when the plant is ready to accept waste, and the acceptance test, which is when the site goes into operation.</p> <p>JS asked if WOOD have a continuing role.</p> <p>JCS confirmed they will follow up after acceptance to ensure any snags are completed and that SUEZ is responsible for any costs after the acceptance test.</p> <p>DH asked about the scrubber, and what it does.</p> <p>JCS explained that the scrubber is where lime and active carbon are injected to respectively neutralise acids and absorb heavy metals. The residues are then removed by the bag filter. This is to clean the emissions before they are released.</p>	
6.2	<p>GS presented the operations update.</p> <p>GS stated that the Grundons Energy from Waste facility has recently been on planned closure so the Eco Park has been taking additional local waste during this period with no operational issues.</p> <p>GS also presented the car data from the community recycling centre for December, showing how busy the site was. He added that additional green bins will be made available shortly to accommodate the increased amount of green waste brought to site over the summer period.</p> <p>GS also advised residents that the CRC will be open to 6pm on weekdays over the summer again, to help reduce waiting times for residents.</p> <p>GS delivered a presentation and explained about plans for Reuse at the Eco Park and Ivydene Cottage.</p> <p>AK asked if items would be brought in from other recycling centres to stock the reuse shop.</p> <p>GS explained that, whilst we do this at other sites, as the Eco Park has the largest and busiest Recycling site in Surrey, we would not expect to have to bring in additional items.</p> <p>KS stated he would address a few of the submitted questions at this point. Question one has been answered previously and SUEZ have confirmed residual waste won't be in open air once the site is operational.</p> <p>GS added that the current situation is an interim solution where we're accepting residual and food waste collected by the Districts and Boroughs into the recyclables</p>	

	<p>bulking facility, which will go into the gasification and AD plants when they are operational.</p> <p>MR asked if containerisation would be a better solution.</p> <p>GS explained that this would result in more vehicle movements, so overall it wouldn't be a better solution.</p> <p>KS asked RP to address question 5.</p> <p>RP responded that recycling from Runnymede goes into the Eco Park and is then bulked up to go to Birmingham for Processing. He explained that it would not be practical to send dust carts direct to Birmingham and that when they go out to market to obtain the best value solution sometimes the solution maybe to transfer the materials to bigger purpose built facilities rather than direct to local processors. SCC are always looking to maximise efficiencies at best value.</p> <p>JS expressed concern that this was not previously explained. He observed that Spelthorne waste goes direct to Colnbrook but Runnymede waste is brought into Spelthorne.</p> <p>RP advised that this information was in the planning application.</p> <p>Addressing question six, RP explained that batteries can be recycled in a number places including at community recycling centres and kerbside collections. There are also 'take back' schemes where some local shops will accept batteries and small electricals for recycling.</p> <p>GS explained that batteries mixed with dry mixed recycling can be a fire hazard so residents are encouraged to recycle them separately, by placing them in a separate bag on top of their bins.</p> <p>JS advised that this needed more publicity.</p> <p>RSA stated he would take on board that feedback.</p>	
6.3	<p>LM talked through the recent comments and complaints.</p> <p>JS asked if SUEZ only used Bulk Freight.</p> <p>GS answered that SUEZ use a number of different hauliers to transfer materials so it always helpful if residents have an issue with a vehicle that they can provide registration numbers and dates/ times of any infringements to allow us to fully investigate and address the matter.</p>	
7	Planning Update	
7.1	<p>JCS presented the planning update.</p> <p>JS stated that Ivydene is on green belt and this requires special circumstances to change. He asked if this was sufficient justification for the change.</p> <p>GS responded that he thinks it is sufficient as it encourages reuse and diverts material away from the waste stream and up the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>RSA explained that the planning application would provide the justification for the change and it would be up to the planning committee to decide if that justification was sufficient.</p>	

	<p>JS stated that the access road is public highway and would be required by residents to access the landscaped area.</p> <p>GS reiterated that the planning committee would make that decision.</p> <p>JM stated that a public highway is any road that is maintained at public expense.</p> <p>KS advised that the road had previously been used by travellers to access the land, which would not be desirable.</p> <p>KS suggested we address questions 2, 9 and 10.</p> <p>LM advised that the volume of the soil is approximately 14,500m³. Also that the meeting held was informal and that there were no minutes to share. However the output of the meeting was reflected in the changes made to the plans, which take into account the views of the residents, which were discussed in the meeting.</p> <p>KS advised that point 6.1 in the last set of minutes addresses the question and that the topic of the soils not being native was raised by JW, who is not present to explain.</p> <p>KS explained that the plans now incorporate the feedback from the local residents.</p> <p>JCS added that the landscaping was first discussed in September last year.</p>	
8	Questions	
8.1	<p>KS asked JHa to address question four.</p> <p>JHa explained that any commercial food waste would make up no more than 10% of overall capacity, so it will be heavily diluted with residential food waste and the capacity of the foam system is greater than required.</p> <p>JHa stated that the residence time in the digester tanks is 16 days.</p> <p>On question 4c, JHa explained that the flare can be tested periodically by either stopping or slowing one of the CHP engines in order to provide sufficient gas for testing.</p> <p>JHa advised that the flare would be tested according to the manufacturer's guidelines and in line with the EA's requirements.</p> <p>JHa confirmed that out of 16 Pre-Op Conditions, 15 have been submitted and 7 have been approved.</p> <p>CL advised that the responses were simply an email saying 'approved' so there's nothing to see.</p> <p>PF asked if this meant it was a 'tick-box' exercise.</p> <p>CL stated that he felt this was rude as the Agency officers had spent a lot of time into preparing and reviewing these to make sure they are correct.</p> <p>CL stated that for pre-op condition 4, this does not require the assessment of a HAZOP and is done as part of the inspection process when they visit to review operating techniques on site.</p> <p>JHa added that all HAZOPs have been completed to comply with British Standard BS EN 61882 as well as having been independently chaired by BPE, who are an external company, and that both the construction and operations team have been fully involved in the process.</p> <p>KS confirmed that questions 8, 9, 10 and 11 had already been answered.</p>	

	<p>JHa addressed question 12 by explaining again that our staff would not be exposed to risk and that safety is the number one priority.</p> <p>GS explained that there are always risks on our sites, including cars, heavy vehicles manoeuvring, and that we have emergency procedures in place to protect life at all times.</p> <p>AK stated that people should be informed about commissioning.</p> <p>PF stated that he has concerns.</p> <p>JHa advised that all the components of the technology exist in other places, the only difference here is the feedstock.</p> <p>GS confirmed that it has been agreed we will provide information in the monthly updates including about the start of hot commissioning.</p> <p>JS advised people need to be told about the steam cleaning.</p> <p>LM stated that this was included in the e-update to be handed out.</p> <p>GS also invited people to visit the Martyr's Lane, Woking recycling centre to see the Revive reuse shop there.</p> <p>KS asked to confirm there was no requirement for a further technical sub-committee.</p> <p>PF answered that there was not.</p>	
9	Date of next meeting	
9.1	Wednesday 11 July 2018 at 6.30pm	