

Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Monday 12 September 2016
Location	Sunbury Golf Centre
Recorder	Luke Ray

Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title / Role
Ken Snaith	KS		Resident, Chair
Richard Smith-Ainsley	RSA	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Tim Evans	TE	Surrey County Council	Councillor
John Seaman	JS		Resident
Malcolm Robertson	MR		Resident
Karen Howkins	KH	Charlton Village Residents Association	Resident
Peter Francis	PF	LOSRA	Resident
Andrea Koskela	AK		Resident
Peter Crews	PC		Resident
Richard Hewitt	RH	Shepperton Residents Association	Resident
Richard Walsh	RW	Surrey County Council	Councillor
Peter Hughes	PH		Resident
Richard Parkinson	RP	Surrey County Council	Waste Group Manager
David Rushton	DR	Environment Agency	Environment Officer
Chris Lowe	CL	Environment Agency	PPC/RSR Officer
Gareth Swain	GS	SUEZ recycling and recovery Surrey	Regional Manager

Jean-Claude Sartenaer	JCS	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Project Director
Emma Jordan	EJ	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Communications Manager
Luke Ray	LR	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Communications Admin
Richard Reeves	RR	M+W Group	Project Director

Distribution

Participants and: Alan Stones (Surrey County Council Planning); Richard James (Environment Agency); Tracey Wilmott French (Spelthorne Borough Council Environmental Health), PCSO Colin Gibbons (Surrey Police), Cllr Mike Goodman, Sandy Muirhead (Spelthorne Borough Council).			
1	Welcome		
2	Apologies		
2.1	Apologies were received from Jorge Hau (SUEZ), Brian Catt, Cllr Sandra Dunn, and Cllr Colin Barnard.		
3	Approval of minutes from previous meeting		
3.1	The minutes were agreed.		
4	Matters arising		
4.1	Item 5.2.7 - KS noted the charging scheme had been implemented and that the CLG hadn't been consulted on this.		
4.2	Item 5.2.8 - GS reported that the foil and carton containers had been relocated.		
4.3	Item 5.2.2 - AK reported difficulty accessing the green waste containers in mid-August due to the height of the barrier on the gantry and the amount of waste in the containers. GS explained that the bins were being exchanged more frequently instead of compacted (which requires access to the container to be closed). Additional containers were subsequently added to cater for increased demand in August (discussed further at 6.4 below).		
4.4	Item 5.4.3 – EJ confirmed no drop in sessions were planned for 2016. SUEZ develops an annual communications plan for the Eco Park and will consider RSA and KH's request for a drop in session at a fully accessible venue when developing the plan for 2017. Once this plan has been agreed with Surrey County Council, EJ will update the group on the activities due to take place in 2017. GS confirmed the members' feedback would be considered.	EJ	GS
4.5	Item 6.2 – RP confirmed data from the offsite air quality monitoring station would be publicly available.		
4.6	Richard Reeves was introduced as the new Project Director for M+W Group, replacing Peter Golden who has moved to a new role within the company.		
5	Technical Subgroup Update		

5.1	<p>PF gave an overview of the recent meeting on behalf of the resident members.</p> <p>Detailed information on nitrification and the strength of cladding for the AD tanks was provided by SUEZ and discussed. PF confirmed his concerns about the cladding and potential for jetting had been allayed.</p>	
5.2	<p>PF expressed concerns the bunding arrangement was not sufficient to deal with a catastrophic tank failure. EJ noted this hadn't been discussed at the sub group meeting.</p>	
5.3	<p>PF confirmed his questions regarding the German guidance were adequately answered and that technical requirements are being followed to a high standard. Some further information from SUEZ is to follow.</p>	
5.4	<p>Uniflare was confirmed as the flare supplier with details of the design to be supplied at the next meeting. PF queried the number of boosters for the flare and potential issues in the event a booster failed.</p>	
5.5	<p>JCS agreed with PF's feedback and confirmed the outstanding issues will be addressed at the next sub group meeting. The bunding issue will also be addressed along with inspection of the tanks for external corrosion.</p>	JCS
5.6	<p>PF explained SUEZ had presented the odour control system for the AD facility to the sub-group, commenting that it appeared a good system but may need a lot of maintenance.</p> <p>SUEZ had also presented the fire strategy for the Eco Park, which PF considered adequate but with potential for issues with the ongoing maintenance required.</p>	
5.7	<p>JCS concurred with PF's summary and noted it had been a constructive meeting. He had noted PF's concerns about the maintenance of the two systems and will address these at the next sub-group meeting.</p>	JCS
5.8	<p>CL added that the fire service were now inspecting waste sites jointly with the Environment Agency. A recent short notice joint inspection was carried out at the Eco Park and, in its current form, the site is considered a low risk. It will be revised in the future as the development progresses.</p>	
6	Project Update (see attached presentation)	
6.1	<p><u>Construction:</u> JCS updated the group on progress since the last meeting, noting the piling was completed earlier than anticipated and walls and foundations were now being put in place for the gasification facility. The structures in the recycling centre are complete with some snagging items outstanding. Looking ahead, work will continue on the AD and gasification facilities.</p>	
6.2	<p><u>Planning Applications:</u> JCS explained a planning application to extend the construction working hours by one hour per day and to allow 24 hour work inside buildings had been submitted and was under consideration.</p> <p>An application for detailed design changes was being prepared and due for submission at the end of the month. JCS confirmed detailed design changes are common with a project of this size.</p> <p>Members of Surrey County Council's planning committee had visited the construction site as part of a development programme organised by the planning authority.</p>	

	<p>KH asked if the group could visit site. EJ explained that at the current stage of construction it wasn't feasible to arrange a site visit for such a large group and that a visit may be possible next spring. JCS added that as an interim measure, SUEZ is arranging a site visit for the technical sub group who will feedback to the main group at the next meeting. KS had visited the site to assist him in chairing group meetings and commented that it would be difficult to host a site visit for a large group inexperienced on construction sites, and noted that SUEZ and M+W are responsible for the health and safety of all those on site.</p>	
6.3	<p><u>Bulking facility operations:</u> GS provided an update. The facility was operating effectively and was well controlled. The Lakeside EfW facility had been down for a period and the bulking facility had accommodated all of the waste collected from homes in Spelthorne within its planning permission.</p>	
6.4	<p><u>Community recycling centre operations:</u> GS reported that the site had been very busy in the weeks leading up to the introduction of the charging scheme and the number of green waste containers had been increased to cater for additional demand. Residents will continue to deposit green waste in containers once the Eco Park is complete and this happens at all other Surrey CRCs, except Epsom. The barriers are required for health and safety, and any residents with difficulty emptying their waste into the container should ask a member of staff for assistance. AK mentioned a lack of staff on the day she visited site and GS would address this going forwards.</p> <p>The site will revert to its usual weekday opening hours of 8am to 4pm from October and will continue to open for an additional hour on Saturdays (from 8am) until the end of construction. In response to a question from KH, GS explained that cars inside the site gates at closing time continue on to deposit their waste. As closing time nears, site staff help manage any queue.</p>	GS
6.5	<p><u>Communications:</u> EJ gave an update on communications activity since the last meeting and activity planned in the coming months. A pilot e-update had been issued to around 300 people, from this it was possible to tell how many people had opened it and what stories had been popular. The information is used to plan future editions.</p>	
6.5.1	<p>EJ gave an update on enquiries and complaints received since the last meeting. Of the 11 complaints, 8 related to piling. This was much lower than the complaints received during the first phase of piling in 2015.</p> <p>There had been two complaints about HGV routing, one confirmed and dealt with accordingly. The other involved Keltbray vehicles; Keltbray is not involved in the Eco Park but is a local company with operations in the area.</p> <p>In response to a query from RSA, JCS confirmed a log was kept by site security of vehicles that enter or leave site from the wrong direction and would provide information on this at the next meeting.</p>	JCS
7	<p>SCC Update</p>	
7.1	<p>GS explained that charges for non-household waste had been introduced at CRCs on 1st September in line with the Council's policy. The charges were for specific types of building and DIY waste with an allowance of one free item or bag of this kind of waste. There is also a charge for tyres. The communications campaign raised awareness of the scheme and the CRCs were busy in August, receiving higher volumes of inert waste. Some residents thought all waste would be charged for and site staff were explaining this wasn't the case. The volume of inert waste has significantly reduced</p>	

	<p>since the policy was implemented on 1st September and is expected to remain low for a time before reaching a steady level.</p> <p>RP added that other local authorities including Hampshire and West Sussex are also introducing charges.</p> <p>AK queried the difference in the charges levied in Surrey with those in Cornwall. RP explained Surrey had set its charges at a level to cover the disposal cost. It was agreed there were many different factors involved in setting charges and that a direct comparison between the two authorities wasn't possible.</p> <p>RP explained that Surrey councils had launched a campaign to deter fly tipping.</p>	
8	Questions	
8.1	The gasification facility building is in the early stages of construction. The facility's design is complete and has been discussed with the technical sub group.	
8.2	A risk based approach has been adopted for the use of body cameras at CRCS. As a result, the charging officers at recycling centres that accept non-household waste wear body cameras. They can start recording if a confrontation occurs and the camera is switched off unless activated. There is potential to equip other site staff with cameras but this isn't currently considered necessary.	GS
9	AOB	
9.1	<p>EJ explained that Jim Golledge had resigned from the group. The group agreed KS should write to him on behalf of the group to thank him for his service.</p> <p>This created a vacancy which, in line with the terms of reference, would be advertised. Two residents have previously expressed an interest in joining and any further interest will be added to these and considered, looking to ensure the membership of the group is representative of the local community e.g. geographical spread of members and representation of key local organisations.</p> <p>Sandy Muirhead from Spelthorne Borough Council has moved to a new role within the council and is no longer able to attend group meetings but would like to continue to receive the minutes. The group agreed a representative from the council wasn't required at group meetings at this time.</p> <p>KS noted that Julia Bachmann hadn't been able to attend recent meetings and it was agreed EJ would contact her to confirm if she wished to continue as a member.</p>	<p>KS</p> <p>EJ</p> <p>EJ</p>
9.2	In response to a query from PF, CL explained the EA isn't directly involved in DEFRA's reporting on the AD industry so can't provide an update on this.	
10	Date of next meeting	
8.1	Tuesday 15 th November 2016.	