

Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Tuesday 21 January 2020
Location	Hazelwood Centre – Home of the London Irish
Recorder	Kacie Thompson (KT), Surrey Communications Manager, SUEZ recycling and recovery UK

Present

Name	Initials	Organisation	Title / Role
Ken Snaith	KS		Resident, Chair
Dan Collins	DC	Technical Director	SLR Consulting
Alison Dodsworth	AD	Charlton Village RA	Resident
Sandra Dunn	SD	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Tim Evans	TE	Surrey County Council	Councillor
Tom Fidler	TF	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Richard Hewitt	RH	Shepperton RA	Resident
Diane Hall	DH		Resident
Justin Hampton	JH	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Plant Manager
Peter Hughes	PH		Resident
Calum James	CJ	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	EIR Manager
Andrea Koskela	AK		Resident
Geoff Lulham	GL		
Richard Parkinson	RP	Surrey County Council	
Malcolm Robertson	MR		Resident
Jean-Claude Sartenaer	JCS	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Project Director

John Seaman	JS		Resident
Gareth Swain	GS	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Regional Manager
Anna von Borzyszkowska	AVB	Environment Agency	Regulatory Officer
Richard Walsh	RW	Surrey County Council	Councillor
Jim Walter	JW		Resident

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).

1.0	Welcome	
1.1	KS welcomes the group and begins the meeting.	
2.0	Apologies	
2.1	No apologies were received.	
3	Approval of minutes from previous meeting	
3.1	AK mentions that her comments were labelled AC in the previous minutes, KT to correct them. JS says that he had mentioned merging turn lanes being important under section 6.0 but it was not recorded. The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed.	KT
4.0	Matters Arising	
4.1	JS asks for further explanation of the visible emissions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH responds that what people are seeing emitting from the stack is steam and not smoke and that the height and colour of the plume will depend on the external temperature and wind. RW asks whether what he is seeing coming out of his boiler is steam and if it is the same as what is visible from the Eco Park. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH confirms that it is. KS asks whether smoke is created when starting the burners with gas oil. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH replies that smoke is not created by or emitted from the process. 	
5.0	Eco Park update	
5.1	<u>Commissioning- AD</u> JH reports that commissioning of the AD facility is now in the final stages and that the	

plant processed all of Surrey's food waste over the holiday season, approximately 150% of normal volumes. To date, the AD facility has processed 11,000 tonnes of food waste and exported 2.5GWh – enough energy to power 700 homes for a year.

JH confirms that the AD facility was inspected by APHA and has met all the requirements of animal by-products regulations.

JH reports that the next step is to commence visual inspection of the facility, the final step before takeover which involves emptying some parts of the facility and inspecting it internally.

RSA asks who loses out financially as the facility never received ROCs.

- JH responds that ROCs are only relevant for the gasifier and that the issue has been discussed in previous meetings.

Commissioning – Gasifier

JH reports that the steam turbine completed commissioning in November, the turbine was synchronised with the grid and has now passed load testing.

JH adds that the gasification process achieved the Maximum Continuous Rating (MCR) of 17.5 tonnes of steam per hour, meaning it has reached the volume of steam that it is designed to produce continuously under normal conditions.

JH reports that the operations team have now occupied the Admin building.

JH reports that since the last meeting there have been five breaches of the half-hourly average limit on HCl emissions, which is associated with the commissioning of the Flue Gas Treatment system. The nature of commissioning is to get things to work properly so it is expected that some tweaks may be necessary. In this instance M&W have identified necessary tweaks to the lime dosing system.

- AVB explains that there are half hourly and daily limits and clarifies that it is just the half hourly limits that have been breached on these occasions. When starting a new process, it must be tweaked to know what the operating range is and how the material will react within the system, so these small breaches are to be expected and are only a small blip over half an hour.
- CJ explained that the EA was notified in each instance (as required by the Permit). Further information on the resolution will be provided to the EA in due course.

MR asks how many hours the plant was operating for when the breaches occurred.

- JH explains that some of the half-hourly breaches were during continuous runs, but that the reaction when a breach happens is usually to stop feeding waste.

GL asks if the permitted emissions levels are higher for commissioning than in normal operations.

- JH and AVB confirm.

JS asks if the lime dosage is consistent throughout the process.

- JH explains that it is a balance and the addition is intended to be constant. The goal of commissioning is to optimise the plant, including finding a suitable consistent level for the lime dosage. This requires varying the mechanical set up and consistency of the lime to test it and get it right.
- KS asks if it is an automated process, JH says ultimately it is.

SD asks about the Minimum Performance Testing and if it is a schedule of individual tests or a continuous period.

- JH explains that it is a set of tests and the intention is to pass them all on one day, but they can be taken on a rolling basis.
- SD asks if there will be any extra noise during the tests, JH explains it is simply normal operation of the facility witnessed by an independent third party and will not cause additional noise.

<p>MR asks if the plant is operating at a continuous basis now.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH explains that M+W are not running the plant continuously yet but are moving forward with each test run. <p>MR asks how long it is currently running,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH responds that the run times are variable but that the facility has run for 7-8 hours at a time in testing. Explains that M&W is currently optimising the control of the feed rate of waste which will help achieve greater stability and longer run times. They are currently testing a newly designed feed screw to assist with stability. <p>TE asks whether there are more tests after the MPT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH responds that after MPT there is a reliability test which is a 30-day period followed by a visual inspection. <p>TE asks whether the plant will be fully live by April if everything goes to plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH confirms that assuming no issues the current projections from M&W have the gasifier being fully live towards the end of March or early April. <p>TE asks for further explanation of the severity of the HCl breaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH reiterates that they are considered very minor and were only briefly above the half-hourly limits. The daily average has never been breached. AVB adds that the permit is 100mg per m³ and the breaches were around 104mg/m³, so very minor and when you consider it is only 1/48 of the whole day it is insignificant. <p>TE asks why we are bothering to discuss the breaches since they are so minor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH explains that while it is not a significant issue it is being discussed now in the interest of transparency. Adds that environmental regulations are driven by air quality and the limits are set at a level that will cause insignificant impact on air quality. <p>AK asks whether gasoil is still being used in the process and if use will be tapered off eventually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH explains that in this kind of facility gasoil will always need to be used for temperature stability during start up or shut down. In order to limit emissions, the top of the chamber must be above 860 degrees before introducing waste and during shut down waste cannot be introduced as the temperature goes below 860 degrees. During commissioning more gasoil will be used than during in normal operations because the nature of the process requires starting and stopping more often. <p>MR asks how much waste has been processed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH to confirm and circulate the number after meeting. <u>POST MEETING NOTE: To date the Gasifier has received 3,560 tonnes of residual waste.</u> <p><u>Next period</u></p> <p>JH reports that current projections from M+W show takeover of the anaerobic digestion facility scheduled for February 2019. Trial operation of the gasifier is due to begin at the end of January with minimum performance testing (MPT) to follow in early February and takeover in late February. The construction villages will be removed, and landscaping will begin before the next CLG meeting.</p> <p>RW asks how long the tests will take and if takeover is when SUEZ takes over from M+W.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH confirms that takeover is when SUEZ takes over from M+W and the trial operation and MPT are a period of six weeks overall. <p>RW asks whether the February prediction is based on how it has been going so far and if it may be set back if there are hiccups?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH confirms and reiterates that commissioning and performance testing are designed to identify any tweaks necessary and ensure that everything is 	<p>JH</p>
---	-----------

	<p>functioning optimally, so it may identify changes that need to be made which require slight alteration to the schedule.</p> <p>Misc. discussion concluding that realistically the takeover projection would be early March at the earliest, as the MPT period is 30 days and February has only 29 days.</p> <p>KS asks if manuals have been produced and are ready for site staff as he has read that they should be supplied within three months before operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH responds that SUEZ has the core manuals but are waiting to receive the more fringe packages from M+W. The manuals are a best-case scenario of how the plant will operate and often need to be varied to make sure that the procedures reflect the reality of operation. The SUEZ operations team has spent two years developing procedures around the operation of the two facilities and sense checking them against commissioning, so they are well prepared to run the plant. Adds that during MPT the independent certifier will confirm that there is enough documentation to run the plant. <p>DH asks what percentage of the waste makes it through the pre-treatment to be converted into fuel in the gasifier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JH reports that 80% of the waste can be used in the gasifier. 	
5.2	<p><u>Planning update</u></p> <p>JH reports that SUEZ is still awaiting a decision on the application to allow HGVs to enter site from 06:00.</p> <p>MR asks for clarification as he thought the application was only evening hours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS explains that SUEZ applied for evening hours during commissioning but that at the last CLG meeting we discussed applying for earlier opening hours to allow lorries to enter and prevent them from parking on nearby roads. <p>JH reports that the entrance sign has now been granted advertising consent following successful appeal.</p> <p>JH reports that SUEZ applied to continue using the RBF as a temporary waste transfer station during commissioning. This is simply an extension of the existing permission which was due to expire at the end of 2019.</p>	
5.3	<p><u>Recyclables Bulking Facility (RBF) operations</u></p> <p>GS shows picture of the RBF during Christmas last year compared to this year, noting that the facility handled similarly high volumes both years but that the waste was more easily managed, and volumes kept reasonable with the gasification and anaerobic digestion facilities are processing the waste the RBF operations are running much more smoothly.</p> <p>GS reports that the RBF is continuing to accept DMR from Runnymede. Everything is running as it should be.</p>	
5.4	<p><u>Community Recycling Centre (CRC) operations</u></p> <p>GS shows a chart of car counts per month and reports that roughly 1100 cars per day passed through the CRC in the busy period between Boxing Day and New Year's. The site staff did an excellent job handling the increased volumes. It is an exceptionally busy site and is operating very well. Adds that on a national level there is a problem to address with wrapping paper as it is very difficult to manage the different types and most of it has added plastic, which consumers don't necessarily realise, making it unsuitable for recycling.</p> <p>GS to consider JS earlier point about merge and turn signs needed at the entrance to the CRC.</p> <p>TE asks why the car count peaks in April and May.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GS responds that visits increase in spring due to garden waste. 	GS

	<p>RW reports that the staff at the recycling centre are excellent and very pleasant and he never receives any negative feedback about the site from residents. Adds that people are very interested in the charity scheme from the reuse shop and SUEZ should do more to advertise it.</p> <p>GS reports that through the 5 reuse shops we have diverted over 1,000 tonnes of reusable material, which is even better than recycling as it uses the material again with no additional carbon impact.</p>	
5.5	<p><u>Surrey County Council update</u></p> <p>RP reports that the recommendations of the Select Committee Task Force were approved by SCC Cabinet in November:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No CRC closures • Review of charging scheme to be undertaken • No Construction wood charges • Wood reintroduced to recycling only sites • Leatherhead reopened on Fridays • Review of Revive shop operations to be undertaken in 2020 • Review of existing CRC portfolio to be undertaken in 2020 <p>RP reports that the introduction of van permits has gone smoothly, and Hampshire has now introduced a similar charge.</p> <p>KS asks about the safety of knives deposited in metal skips as there was an action from the previous meeting to review this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GS confirms that following a review SUEZ and SCC concluded that the bottom of the metal skip is the safest place for knives being recycled. 	
5.6	<p><u>Reuse shop</u></p> <p>KT reports that in Q3 2019 the Revive shops donated £9570 total to the following local charities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forces Children's Trust - (Eco Park) • Jigsaw Trust • Princess Alice Hospice • Seeing Dogs Alliance • Your Sanctuary <p>Tim Oliver, leader of Surrey County Council, presented a combined Q2 and Q3 2019 donation to Princess Alice Hospice in October, resulting in coverage in several news publications.</p> <p>KT reports that the donations for Q4 2019 are still being calculated but estimates that the total donation in 2019 will be approximately £35,000.</p> <p>RW says that we should consider putting signs outside on the roads indicating the charity information and shop location, with the approval of the planning department. References the signs outside Nutty Lane nursery.</p> <p>GS asks if the CLG members would support SUEZ asking the planning committee for permission to have signs on the roadside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AK responds that if it is within the boundary of the site and only along the road as you're queuing then it would be fine. • RSA says that the signs outside Nutty Lane if reported to Spelthorne would be taken down. • Several people say they wouldn't support it outside the site. • JW says that there is high foot traffic on the bridge so would it be possible to put up something there. KS explains that Spelthorne has for many years prevented that kind of advertising, they will be taken away. <p>GS reiterates that as a result of the performance of the Revive shop there is roughly £2000 per quarter available in Shepperton for worthy, local causes.</p>	

	<p>AK asked about upping the percent donated to charity and whether that has been discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RP responds that there must be a balance as there are pressures on local authorities to generate income and donating a higher percentage from the shops would leave a hole in the budget. Agrees to discuss the idea with Mike Goodman, the portfolio holder for waste and environment, but at present there are still savings targets to meet. 	RP
5.4	<p><u>Landscaping</u></p> <p>JCS reminds the group that landscaping the Environment Enhancement Area (EEA) is the last important construction project for the site and that SUEZ previously submitted a landscaping and ecology management plan which has been agreed. The plan has the main objectives of visually screening the site, building habitat and enhancing local amenity.</p> <p>JCS presents a map of the landscaping plan which consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 large bunds and 2 small bunds • 47 mature trees along the railway line • 930 trees total – 2.3 hectares of woodland • Grassland • Footpath access • Over 1000 shrubs <p>JCS reports that prior to beginning planting the soils had to be tested for suitability as topsoil. While testing the soils, very low levels of asbestos were unexpectedly discovered. The levels are very low but need to be addressed, so SUEZ has appointed SLR Consulting to help prepare a remediation plan. Introduces DC, an asbestos specialist from SLR Consulting who has prepared the remediation strategy.</p> <p>The best option is to retain the soils on site and encapsulate the soil within the core of the planned bunds and then use clean cover material. We will be submitting a watching brief document and addendum remediation strategy</p> <p>AVB asks where the material came from.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JCS says that the material in the stockpile came from site. <p>AVB says that the Environment Agency may need to be notified with possible further discussion required around potential permitting arrangements. Misc. discussion as to whether the soil is considered waste.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC explains that a material management plan will be submitted to the EA once the addendum remediation strategy is finalised and it will cover the suitability to retain on site. Explains that as the soil originated on site and there was never any intention to discard the material it can be covered by a material reuse regime (CL:AIRE) rather than a permit. No works will begin until the EA and Spelthorne have been consulted. <p>DC explains that the soil was tested prior to construction and there was never any asbestos identified previously. It was always the intention to reuse the material on site rather than importing new soil. It was only recently when M+W had to look at nutrient value for suitability for planting that very low levels of asbestos were identified. There have not been any visible Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) and only 12 samples out of 48 had levels just barely above the detectable limit.</p> <p>DC adds that based on the nature and very low level of asbestos found there is no requirement to notify the HSE.</p>	

RSA comments that it would be expected to have contaminated material on a brownfield site and he doesn't see why it would have been previously expected to use all soil on site.

- DC responds that there are different criteria for what can be used where, assessed based on likelihood of access. The past watching brief identified that it is possible that contamination will be present on site and that if anything is visually identified during soil movement then works will be stopped and further testing carried out, which is what has been done in this instance.

KS asks whether there will be a permeable membrane separating the contaminated soil from the clean cover.

- DC responds that an anti-mixing barrier is optional and not necessarily needed on a site like this because no one will be excavating there in the future and once planted there won't be much disturbance.

KS remarks that the trees are due to be substantial trees and so will require deep digging to put substantial roots in, so a barrier may cause an issue. Requests that this be considered.

- DC reports that there is a reasonable thickness in the clean material and the required planting can be factored into the thickness and cover system.

MR asks how much soil is affected.

- DC responds that only 12 out of the 43 samples taken from the stockpile have a low level of asbestos. Part of the strategy moving forward is to test further. Even the core of the bunds would have very low levels of asbestos, other sites he works on has very high levels inside the bunds and it is considered safe.

MR asks if the bunds will have to be higher than planned.

- DC responds that there is more than enough space within the core to accommodate the contaminated material.

PH asks how many samples in total were tested.

- DC replies that there were 43 samples tested and of those only 12 contained low levels of asbestos.

RSA asks if the whole area will need tested to decide what can be used on top.

- DC confirms that the remaining soil will be tested

Misc. questions as to whether the area where the soil came from is a former landfill.

- JCS explains that the soil in the stockpile was dug from the site but it was not a landfill on the west side of the site where the soils came from.
- GS adds that there is a bentonite wall that separates the landfill on the east from the non-landfill on the west.
- DC confirms that based on the soil tests he has seen the soil in question was not part of a waste deposit in a landfill.

KS requests that there is additional communication distributed once there are updates, GS and KT agree.

JW remarks about the soils being moved throughout the previous years, explaining that there were issues with dust on the back of his house during that time and that residents have allotments nearby.

KT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC says that it is highly unlikely to have been a risk, reporting that in 20 years of experience and even on sites much more contaminated he has never seen a site with fibre release into the air above the control limit. Adds that asbestos was not banned until 1999 and was very common, so testing allotments wouldn't be of any use. <p>DC explains that the best way to reassure the group that asbestos did not leave the site is to proceed with the soil works and closely monitor the air along the perimeter for dust and asbestos. Now that a very low level of asbestos has been identified on site it triggers the Control of Asbestos Regulations (CAR) which requires a risk assessment setting out things like air monitoring and dampening down. Going forward that data can be used to show the group that asbestos in the air is not exceeding the control limit and would not have during previous works.</p> <p>JW remarks that the soil works could have been better managed before and that it was not dampened down regularly enough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC explains that asbestos isn't released in soils in the same way as it is when found indoors and that the people at risk are primarily those people cutting through asbestos indoors. The natural moisture content in soil helps reduce likelihood of fibre release and even a moisture increase of 5% reduces the likelihood of release by 90%. For reference, another site only one mile away and with similar stockpiles had a natural moisture content between 20-30% which means the risk of fibre release would be insignificant. • JCS and DC confirms that moving forward all works in the area will be very closely monitored and works will be carried out in accordance to CAR. <p>MR comments that residents would like to be reassured by testing their gardens for asbestos.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC responds that even if a garden tested positive for asbestos the tests do not tell you where the contamination came from. It is more likely to be a result of previously existing asbestos sheds. <p>AK asks DC to reintroduce himself so that they can refer to his credentials when discussing this with neighbours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC replies that he is a technical director at SLR Consulting and works with SUEZ on several sites. He is an end of waste specialist and primarily deals with contaminated land. He is an asbestos expert for the Metropolitan Police. 95% of the projects he works on involve asbestos and most of the time it is discovered after construction began. 	
5.6	<p><u>Communications</u></p> <p>KT reports that the following complaints were received since the previous CLG meeting and explains SUEZ's response:</p>	

Date	Type	Status
21/01/20	Odour	Unsubstantiated
10/01/20	Litter on Charlton Lane	Organized an immediate litter pick and are beginning monthly litter picks
04/01/20	Lights	Unsubstantiated
06/12/19	Odour	Unsubstantiated - complainant several miles away and wind in opposite direction
05/12/19	Odour	Unsubstantiated
04/12/19	Odour	Unsubstantiated
18/11/19	Noise (x3)	Unsubstantiated - attributed to highway works on M3 behind Eco Park
03/10/19	HGV through Charlton Village	Not applicable - vehicle part of SUEZ Ash Vale fleet
26/09/19	HGV parking in cycle lane	Driver identified, reprimanded and haulier contacted. Planning application to open site earlier.
25/09/19	HGV parking in cycle lane	Driver identified, reprimanded and haulier contacted. Planning application to open site earlier.
	2x HGV turning right	Both drivers identified and issued warnings

AVB reminds the group to use the instant hotline number (0800 80 70 60) to the EA and provide a contact number rather than just email to allow for quick response. Make sure to note the time and a postcode or other indication of your location. The EA will not share your name or personal information with SUEZ.

- KT adds that residents should also contact SUEZ directly with a complaint even if they have contacted the EA directly, as that will allow us to quickly investigate and address any issues on site. Sometimes complaints are not passed on within the same day and so it becomes more difficult to do anything in response.

MR asks whether SUEZ sends complaints they receive to the EA.

- CJ confirms that it is part of our environmental management system to share any complaints received directly and our response to them.

6.0	Questions	
6.1	<p>KT reports that the only question received was about the article in the January 2020 edition of both Shepperton and Sunbury Matters. Adds that the factual inaccuracies were disappointing and that it was not best journalistic practice to publish the article without contacting SUEZ for comment. Reports that SUEZ will be writing a letter to the editor responding to the false claims.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RW says that the Shepperton Matters and Sunbury Matters cut-off date for content is the 17th each month so it is too late to include anything in the February edition but could still be included in the March edition. • TE reports that he knows the resident who wrote the article and has informed him of the factual inaccuracies. 	KT
7.0	AOB	
7.1	<p>MR says that the footpath needs maintenance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RP agrees to investigate the issue as Surrey is responsible for maintenance. 	RP

	<p>MR reports that part of the path has been cut away, presumably to get water away from site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AK agrees and says she reported it a long time ago. • JCS to have a look. <p>AK says there have been rumours in the community that the site has been flooded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JH and GS say there is no basis to that, confirming that the site has not been flooded. 	JCS
8.0	Date of next meeting	
8.1	Tuesday, 24 March 2020, location TBC.	