

Meeting record

| | |
|----------|----------------------------------|
| Subject | Eco Park Community Liaison Group |
| Date | Tuesday 23 January 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 |
| Jim Walter | JW | | Resident |
| Andrea Koskela | AK | | Resident |
| Peter Hughes | PH | | Resident |
| Karen Howkins | KH | Charlton Village Residents' Association | Resident |
| Peter Crews | PC | | 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 |
| Emma Smyth | ES | SUEZ recycling and recovery UK | Planning Manager |
| Jorge Hau | JHau | SUEZ recycling and recovery UK | Technical Coordinator |
| Calum James | CJ | SUEZ recycling and recovery UK | SHEQ Manager |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|----------------------------|---------------------|
| 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 |
| Chris Lowe | CL | Environment Agency | PPC/RSR Officer 1 |
| David Rushton | DR | Environment Agency | Environment Officer |

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 | LM to provide feedback to the venue re: set up | LM |
| 2 | Apologies | |
| 2.1 | Cllr Tim Evans, Julia Bachmann, Malcolm Robertson | |
| 3 | Approval of minutes from previous meeting | |
| 3.1 | Accepted | |
| 4 | Matters Arising | |
| 4.1 | KS asked for confirmation that action 4.3 will be covered in today's presentation. JCS confirmed. | |
| 4.2 | KS also asked for confirmation that information on glazing will be provided as per 5.1. JCS confirmed. | |
| 4.3 | KS confirmed action in 5.5 has been completed. | |
| 5 | Project Update | |
| 5.1 | JCS provided a document detailing the specification of the glazing to PF. He also confirmed that it is double-glazing, with argon in between, surrounded by aluminium and that it meets British Standard BSEN1279 JCS provided a summary of progress on site. Recyclables Bulking Facility and Community Recycling Centre are complete. On the AD: | |

- Pipe testing
- CHP exhaust duct installation
- Making Plant ready for mechanical completion

On the gasification facility:

- Admin building cladding
- Ash handling facility
- Steam turbine alignment
- Air cooled condenser cladding
- Water and steam piping
- Cabling, road surfaces, pavements and kerbing

JCS confirmed that the mechanical completion has to be verified and the systems tested separately before first waste can be delivered which is expected to be April.

KS asked where the AD reception hall was on the main aerial photo. JCS pointed it out.

KS asked where the slurry from food waste will go.

JHa informed the group that the AD facility has to be self-contained and all delivered waste is treated in accordance with animal and by-product regulations. He explained that, after tipping their waste, the vehicles are cleaned before exiting the facility. In addition, the hall is cleaned down at the end of every day and water used for washing goes into a sump and is used within the AD process. The hall is also designed so the floor slopes to the back of the building.

AK asked and JCS confirmed that cold commissioning is starting.

JHo explained the odour control system as per the diagram.

SD asked how many people would be in the area.

JHa confirmed that there would be two people in the gasification hall area during the day plus the drivers and one person in the AD hall during the day, plus drivers. He continued that they only accept waste during daytime operating hours and that processing operations were controlled via the control room.

PF explained that dust control was very important in a plant such as this due to the risk of explosion.

JHa explained that the levels of dust will be kept low using a series of methods and there would be three changes of air per hour. The dust would be gathered and emptied, rather like a vacuum cleaner bag.

PF asked what monitoring devices would be used.

JHa confirmed that personal monitors would be worn by staff as part of commissioning, as well as spot checks to ensure we have the correct level of extraction.

PF explained that accumulations of dust could be dangerous if lifted by a breeze.

JHa confirmed there would be regular cleanings and that the site had been designed to reduce dust collecting, such as vertical rather than horizontal cable trays. He also added that there would be localised extraction at specific high risk areas, in addition to the roof level extraction.

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | <p>CJ added that under the dangerous substances and explosive atmospheres regulations (DSEAR) SUEZ are required to carry out a risk assessment on the entire site to ensure suitable and sufficient safeguards against dust and flammable gas explosion are implemented.</p> <p>KS asked if a further technical sub-group was required to look at this in more detail.</p> <p>PF stated that he did not feel this was required.</p> | |
| 5.2 | <p>GS explained the difficulties over the Christmas period. Despite making provisions for additional waste volumes expected over the festive period, including arranging additional haulage and offtake capacity, we still received more volume than expected and were impacted by the way Christmas fell this year, with only three operational days between Christmas and New Year.</p> <p>We were also impacted by the adverse weather in between Christmas and New Year as loads took longer to take waste away and return. Overall we maintained the service to the districts and residents.</p> <p>All the waste was cleared by the Wednesday and we continued to clear the oldest waste first which is good operational practice as well as to satisfy our permit requirements. SUEZ maintained communication with the EA throughout this period, with regular photos sent to the site regulatory officer.</p> <p>We also provided additional odour and pest control over the period. We accept it wasn't ideal but we have revised our site management procedures and an updated version of this document has been sent to the EA for review.</p> <p>Waste volumes have now returned to normal.</p> <p>On the bird control, we have an obligation to control birds on site and there's a number of ways we do that. We have been using a hawk and a bird scaring cannon, but we were advised by residents that this was a concern.</p> <p>KH observed that there was no mention of bird cannons in the updates.</p> <p>LM advised that this information was included in the covering email on the Nov/ Dec edition sent out early December.</p> <p>KH asked if the hawks have bird flu.</p> <p>GS explained how the hawk and handler work and the challenges, and why a mixture of bird control methods are required to be effective.</p> <p>CJ added that hawks take years to train so it would be highly unlikely that they would be allowed to be infected by any illnesses.</p> <p>CL confirmed that hawks used for bird control are registered with DEFRA and use biosecurity.</p> <p>CJ explained that there can be three birds on site at any one time to ensure consistent cover. Birds can become lethargic after feeding so it's important to plan for this.</p> <p>RSA asked if we had looked at using bio-acoustic bird scarers.</p> <p>GS confirmed that we have and do use them within the business, and they are very effective as part of a bird control programme, but as the birds are intelligent we need to use a variety of methods.</p> <p>JM commented that people had complained to him about queuing over the Christmas period.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----|--|---------------------|
| | <p>GS advised that the CRC was also busy as a result of people depositing their additional Christmas waste and he offers apologies to those who had had to queue.</p> <p>GS offered to present car data from Charlton Lane CRC over the festive period at the next meeting.</p> <p>JM suggested we add digital displays to show the waiting times.</p> <p>GS said he would investigate.</p> <p>PF asked for clarification on the number of bays being used to house the waste.</p> <p>CL advised that looking at the number of bays in use was not helpful, but the key for compliance is that the waste had to be removed within three days, which it was.</p> <p>PF asked if the bird problem is new.</p> <p>GS advised that it is seasonal with the worst periods being late in the year and March/ April.</p> <p>KS commented that the gulls are not new and have always been a problem on the site.</p> <p>GS explained that this is also an interim solution until the gasification and AD plants are operational, then the residual and food waste will go straight into the respective tipping halls.</p> <p>KH asked if the RBF will then be enclosed and what it would be used for.</p> <p>GS explained that it would not be enclosed and that it would be used to store recyclables from the CRC, such as mattresses, green waste and wood and not for municipal residual waste containing organics.</p> <p>PF observed that this explanation would have been helpful earlier as he had not appreciated this was temporary.</p> | <p>GS</p> <p>GS</p> |
| 5.3 | <p>RP provided a summary of the recent changes to the CRCs. Some smaller sites are now closed on some days of the week, but SCC opted to retain a strategic network of sites that are still open seven days a week, of which Charlton Lane is one.</p> <p>Smaller sites now also have restrictions on vans and trailers. The main change for Charlton Lane is the removal of the free daily allowance of non-household/ construction waste.</p> <p>RP commented that it's still early days to assess the impact of the changes, and this is traditionally a quiet period anyway, but Easter will be when it gets busy.</p> <p>GS observed that we've already seen a reduction in non-household/ construction waste being dropped off at the site.</p> <p>JM asked if there would be additional pressure on Charlton Lane as a result of the changes.</p> <p>RP replied that it was too early to tell but the Cabinet could have closed four of the smaller sites completely but opted not to.</p> <p>SD asked when there would be an update on fly-tipping data.</p> <p>RP explained that SCC always monitors data but only the tonnages as the districts and boroughs hold the data on the number of incidents.</p> <p>RP agreed that tonnages data would be sent out with the minutes.</p> | <p>RP</p> |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <p>extended hours. There will also be another one going in soon on the design of silencers on valves.</p> <p>KH asked what the heat report was about.</p> <p>ES explained that it was a feasibility study to look at what the heat from the plant could be used for. Producing the report was a planning condition but it essentially looks at what could be done. The site is challenging as heat would need to be used locally and it's bound by the railway and the motorway, which would make it too expensive to run pipes under these. The only viable option would be if the local landowner adjacent to the site wished to have greenhouses on the land and the heat could be used for this.</p> <p>JW asked about how much heat will be lost.</p> <p>JHa explained that it's a trade-off between power and heat so we can choose to produce more power so less heat is lost. He added that heat generated is used within the processes as much as possible, for example to provide heat for the pasteurization process within the AD facility and to provide heat for the admin offices on site.</p> <p>PC suggested that the option of using the heat was given as a benefit, therefore this study should have been done earlier.</p> <p>RP explained that European cities have plants such as this in the heart of their cities so the heat can be used for buildings locally. In the UK we don't have the network for this and there is more objection to have such facilities near to residents and buildings. Within the UK he is only aware of a couple of EfW sites that use combined heat and power– Sheffield and South London sites do, and SUEZ EfW in Wilton.</p> <p>ES also talked about the application to extend the hours at the RBF and that this is simply a continuation of hours that we already have to help us manage the volumes of waste coming through the site until the gasification and AD facilities are operational. The additional hours allow us to finish bulking up each day, should we need to.</p> <p>ES stated that the application for change of use at Ivydene Cottage to a re-use hub has not yet been submitted.</p> <p>KH asked whether it would go to Spelthorne for approval.</p> <p>ES advised that it would go to Surrey County Council as it's for change of use.</p> <p>GS offered that we present on re-use at the next meeting.</p> <p>RSA asked how many conditions there were still to discharge.</p> <p>ES confirmed that condition 28, on silencers, was the last one.</p> <p>SD asked if the plans for Ivydene were to demolish and rebuild or to refurbish.</p> <p>ES confirmed that the plans at the moment were simply to apply for change of use and that there were no plans to demolish. If there was an intention to do this in future, it would require a separate planning application.</p> <p>ES continued that there would be an area for storage, a shop area, possibly a repair area for bicycles and that the intention is to use the building as it is.</p> <p>KH asked how the parking would work.</p> <p>ES explained that there would be space for parking in the lane as it would be blocked off and would not be required for access once construction was completed.</p> <p>KH asked if it would be possible to change the use and then later on extend it to make it part of the Eco Park.</p> | <p>GS</p> |
|--|-----------|

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------|
| | <p>RSA explained that as it's on greenbelt any planning application would have to ensure the footprint remained the same.</p> <p>AK suggested that it was a perfectly sensible question.</p> <p>KS answered that planning had already answered the question.</p> <p>RSA reconfirmed that on green belt you can develop but only on the existing footprint.</p> <p>ES confirmed that SUEZ is not applying to enlarge the footprint.</p> <p>JW commented that he likes the idea for upcycling and the opportunities for creating employment and increasing skills at Ivydene Cottage.</p> <p>PH agreed.</p> | |
| 7 | AOB | |
| 7.1 | <p>PC thanked the EA for attending and keeping everyone updated.</p> <p>CL reiterated that they have visited the site and provided recommendations and that everything is compliant.</p> <p>KH asked about the lights on the stack.</p> <p>JCS stated that we are aware the lights went out last week. We are not obligated to have lights on the stack but it is recommended due to our proximity to Heathrow and London and for small aircraft. We received notification from the Police and alerted the Civil Aviation Authority who notified people. We have a process in place for if this happens again although the lights are now on two different supply systems.</p> <p>JW explained that the stack will be on all digital in-flight navigation systems anyway but as we're just off the main helicopter route into London, the CAA would issue a Notice to Airmen if the lights went out.</p> <p>JHa confirmed that our processes are being updated to reflect the new procedure.</p> <p>KS asked about the comments in the press recently about possible waste sites and that one was included that had previously been dismissed as impractical, but was now being considered again.</p> <p>RP explained that the consultation is ongoing and that it is a reassessment of potential waste sites which also looks at which processes would or would not be suitable for each site.</p> <p>KS requested that someone from Surrey Planning attends the next meeting to explain this.</p> <p>KH asked if it was a SUEZ waste lorry on fire by the M25 recently.</p> <p>GS confirmed that it was not a SUEZ vehicle.</p> <p>AK requested new site photos.</p> <p>JCS agreed that these would be provided at the next meeting.</p> | <p>RP</p> <p>JCS</p> |
| 8 | Date of next meeting | |
| 8.1 | Wednesday 18 April 2018 at 6.30pm | |