

Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Tuesday 14 May 2019
Location	Sunbury Golf Centre
Recorder	Louise Morton

Present

Name	Initials	Organisation	Title / Role
Ken Snaith	KS		Resident, Chair
Jim Walter	JW		Resident
Richard Hewitt	RH	Shepperton Residents' Association	Resident
Diane Hall	DH		Resident
Alison Dodsworth	AD	Charlton Village Residents' Association	Resident
Andrea Koskela	AK		Resident
Malcolm Robertson	MR		Resident
John Seaman	JS		Resident
Peter Hughes	PH		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	Environment Delivery Group Manager
Richard Walsh	RW	Surrey County Council	Councillor

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	KS acknowledged the sad passing of Peter Francis recently and recognised his significant contributions to the group. A moment's silence was held.	
2	Apologies	
2.1	Cllr Colin Barnard, Mark McCartney, Cllr Tim Evans, Julia Bachman, Anna von Borzyszkowska (EA)	
3	Approval of minutes from previous meeting	
3.1	DH noted that her question in 5.1 was not recorded accurately, although the recorded answer was accepted.	
4	Matters Arising	
4.1	PH questioned that an answer given in 9.1 gave a date as May 19, which is the current month. LM explained that the question related to contractual dates, not the progress update.	
5	Project update	
5.1	JCS presented the project update. Activity from the last period included: <u>Anaerobic Digestion Facility</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of Pre-commissioning • Wet commissioning • Installation of gas holder <u>Gasification facility</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admin building fit out • Electrical works • Pipe lagging • Pre-commissioning activities • Commissioning of Systems (services, fire protection, odour control, etc) 	

- Testing Mechanical Pre-Treatment with waste
- Refractory Drying and Steam Blowing

JCS advised that screening the soils would re-start soon, and would take a few weeks to finish.

JCS confirmed that food waste is expected on site imminently and that black bag waste was received in the tipping hall of the gasification facility earlier that day to start the next phase of commissioning the mechanical pre-treatment equipment.

JCS asked for feedback on the recent steam blowing.

JW, DH and AD all noted that they had observed the steam. JW commented that he could hear the slight hissing sound if he listened closely.

JHa stated he felt it was a very efficient steam blowing and that the chemical clean done on the pipes prior to steam blowing had worked very well.

JCS concluded that first fire on waste for gasification was expected in late June/ early July and the SUEZ takeover of the AD facility was expected in August.

JW asked about the soils bunds, stating that they were quite far up towards the Halliford Road end and asked when the construction debris would be removed.

JCS stated that the timescales for this are currently being worked on.

JW asked when the landscaping will start.

JCS advised that this will not start until construction and commissioning is complete, so timescales are unconfirmed but it was likely to be affected by seasons as planting has to be seasonal.

JS asked when the planning permission for the landscaping will go through.

LM confirmed that planning was granted in March.

AK advised she was unable to find the application on the SCC website and the link sent did not work. She asked if anything substantial had changed from the version previously presented.

LM advised that the plan was as per the design previously shown to the group, based on feedback from JW.

JW commented that he believed there were timescales built into the planning consent.

JCS confirmed that the work needed to start within three years of permission being given, and be finished within three years of the work starting.

KS asked if the black bag waste used for commissioning was the same as the waste that will be received when the plant is operating.

JHa answered that it was. The waste was supplied from one of our other transfer stations within Surrey and contained black bag waste only.

DH asked what percentage of waste was removed through the mechanical pre-treatment process.

JHa stated that it was approximately 20% and that the majority of this would be recyclable or recoverable in some way, such as metals or hardcore.

JCS advised the group that the site had been awarded Bronze at the recent Considerate Constructors awards.

SD asked what the plume of dark smoke was during the recent steam blowing and commissioning activities.

JCS stated that there may have been a small amount of dust from the first time the odour control fans were switched on, as this comes from the active carbon filters.

Consensus from the group that this was more substantial.

LM requested photos with times and dates so this could be investigated.

JHa showed a photo of the Eco Park to the group, showing a large dark plume. He stated that this is steam but the light at dusk would show it as dark.

He continued to explain that if the plume is seen coming from below the top of the stack it is coming from the building, it will be steam. The plume from the middle of the gasification building is steam coming from the start up boiler vent. Any emissions from the process would show as coming from the top of the stack, not the building.

AD said this was extremely helpful as it increased her understanding of the emissions process.

JW confirmed the plume he had seen came from the building.

JHa explained that the stack had five flues. One flue is used for the emissions from the gasification process, once they have been filtered and cleaned. Two of the flues are for the odour control systems and two further flues are for the two combined heat and power engines from the AD facility.

JHa also stated that there are two small emergency diesel generators on site that would emit emissions that wouldn't go through the stack.

GS asked JHa to confirm if these had been operated in the last two weeks.

JHa confirmed that they had not, other than for routine maintenance.

KS concluded that the dark plumes must be a trick of the light, and the emissions were indeed steam from the steam blowing.

AD asked if the recent plumes were a true representation of what it would be like when the site was operating.

JHa stated that it was not, as the steam blowing would only be required in future if significant work was needed to the pipes and they required cleaning again, and the start up vents are for start up only, so they may be required during routine maintenance and shut down but not for ordinary operations.

AD asked what we would see coming out of the stack.

JHa stated it would mostly likely just be a heat haze. Occasionally there may be some white steam emitted. He showed a photo of the steam blowing tent to show that this was temporary and had now been dismantled as the steam blowing had been completed.

KS confirmed the tent had not been present when he toured the site earlier in the day.

MR asked if it would be possible to have a webcam on the stack to monitor activity.

JHa stated that, as evidenced in the meeting, visual information can be misinterpreted, so a webcam may not be helpful. The information from the CEMS will provide information for people on what is being emitted from the site.

AD asked if that information would be available.

	<p>LM confirmed that she is developing a solution to show the emissions from the site on the SUEZ Surrey website, in a similar fashion to the emissions shown on the SUEZ Cornwall website.</p> <p>P.M.N. SUEZ Cornwall emissions website http://www.suezcornwall.co.uk/what-we-do/energy-recovery/emissions-monitoring/</p>	
6	CRC and RBF operations	
6.1	<p>GS presented on the CRC and RBF operations update.</p> <p>GS stated that the RBF had been operating well. The site had recently been receiving an increased volume of waste from Spelthorne as a result of the Grundon's facility at Colnbrook being unavailable due to routine maintenance.</p> <p>GS informed the group that SUEZ had recently won a National award for Excellence for the community recycling centre at Martyrs Lane, Woking, from an industry body. The award was for Civic Amenity of the Year for the UK. He explained that the site at Charlton Lane was operated to the same standards as the site in Woking.</p> <p>GS presented data on the number of visitors to the Charlton Lane recycling centre. The data showed how busy the site was over the Easter weekend, receiving in excess of 5,800 visits. A second graph showed the seasonal growth in average daily visitors from January to May this year.</p> <p>AD stated that she visited the CRC regularly and the service was always good.</p> <p>JW commented that SCC should use this data to inform their road infrastructure plans as the current solution is not suitable.</p> <p>RW asked GS and RP if there had been a significant change in the volumes at the CRC in the last 5 to 10 years.</p> <p>GS stated that, if anything, the volumes have decreased.</p> <p>RW stated that therefore the question is about road coverage rather than the road network.</p> <p>JW stated that the junction over the M3 was very poor and sometimes he chose to go a long way round to Staines if he could see traffic queuing up.</p> <p>RSA stated that the junction would be worse as there was more traffic coming through Charlton Village, therefore there were fewer gaps for cars to pull into, resulting in the traffic backing up.</p> <p>KS stated that there was queuing traffic when he visited the site at 3pm, but the traffic wasn't going into the CRC.</p> <p>RSA stated that there was a proposal for a roundabout at that junction, tied up with the proposals for the Shepperton studios expansion.</p>	
6.2	<p>RP presented on the current changes to the community recycling centres.</p> <p>He recapped the consultation which ended in January and the need for Surrey County Council to save money.</p> <p>RP explained the changes to the four recycling only sites that were introduced in May.</p> <p>AD asked what the trial period for this was.</p>	

RP answered that the decision needed to be made before the beginning of October, which was the date the cabinet had set for closure of the four sites.

RP stated that, overall, the amount of waste being taken at the CRCs in Surrey had reduced. In 2015/16 the sites received 143,000 tonnes of waste compared to only 86,000 tonnes last year, so overall the sites were not as busy as they used to be.

GS confirmed that the Charlton Lane CRC was no longer the busiest site in Surrey, with tonnages dropping from over 20,000 tonnes per year historically to approximately 10,500 tonnes last year. He explained that this was attributed to the introduction of the charging scheme, the residents permit and van permit schemes and the reduction in non-household, construction waste with the introduction for charging at the site.

KS stated there were lots of questions, nationally and locally, about fly-tipping.

RP explained that volumes at the CRCs had dropped by about 50,000 tonnes per year, in part due to the introduction of charges, whereas fly-tipping volumes had remained fairly constant at about 3,000 to 4,000 tonnes per year. There had been a slight increase recently in tonnages as well as incidents, although with the latter Defra accept that the data is inaccurate due to the different ways individual authorities report the incident data.

GS explained that much of the fly-tipping is a result of organised crime, giving the example of the fly-tipped waste in Nutty Lane recently. This was processed material on an industrial scale from a site, not residents who don't want to pay a charge. Similarly, a recent fly-tip at Lyne Lane was industrial waste where businesses charge residents to remove waste, but then fly-tip it, rather than pay commercial rates. Often it is waste such as mattresses and white goods that residents could take to the CRCs free of charge.

RP continued with his presentation on the changes at the CRCs, advising that the second recommendation from the cabinet members was to introduce charges for construction wood. The current law does not oblige Surrey County Council to take construction waste for free, therefore construction wood and roofing felt will be charged for from 3rd June.

AD stated that there's already a petition to campaign against this.

MR asked if wood waste was recyclable.

RP answered that it was not recyclable in the main, because it was often treated or protected wood where it's been used for fence panels or flooring or it is laminated or MDF, so it's classed as contaminated wood in the view of true recycling..

GS advised that wood in that condition is normally chipped and used as biomass in special energy from waste facilities and this is what happens to Charlton lane's wood.

MR asked if it could go into the gasification plant at the Eco Park.

JHa explained that it was a different process for black bag waste or wood, so a plant would normally be designed to process one or the other, not both.

SD commented that the petition has over 1,000 signatures already.

RP advised that Surrey County Council is in a difficult financial position, but has chosen not to close sites. Members have had to make some difficult choices with regard to cost savings at the CRCs and officers and SUEZ are seeking to implement these changes as well as possible.

	<p>RW added that Surrey County Council has already saved £123m this year, with a projected further £86m so the financial position is improving and some of the changes being implemented may be reviewed again in future.</p>	
6.3	<p>GS expressed his appreciation that the Revive shop had been so well received by local residents. He explained that the shop opened in early April and had been doing really well.</p> <p>GS explained about the different items available to buy, including bikes, furniture, bric a brac, pots, garden furniture, sports equipment.</p> <p>GS also informed the group about the great initiative working in partnership with HMP Ford. Bicycles dropped off at the community recycling centres are taken to HMP Ford where they are checked and repaired by the prisoners in a dedicated SUEZ workshop, before being returned to the Revive shops to be sold. The work is part of a scheme to provide training and rehabilitation and to improve employment prospects upon release.</p> <p>AD asked why the charity scheme only donates 10% of profits and who gets the rest of the 90%.</p> <p>GS explained that the net revenue, after VAT and all operational costs, goes into the contract to support the service, but ultimately it goes to benefit Surrey County Council and SUEZ in a profit share, as part of the contract.</p> <p>RP stated that the revenue generated was needed to enable them to make fewer cost savings elsewhere in the service. He stated that SUEZ benefited as an incentive to encourage them to develop the Revive shops to support the service. He also stated that there is an environmental benefit to the shops, as it prevents waste going to landfill.</p>	
7	Communications update	
7.1	<p>LM summarised recent communications, and explained that the Eco Park website would be retired in the coming months, with relevant content moved across to the SUEZ Surrey website, which will also host the emissions data.</p> <p>GS mentioned that he had recently presented to a Probus group in Shepperton, where one of the questions asked was how he was going to ensure the residents understood all of the controls that SUEZ had in place in the gasification process.</p> <p>GS reminded the CLG that their role was to help local residents understand more about the facility, using the materials provided such as the presentation, monthly updates and FAQs.</p> <p>RW suggested we contact Monica Chard at Shepperton Matters to get an article included.</p> <p>LM agreed to follow this up.</p> <p>LM advised the group that Karen Howkins had applied to join the Community Liaison group, as there were still two vacancies left by Peter Crews and Jim Maxwell.</p> <p>LM handed out voting slips for people to make their choice, with instructions to mark the paper and hand it back anonymously.</p> <p>P.M.N. Eleven people voted on membership. Those people were AK, KS, RSA, RW, SD, RH, JS, DH, AD, MR and JW. The results were 5 votes in favour of Karen joining the CLG and 6 votes against. LM will advise Karen of the outcome.</p>	<p>LM</p> <p>LM</p>

8	Questions	
8.1	<p>AD asked why the sign at the front entrance was covered over.</p> <p>LM confirmed that the text was being amended.</p> <p>RSA also advised that the sign will not be illuminated.</p> <p>AD asked if the site was operational 24hrs a day as she had seen photos of it lit at night.</p> <p>JHa confirmed that, yes it was, as both the AD and gasification processes are continuous, therefore would operate 24hrs a day and there would be shift workers on site at all times.</p>	
10	Date of next meeting	
10.1	<p>Wednesday 18th September, 6.30pm. Location to be confirmed.</p> <p>P.M.N. The date of the next meeting has been changed to Tuesday 24th September. Location to be confirmed.</p>	