

Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Tuesday 24 September 2019
Location	Hazelwood Centre – Home of the London Irish
Recorder	Kacie Thompson (KT)

Present

Name	Initials	Organisation	Title / Role
Ken Snaith	KS		Resident, Chair
Richard Hewitt	RH	Shepperton RA	Resident
Diane Hall	DH		Resident
Alison Dodsworth	AD	Charlton Village RA	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	JH	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Plant Manager
Louise Morton	LM	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Communications Manager
Sandra Dunn	SD	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Richard Parkinson	RP	Surrey County Council	Environment Delivery Group Manager
Richard Walsh	RW	Surrey County Council	Councillor
Tim Evans	TE	Surrey County Council	Councillor

Distribution

<p>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).</p>	
1.0	Welcome
1.1	<p>KS welcomed the group and began the meeting, introducing KT as the replacement for LM who will be moving on from SUEZ in early October. KS leads the group in a round of introductions.</p> <p>KS acknowledged the sad passing of Jim Maxwell and recognised his contributions to the group. A moment's silence was held.</p>
2.0	Apologies
2.1	Apologies were received from Richard Smith-Ainsley, Anna Vaughn and Tom Fiddlar.
3	Approval of minutes from previous meeting
3.1	The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.
4.0	Matters Arising
4.1	<p>LM reports that the article discussed under section 7.1 was included in both Shepperton Matters and in Hersham News.</p> <p>PH notes that the minutes of the previous meeting concluded that the first fire on waste was expected in late June or July and asks for an update on timelines. KS asks about definitive date for completion and notes question sent by email by RSA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH responds that timelines will be discussed during the project update section later in the meeting.
5.0	Project update
5.1	<p><u>Commissioning</u></p> <p>JH explained that moving forward he will be leading meetings rather than JCS as the focus on site becomes less construction focussed and more operational. Commissioning is progressing well and the AD plant has now processed 4,300 tonnes of food waste. The CHP engines are now generating heat and electricity and the facility is on track for takeover in by end of December.</p> <p>The pre-treatment system is now commissioned as are the flue gas treatment systems. Achieved first fire on the gasifier waste on 22 September.</p> <p>Information was provided about the screening process for food waste and showed photos of plastic rejects. Reported high quality of cleanliness of the plastics separated out and circulated sample of the digestate, explaining that the slight ammonia smell is a good sign as it adds nitrates back into the soil.</p> <p>KS asked whether there are micro plastics in the process and what will happen if the digestate goes to agricultural land.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH answers that the shredding process is not intense enough to create micro plastics. At present the digestate is sent to composting facility until it is cleared by the EA for agricultural use. <p>MR asked what happens to plastic rejects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH explained that due to the mix of low-grade plastics it is not recyclable, like most thin film. <p>JS asked whether the sample has been through maturation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH explained that we do not mature on site. The ammonia coming off is neutralised in the odour control system, but the levels are so low they do not pose a risk. <p>JH presented photo of refuse derived fuel and a video of the Gasification fluidised sand bed in operation.</p> <p>AK asked whether gasification is a continuous process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH confirmed that it is. Explained that currently there is a low flow rate of waste as the process is being tested. So far 10 tonnes have been fed into the process but in full operation it would be around 6 tonnes per hour. <p>AK asks whether it has all gone to plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH confirms that it has gone well, and we are pleased at this stage. Reminds the group that commissioning is a process to test the system and there will likely be some tweaks needed as the process begins to ramp up to normal operating point. <p>MR asks if gas oil is being used in the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH reports that gas oil will be used to start the burners up and will be used periodically during commissioning until it is possible to introduce enough waste for the gasifier to be self-sufficient. <p>KS asks whether using gas oil would cause any visible plume to come from the stack.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH responds that gas oil has been used on and off for several months now while testing the burners and extraction system. It would not cause anything different to show out of the stack, but as the process begins hot commissioning and the weather gets colder you will begin to see a plume of steam emitting from the stack. (post meeting smoke was seen coming from the chimney on one day) 	
5.2	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>JH presented construction update slide, reporting that the roadways and car parking areas are now being finished and the site lighting is due to be finished at the end of September. The construction village is being dismantled and the landscaping of the green belt area will begin soon.</p> <p>JH presented slide on upcoming works, explaining that the AD facility will undertake a Minimum Performance Test in October with takeover anticipated in November. The gasification facility will continue the ramp-up curve of accepting more waste, with a Minimum Performance Test possible as soon as November.</p> <p>SD asks when the EA will get involved in the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH explained that they are already involved with the permitting process and that they signed off the last pre-op conditions in early August which gave permission to proceed with introducing waste into the process. 	

DH asks if there is an inspection by anyone.

- JH reported that the EA were on site two weeks ago and SUEZ is in regular conversation with them.

Misc. discussion about other gasification facilities in the UK, JH reports that Levensat in Edinburgh and Energy Works in Hull are up and running and further along with commissioning than we are.

JS asks about the projected dates for the minimum performance test (MPT) and independent certification dates.

- JH reports that the MPT for the AD will likely take place in October and the MPT for the gasifier will take place in November if everything continues as planned.

AD says that without a final inspection it seems like SUEZ is self-governing. Asks how residents will know the integrity of the plant is as it should be.

- JH explains how the Health and Safety Executive operates and that the independent certifier looks at all the significant documentation, such as HazOp studies, which is a detailed check of the design and fail safes. They also look at commissioning procedures, certifications around calibration of instruments along with other documents. The EA includes pre-operation conditions like an accident management plan and detailed start up and shut down procedures for gasifier which they have approved.
- JH confirms that the independent certifier runs checks but adds that it is not in SUEZ interest to take over operation of the plant unless it is safe and running well, so SUEZ will do independent inspections to ensure safety for the operations teams.

MR asks if we are doing continuous emissions monitoring and where it will be available to see.

- JH confirms that continuous emissions data is already being recorded.
- JH adds that emissions data will ultimately be available online once we have finished developing the web platform. For now it is a matter of public record once submitted to the EA.

AK showed the group a print out of CERC data from the previous month, explaining that the data is available, but many people cannot interpret it.

- KT explains that an explanation of the data and what the emissions are can be included on the website once the platform is completed.

JH explained that the EA will investigate the nature of any breach of the permitted emissions limits and look at the actions taken by the Company to address it. They then use a point scoring system and sites are rated within bands so that the public will know what is good and what is unsatisfactory. Sites in Band A and Band B are operating well.

TE asked whether Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has expressed concerns about the fire risk from vegetation that is near to the site.

- GS responds that they have been to the site and have not expressed concern and that bund screening will be completed in the Spring.

JS asks what happens if the flu gas operation fails and whether the independent certifier is satisfied with what might happen, if it fails.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH explained that the plant is operated by a main computer which has been programmed to react to different conditions and a secondary safety computer which is programmed to shut down the process if the main computer does not react as programmed. If the flu gas treatment system fails, then it would automatically trigger the system to stop feeding waste. If it did not stop feeding waste, then the entire process would be shut down by the safety computer. This system has been rigorously tested over the last few months and is being closely monitored as waste is introduced to the process. <p>SD asked if there is an operator controlling the process or if it is entirely the computer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH explained that whilst the process is controlled by a computer there are always trained operators closely monitoring everything. 	
5.3	<p><u>Planning</u></p> <p>GS gave apologies for Emma Smyth's absence and presented the planning update slide and explained that in response to complaints relating to HGVs parking in the local area SUEZ has applied to open gates earlier (06:00 Monday to Saturday) to allow HGVs to enter and park on site only – not altering the hours of operation.</p> <p>MR says that this issue seems a sign of a failure to control contractors and this is moving towards 24-hour opening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS said that SUEZ is trying to assist the contractors and eliminate residents' frustrations and that the site will not be open 24 hours as there is only a temporary permission in allowing gates to open at 06:00 and remain open until 20:00. <p>AD said that if they are going to arrive there at that time anyway it makes sense to be allowed to park on site.</p> <p>MR asked whether HGVs were ever allowed overnight parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS responds that they have never been allowed overnight parking due to site safety concerns. <p>TE said he does not see any reason why opening at 06:00 would be a problem. There is no reason that residents should be upset with taking lorries being taken off the road and onto the site.</p> <p>AD raised concern that the lorries will begin arriving earlier and will just start parking on local roads at 05:00 instead. Agrees that opening the gates earlier is a no brainer, but that happened in the past has changed the attitude to this resolution. She felt uncomfortable speaking on behalf of the residents and agreeing as the CLG to support this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS said that if the lorries are arriving at 05:00 and parking locally then they will be abusing the permission and it can be taken away. Right now they have a reason to be arriving early (beating traffic) but if arriving before 05:00 it would be a clear abuse of the permission. <p>TE said that as a councillor representing the residents, he support this application.</p> <p>KS summarises GS points and reminds the group that SUEZ cannot enforce highway regulations and that this will wind down once the plant is up and running and the 8pm closing time will no longer be necessary.</p> <p>GS reiterated that this planning application is reacting to residents' complaints and trying to put a solution in place and SUEZ will continue to try to be an even better neighbour.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MR asked why we don't allow HGVs to park up overnight. GS explains that with the operations on site it is not appropriate to have lorries parked up overnight. Illegally parked HGVs in Spelthorne should be taken care of by police. KS adds that other HGV traffic through Charlton village is separate, it is not to do with HGVs legally visiting site to do what they are contracted to do. <p>MR brought up an email complaint from Adrian Corti regarding a vehicle spotted by a resident which SUEZ says did not enter the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS relayed SUEZ process for investigating vehicles entering site and confirmed that that vehicle registration did not enter site on the date supplied. In other situations, if a bulk vehicle is found to have entered site and not followed the appropriate routing strategy the driver will be issued with an infringement notice and taken through site inductions again. <p>GS presented information about the advertising consent application for the entrance sign, explaining that its application was refused by Spelthorne Borough Council in May and SUEZ submitted an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) in July. The PINS inspector will make an unannounced, unplanned visit to site in October and will then review documents and representations from both parties before making a final decision in December.</p> <p>TE asked why Spelthorne turned down the sign.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KS responded that the sign was turned down by Spelthorne because it was deemed to be distracting for passing drivers. <p>JS asked whether members of the public can get involved in this planning process or make comments on the application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> KS responded that since it is now in the appeal process it will not be open for public representation. 	
6.0	CRC and RBF operations	
6.1	<p><u>Recyclables Bulking Facility (RBF)</u></p> <p>GS reported that there has been no change in RBF operations except that food waste is no longer accepted at the RBF as it is now being processed at the AD plant. Soon the black bag materials will also be removed as the gasifier ramps up to full capacity. RBF operations are running well.</p>	
6.2	<p><u>Community Recycling Centre (CRC)</u></p> <p>GS reported that the CRC has not had the same volumes as in previous years.</p> <p>DH reported that queues have been less recently.</p> <p>JS mentions that merging turn lanes are needed.</p> <p>KS confirmed that the CRC has run well the last few times he has visited, but that residents have complained that people push in line due to the two-lane system.</p> <p>GS reported story of a wallet containing £700 being recovered and returned to a customer who was delighted by the integrity of the SUEZ site staff. The resident wrote a kind letter to site thanking the staff members who returned the wallet.</p> <p>AD echoed that the site staff are excellent. Reiterates KS's point that people will always try to push in line and raises safety concerns around some residents who do not reverse parking as instructed.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS explained that it is difficult to manage the public, but the site staff do their best to ensure that things run smoothly and to encourage vehicle safety. <p>DH reported her surprise that knives are thrown in scrap metal, raises safety concerns with public access given the national increase in knife crime.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS responded that knives were previously taken to reuse but for safety reasons the procedures were changed as it was thought that the safest place for them to be disposed of would be at the bottom of a scrap metal bin. GS to take this comment away and investigate whether there are any other options. 	GS
7.0	CRC SCC update	
7.1	<p>RP reported the following suggestions from the recent Select Committee Task Force review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No CRC closures Review of charging scheme to be undertaken No Construction wood charges Review of Revive shop operations Increased recycling performance through kerbside collections Review of existing CRC portfolio <p>KS asked about a meeting to review the PFI contract, reported to being held on the day of this CLG meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RP responded that he is not aware of a meeting to discuss the contract. AK reported that the meeting did happen but that the public was asked to leave. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RW explained that the meeting required commercially sensitive discussions and was therefore considered a Part II discussion which is one of the few restrictions for public access. 	
8.0	Revive reuse	
8.1	<p>AD reported that the lady running the shop is very helpful but adds that more should be given to charity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS confirmed that the task force is looking at the current situation relating to reuse shops and local charities. In the period April 2019 to March 2020 we should divert 1000 tonnes of material through the reuse shops. <p>LM presented slide on charity donations for March, April and May, presenting Woking NCT, Princess Alice Hospice, White Lodge Centre and Bloomin' Arts as the most recent winners. Each charity will receive a £1821 donation.</p> <p>AK and others reported that they did not notice the charity information when visiting the shops. Agreed to include information about the charity scheme in her newsletter in Charlton.</p> <p>LM explained a charity cannot win more than once from the same shop in the same year and that the total amount donated to charity is 10% of the profit from the shops in that quarter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AK suggested that the percent donated to charity should be increased. 	

9.0	Complaints	
9.1	<p>KT presented slide on compliments, complaints and comments explaining that there has been a marked increase in visit requests and educational event requests – likely in response to increasing public interest in sustainability.</p> <p>KT reported that there have been 10 complaints regarding HGVs passing through Charlton Village or parking on local streets. There have been 16 complaints from the same residents regarding Runnymede Borough Council RCVs, which are not beholden to the routing strategy. The complaint has been referred to Runnymede, but the complainant continues to send them every operating day.</p> <p>AD expressed frustration about responses to the HGVs and the burden of proof on residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GS explained that we do take disciplinary action and infringe drivers, using a three-strike policy like the points system used for speeding offences. A first or second offence will result in a discussion with the driver, notice to their manager and mandatory re-induction to the site. Any driver caught flouting the rules a third time will be permanently banned from site. <p>KS explained that it comes down to trust and part of that trust is SUEZ passing on to residents' associations what they do about these complaints. Suggests GS go to one of the open meetings to discuss the process of responding to complaints.</p> <p>KT agreed to put together report of actions taken in response to complaints for future CLG meetings.</p>	KT
10.0	Questions	
10.1	<p>Q1 Do we have a date for final commissioning for the entire plant? (i.e. November) and Q2 Do we have a date for completion of landscaping? (i.e. Spring 2020) were covered previously in the meeting.</p> <p>Q3. With the decline of our butterflies, bees and birds is there a plan for a large wild meadow?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping must be completed in accordance to the planning permission, so it will be restored to grassland and to the green belt. Once landscaping is completed it might be possible to introduce wildflowers. <p>Q4. How are waste producers, and carriers informed which types of waste the Eco Park is not licensed to accept?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GS reported that most of the waste going through the gasifier will be residual waste. There are controls in place, the weighbridge checks the documentation and it is then tipped on floor and inspected. It is then inspected as it is loaded into the pre-treatment process. • JH added that we include acceptable and non-acceptable waste in the training for drivers. SUEZ also does outreach to other boroughs to educate them on what to look for. <p>Q5. As radioactive waste is not accepted where are ionising radiation detectors located, which ionising radiations are detected and at what thresholds?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH responded that we are not licensed to take radioactive waste and so do not have ionising radiation detectors because it is not an issue. The waste will be coming from kerbside collections only. None of the sites in Surrey have these detectors, they are usually only found on hazardous waste sites. 	

Q6. What happens if prohibited waste is delivered and identified? If prohibited waste is delivered and not identified and processed what are the implications for safety, health and air pollution?

- JH reported that we verify the waste prior to feeding it into the processes and do several full inspections of deliveries throughout the day. There is a quarantine area for anything separated that is not acceptable for the process. The challenge as an industry is that people do not take responsibility for what they discard in their general waste bins, so we must manage that with appropriate processes and inspections.

Q7 What is the definition of contaminated waste? Has been discussed in previous meetings.

Q8-12. Various questions relating to the entrance sign, when it was originally presented to the planning authority and whether the sign is on highway land or within the Eco Park boundary?

- GS confirmed that the approved planning application was submitted with the sign included.
- MR added that the original plan said the sign would be red, but a later application changed it to green.
- LM, JC and RP confirmed that the sign is in the same place as noted in the original application and is on highway land.
- GS explained that the sign was approved by the planning committee as part of the application and always part of the plans but that the group was likely to have been focussed on other issues which were of more concern, rather than the sign. GS confirmed that the sign was temporarily removed because it was damaged, but it has now been repaired and will remain in place until the appeal is decided.

Q13. Are the signs associated with the emergency exit from the CRC adequate?

- JC and JH confirm that they are.

Q14. What is the expected sulphur content of the gas produced by the anaerobic digester? When the gas is burnt will the sulphur be converted to sulphur dioxide? If so, has the dispersion from the flare and the stack been modelled for different weather conditions? If so, what were the results?

- JH explained that the expected sulphur content is minimised because ferric chloride is injected into the process along with a biochemical scrubber on the gas system that removes further sulphates from the process.
- KS mentioned that these matters have previously been better dealt with within the TSG.
 - AK reports that members of the TSG were disappointed with the amount of information shared and that was why the TSG was disbanded.
 - JH disagreed with this assertion and thinks that the answers were given but that it was not necessarily the answer that people wanted. The team put a lot of time and effort into preparing for the meetings and sharing information openly.
 - DH read from previous minutes that Peter mentioned that there was no longer a need to have the TSG meetings but

	<p>that it does not mean the group accepts everything decided – not saying there was not enough information provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LM says that if there is a need to re-establish the TSG, we are happy to look at that, JH reiterates this. <p>Q15. Will small cylinders containing nitrous oxide be accepted at the Eco Park? If so, what are the implications for safety, health and air pollution? If they are not what are the implication for councils which collect cylinders containing nitrous dioxide as litter and in road sweepings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, there will likely be the odd nitrous oxide cylinder sent to the Eco Park, likely picked up in road sweepings or thrown in bins. They are typically empty at the point of being thrown away and will likely come out in the pre-treatment process along with other metals. Nitrous oxide is already present in the combustion process of the plant, so it is not a safety concern. <p>Q16 was discussed earlier in the meeting (SFRS) and Q17 (Landscaping) has been covered in previous meetings and all drawings are available on the planning portal.</p> <p>JS raised a question about fire safety inspections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH confirmed that there have been visits and will continue to be visits from the fire service and no issues have been raised. SUEZ engages with Surrey Fire and Rescue to ensure that we are using appropriate procedures if there are any issues in future. • IN suggests doing joint exercises on site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ JH responds that SUEZ are already in discussions with SFR to carryout joint exercises post takeover in 2020. <p>Q18. Which substances does the CEMS monitor? Are other emissions also monitored?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH presented a document showing the emissions monitored and reminded the group that this information was included in the FAQ document that was requested by the group and circulated previously. Emissions information will be publicly available when submitted to EA. • Group requested the FAQ document be resent. KT to circulate along with the minutes. <p>DH asked whether the most recent air quality report can be circulated. The last one on looks to be from June 2018.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jean Claude to follow up on this. <p><u>Post meeting update: Report has been located and KT will be sending it out with the minutes.</u></p> <p>AD asked about fire alarms going off, reports hearing them from her home within the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH responds that this is an issue we are aware of and we are working with M&W to address it. There are some activation heads that are over sensitive and set off easily. There is also ongoing testing of the permanent alarm system. <p>SD asks for an update on the lighting system for the scout hut.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH to chase this up, as well as the tarmac question. <p><u>Post meeting note: lighting installation has now been completed by SUEZ.</u></p>	<p>KT</p> <p>KT</p>
--	--	---------------------

11.0	AOB	
11.1	<p>LM introduced an application for new member, Geoff Lulham which was approved for membership in a 7 to 1 vote and to be invited to the next meeting by KT.</p> <p>As this was LM last meeting KS thanked her on behalf of the group for all her good work and wished her all the best for the future in her new job.</p>	KT
12.0	Date of next meeting	
12.1	Tuesday 21 January, location tbc	