



Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Wednesday 13 April 2016
Location	Sunbury Golf Centre
Recorder	Sam Brownjohn

Present

Name	Initials	Company	Title / Role
Ken Snaith	KS		Resident, chair
Cllr Sandra Dunn	SD	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Richard Walsh	RW	Surrey County Council	Councillor
Jim Maxwell	JM		Resident
Andrea Koskela	AK		Resident
John Seaman	JS		Resident
Malcolm Robertson	MR		Resident
Karen Howkins	KH	Charlton Village Residents Association	Resident
Peter Francis	PF	LOSRA	Resident
Richard Hewitt	RH	Shepperton Residents Association	Resident
Peters Crews	PC		Resident
Jim Golledge	JG		Resident
Peter Hughes	PH		Resident
Richard Parkinson	RP	Surrey County Council	Waste Group Manager

Chris Lowe	CL	Environment Agency	PPC/RSR Officer
Gareth Swain	GS	SUEZ Recycling and Recovery (R&R) Surrey	Regional Manager
Jean-Claude Sartenaer	JCS	SUEZ R&R UK	Project Director
Jorge Hau	JH	SUEZ R&R UK	Technical Coordinator
Calum James	CJ	SUEZ R&R UK	SHEQ Manager, Processing
Andrew Jones	AJ	SUEZ R&R UK	SHEQ Manager, Energy
Emma Jordan	EJ	SUEZ R&R UK	Communications Manager
Sam Brownjohn	SB	SUEZ R&R UK	Project Assistant
Peter Golden	PG	M+W Group	Project Director

Distribution

Participants and: Alan Stones (Surrey County Council Planning); David Rushden, Esther Van Lith (Environment Agency); Tracey Wilmott French (Spelthorne Borough Council Environmental Health), PCSO Colin Gibbons (Surrey Police), Cllr Mike Goodman.

1	Welcome	
2	Apologies	
2.1	Apologies were received from Cllr Smith-Ainsley, Tracey Cocker, Tim Evans, Sandy Muirhead and Mark Nightingale.	
3	Approval of minutes from previous meeting	
3.1	The minutes were approved with a correction and a deletion to item 5.6.	
4	Matters arising	
4.1	<p>JM referred to item 4.2 re: his request for Surrey Fire Service to be invited to attend a meeting. KS reminded him that the Fire Service had been consulted at an earlier stage and they will be invited to site at a later date to assess the development.</p> <p>CL confirmed the site has a fire prevention plan covering the current operations and that the fire risks associated with the building works are minimal.</p> <p>GS suggested the Fire Service be contacted with an update on the project.</p> <p>It was noted the technical sub-group was due to discuss the Fire Strategy for the Eco Park.</p> <p>SUEZ / SCC to contact the Fire Service to update them on the project and agree the appropriate stage for them to attend a CLG meeting.</p>	GS/RP

4.2	<p>Referring to item 5.6, PF commented that it implies the room in question is a welfare room and he remains concerned it is unsafe.</p> <p>JCS noted this issue had been discussed extensively with PF, the room is not a welfare facility but an auxiliary control room. SUEZ do not share PF's concerns and it was agreed at the technical sub group meeting that it wouldn't be possible to reach agreement on this point.</p> <p>EJ confirmed the matter had been discussed at the 25 January and 08 April technical sub group meetings.</p>	
5	Technical Sub Group update	
5.1	<p>PF gave an overview of the recent meeting on behalf of the resident members. The removal of ammonia from the AD process was discussed. SUEZ noted the sequential batch reactor tank is treated with caustic soda so the ammonia is converted into nitrates. PF has requested a list of nitrates produced. There is no limit for nitrates present in the water discharged via the sewer. This is to be further discussed at the next TSG.</p> <p>PF has asked SUEZ to confirm the technical specification of the cladding on the AD tanks.</p> <p>SUEZ had confirmed that the pumps dedicated for emptying the AD bunds will be manually operated.</p> <p>SUEZ had confirmed the SBR feed tank will not be double skinned. JCS noted that double protection does not mean a double skinned tank, it refers to two methods of protection, in this instance the tank cladding and the bund. PF commented the planning application states a double skinned tank will be used. PF requested RP to refer the issue back to the County Planning Authority.</p> <p>CL confirmed the pre-operational conditions of the permit cover tank failure and will need to be satisfied before operations begin.</p>	RP
5.2	<p>PF noted that he raised the AD plant's compliance with the German Agricultural Occupational Health and Safety Standard "Safety Rules Biogas Systems", SUEZ indicated that this document did not apply to the project but would review specific points of concern. PF agreed to prepare a list.</p>	PF
5.3	<p>In response to a member's question, PF noted converting nitrates into fertiliser is a desirable feature of AD plants but not a compulsory measure.</p> <p>CL confirmed the water discharge consent is regulated by the local water company.</p> <p>In response to a member's query on the regulation of nitrates in waste water, CL confirmed this is for the local water company to monitor and control under the Water Industry Act.</p>	
5.4	<p>PF noted the remainder of the meeting was taken up with a good explanation of the monitoring of emissions both on and off site.</p>	
5.5	<p>KS asked if the resident members were happy with the information they have received from SUEZ. PH and PF confirmed they were satisfied, although PF was not totally in agreement with some of the responses.</p>	

	In Brian Catt's absence, EJ noted he had commented that queries and issues he had previously raised regarding emissions monitoring were addressed during the recent meeting.	
5.6	<p>On behalf of SUEZ, JH concurred with PF's account of the meeting. He added that a query was raised regarding the dust extraction system for the gasification facility. M+W are designing this now and details would become available in due course.</p> <p>JH confirmed the AD tank cladding is designed for all weather conditions. PF had requested details of the cladding's specification; M+W will provide this.</p> <p>PF confirmed the flare is also in design at the moment.</p>	PG
5.7	<p>JM suggested the TSG wasn't addressing residents' concerns. PF noted issues raised have been discussed in detail and duly addressed and recorded. In some instances, issues have been resolved, others remain under consideration and in some instances it has been agreed that a consensus won't be reached.</p> <p>PF noted responsibility for the safe operation of the plant is ultimately with SUEZ.</p> <p>GS stated SUEZ have an expert technical team who have fully reviewed all processes.</p>	
5.8	JH confirmed SUEZ do not consider PF's concerns relating to the control room a significant risk; the room will not normally be occupied and will be used at start-up and in emergency circumstances, e.g. a fire.	
5.9	In response to KH's query, CL confirmed a move away from a double skinned tank would not require a permit variation. When the AD facility is finished the EA will assess if it meets the requirements of the pre-operational conditions.	
6	Project Update - Construction	
6.1.1	JCS gave an update on progress with construction (presentation attached) and played a film shot by drone showing the progress on site.	
6.1.2	<p>RW requested SUEZ put forward a plan to deal with busier periods whilst the CRC has reduced availability.</p> <p>PG noted that the RBF demolition will be carried out and hoarding will be moved as soon as possible to minimise inconvenience.</p> <p>GS explained that when the Eco Park was conceived it was decided to keep the CRC, which is the busiest in Surrey, open throughout the building works to maintain a service to residents.</p> <p>The transfer operation is reducing in capacity with the move to the RBF which will have an effect on the CRC. The reduced opening hours for all Surrey CRC's allow an additional hour for M+W to prioritise work when the CRC closes at 4pm. GS will look at further options for alleviating waiting times.</p> <p>In response to a member's query about queue length, GS confirmed the access road was increased to two lanes at weekends to reduce queuing on to Charlton Lane.</p> <p>A member suggested vehicles be checked further inside the site to reduce queuing at</p>	GS

	the gate, GS agreed to review this suggestion.	GS
6.1.3	In response to members' queries, PG confirmed there are water tanks and a spray system to help control dust from the construction works, and that the earth stockpiles near the railway line will be used for the bund or landscaping, with the majority of material used on site.	
6.1.4	JCS confirmed all electrical connections to the Eco Park are now in place.	
6.1.5	JCS noted a considerate constructors scheme inspector had visited site and awarded M+W a 'Performance Beyond Compliance' rating. The scheme covers five areas – appearance of the site, respect for the community, protecting the environment, safety and valuing the workforce.	
6.1.6	JCS confirmed the off-site air monitoring equipment has now been installed.	
	Project Update – CRC Operations	
6.2.1	<p>GS updated the group. The RBF would open the following day. As a result, the site will stop taking trade waste, which will reduce both traffic using the site to bring waste in and bulk haulage to remove materials. Trade customers were notified and advised of alternative SUEZ facilities. The site will also accept less material from other CRCs, further reducing traffic.</p> <p>Whilst the AD and Gasification facilities are being developed, the RBF will temporarily handle residual waste and food waste.</p> <p>Two vehicles have been located at the site to service the CRC and allow containers to be exchanged more frequently during the building works.</p> <p>In response to a member's query about the future acceptance of trade waste, GS confirmed the Gasification and Anaerobic Digestion facilities are able to accept trade waste but considered it likely the capacity would be taken up by household waste.</p> <p>CL confirmed the EA was satisfied with food waste being tipped in the RBF. The issues it had raised had been addressed by SUEZ and it is satisfied the RBF drainage is adequate.</p> <p>RW noted changes to the CRC service across Surrey were published in Surrey Matters, which every household receives. GS added that 250,000 leaflets were produced and available at the county's 15 CRCs.</p>	
6.2.2	<p>The capacity for managing residual waste at the site is currently reduced and SUEZ is therefore making contingency arrangements to allow for any exceptional short term increases in material coming into the site, e.g. if Grundon's Lakeside facility were unavailable meaning Spelthorne BC trucks would need to tip at Charlton Lane. It has submitted a planning application to allow up to 6 bulk vehicles to service the site between 6pm and 8pm to remove the waste tipped during the day. No deliveries would be allowed in this period.</p> <p>The application had been validated and the County Planning Authority would therefore carry out its statutory consultation in due course.</p>	
	Project Update - Communications	

6.3.1	EJ gave an update (see presentation attached). Monthly updates on progress with construction are published on the website and the e-newsletter is in draft (hard copies will be available on request). The website news page is regularly updated. A communications plan for the year has been agreed with SCC and will see the website developed and more collateral about the project produced.	
6.3.2	EJ gave an overview of enquiries, complaints and compliments received since the last meeting.	
6.3.3	GS noted that the company's legal name has now changed to SUEZ Recycling and Recovery UK Ltd. SITA Surrey's name has also changed. This will not affect any of the company contracts or licenses. The new branding is being rolled out in the coming months.	
7	Surrey County Council Update	
7.1	RP confirmed air quality monitoring equipment has been installed at Haslett Road. This is monitoring NOX and PM10, and equipment will shortly be installed to monitor PM2.5 and weather conditions. Reports will be available annually. CL noted that the Environment Agency will monitor the site more frequently during commissioning and the early stages of operations.	
7.2	RP confirmed the opening hours of Surrey CRC sites have changed and some sites are closing one day a week as part of a cost reduction exercise. SCC are developing a charging system for non-household waste, this won't be introduced for a number of months. SCC are also developing a strategy and campaign to deter fly tipping. GS anticipated that charging will not be implemented at the Eco Park until the current phase of work on the CRC, which restricts the area available for cars and the public, is completed.	
8	Questions	
8.1	Referring to the Health and Safety Executive's role in the project, CJ confirmed the HSE was consulted as part of the permit process and will monitor the site on an ongoing basis during the development and operational stages.	
8.2	Regarding bulk haulage, GS explained SUEZ has a permit to operate Charlton Lane and handles waste in accordance with this, using appropriately licensed hauliers. Bulk Freight vehicles without sufficient driving hours to get through the local area are not loaded. Waste coming into the site has recently reduced and this will reduce bulk HGV traffic from the site.	
9	AOB	
9.1	MR requested that GS ensure all lorries leave site fully sheeted. GS accepted that all bulk haulage vehicles leaving the site should be sheeted and will review this with the site manager.	GS
9.2	KH queried which organisation cleared the fly-tipped material outside Charlton Lane	

	the previous week. GS to investigate.	GS
9.3	A board where trains are required to use their whistles has been moved, SD asked if SUEZ communicate with Network Rail. GS wasn't aware of any regular communications with Network Rail. SD will contact Network Rail.	SD
9.4	<p>JM asked for clarification on restrictions on private cars bringing waste to CRCs. GS confirmed SUEZ will address this before the charging system is introduced.</p> <p>KS requested that the CLG form part of the consultation on the charging scheme for non-household waste. RP noted there are 15 CRCs in Surrey and the restrictions will apply to all sites.</p> <p>KS noted the information on SCC's website regarding the introduction of charging was out of date.</p> <p>RP confirmed there is no rule requiring the public to have seats up. All household waste is accepted at sites, SCC have no obligation to take non-household waste but will accept small amounts.</p>	RP
10	Date of next meeting	
10.1	Wednesday 15 June 2016.	