

Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Tuesday 24 July 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
Alison Dodsworth	AD	Charlton Village Resident's Association (new)	Resident
Malcolm Robertson	MR		Resident
Andrea Koskela	AK		Resident
John Seaman	JS		Resident
Peter Crews	PC		Resident
Diane Hall	DH		Resident
Jim Walter	JW		Resident
Karen Howkins	KH	Charlton Village Resident's Association (outgoing)	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
Jorge Hau	JHau	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Technical Coordinator

Calum James	CJ	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Environment and Industrial Risk Manager
Emma Smyth	ES	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Planning 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
Chris Lowe	CL	Environment Agency	PPC/RSR Officer 1
Tim Evans	TE	Surrey County Council	Councillor
Richard Walsh	RW	Surrey County Council	Councillor

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	Welcome	
1.1	Alison Dodsworth was introduced as the new representative for Charlton Village Resident's Association as she was elected as their chairperson in May.	
2	Apologies	
2.1	Cllr Barnard	
3	Approval of minutes from previous meeting	
3.1	Accepted	
4	Matters Arising	
4.1	Referencing 5.1, JS stated that the recycling figure for Wales is high but this number includes bottom ash, so the true figure is lower and therefore they are not exemplary.	
4.2	<p>PF stated that there was a glaring omission on 5.1 in that no reference was made to reducing carbon footprint. He stated that the presentation made no reference to the fact that the Eco Park does not fit into a policy to reduce carbon footprint and that this should be a priority for everyone globally.</p> <p>RP responded that the waste hierarchy is in the waste plan and when the planning application for the Eco Park was considered, the carbon footprint was looked at.</p> <p>GS added that the travel plan and carbon footprint was looked at as part of the planning application, including travel to site and the use of public transport.</p>	

	<p>JHa mentioned that staff are encouraged to car share, and do so.</p> <p>JW stated that SCC is currently consulting on carbon footprint on transport but it seems siloed and should be looked at holistically.</p> <p>JCS explained that the carbon footprint at the Eco Park has been looked at and, indeed, the technology used will help to reduce the carbon footprint. The CO₂ process emissions from the AD plant is neutral as food waste is biogenic and the CO₂ process emissions from the non-biogenic part of residual waste in the gasifier is largely compensated by the displacement of CO₂ created by the electricity generated by both plants.</p> <p>GS added that the Eco Park also reduces carbon footprint as the number of vehicle movements is reduced as waste is processed on site rather than being transported off site.</p> <p>TE added that SCC has a policy of reducing carbon footprint and councillors are aware and have signed up to this.</p>	
4.3	<p>Referencing 6.2, JS stated that Spelthorne does not collect batteries as part of their waste collection service, and it was previously stated that they did.</p> <p>RSA agreed and stated this was an error but there are still plenty of places locally to deposit them.</p>	
4.4	<p>PF wanted assurances that the Haz-op referenced in 8.1 has been completed and checked, otherwise he believes the request is superfluous. He objected to that fact that he was called rude.</p> <p>GS clarified that the referencing to being rude was the accusation that the EA review of pre-op conditions was a tick box exercise, when it was not.</p> <p>PF asked why no-one was looking at the detail of the Haz-op.</p> <p>CL responded that it is a standard part of commissioning and that all Haz-ops will be reviewed as part of their site inspections. He explained that there was a requirement in all conditions to make sure people have the right systems and processes in place and that the EA looks at these as part of their routine inspection process.</p>	
4.5	<p>Also 8.1 PF explained that he was asked if there was a requirement to have a technical sub-group meeting and he replied that there was not, but that he wanted it on record that that doesn't mean acceptance of everything and should not be construed as approval.</p> <p>KS commented that he was disappointed the technical sub-group has not continued.</p> <p>DH agreed and felt there was a role for this with the forthcoming air quality report and move into commissioning.</p> <p>KS suggested others could take over if required.</p> <p>PC stated that he was concerned the site would not work as it was a world first and looked expensive. He stated he did not feel he would benefit from further technical sub-group meetings.</p>	
5	Project update	
5.1	<p>JCS presented on construction progress and talked through the progress made over the last few months and what will happen over the next period. This includes the process of steam blowing, which is where steam is pushed through the pipework to clean out impurities prior to operation. This is important to make sure no debris enters</p>	

	<p>the turbine, as it could get damaged. During the steam blowing, local residents may see steam coming from the building, as it will be released directly and not via the stack. And they may hear noise from the short blasts of steam.</p> <p>JCS advised that we currently expect to start accepting waste in October.</p> <p>KS asked if the 3rd weighbridge and acoustic fencing were in the planning application.</p> <p>JCS stated that the new location of the 3rd weighbridge was submitted as a non-material amend but that the acoustic fencing was in the original plan.</p> <p>JHa added that the acoustic fencing can be seen on the original graphics for the site.</p>	
6	RBF and CRC updates	
6.1	<p>GS presented on the RBF and CRC operations.</p> <p>He stated that the RBF is operating as normal. Grundons had some operational failures recently so waste from Runnymede and Spelthorne were diverted to the Eco Park and that this was handled with no issues.</p> <p>The CRC has been quieter than usual, due to the hot weather. At this time of year, green waste typically accounts for 40% of the waste brought to the CRC, but as the grass is not growing due to lack of rain, this has resulted in fewer visitors to site.</p> <p>GS commented that the staff on site are struggling with the heat as they are still required to wear appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) but we are ensuring they take sufficient breaks and keep hydrated.</p> <p>GS stated that the extended summer hours are being used, which is good. He also asked if the residents had any feedback on the service.</p> <p>KS stated that the site was good today but the bays on the RBF were not empty.</p> <p>JS stated that he had visited that day and had received help from staff without requesting it.</p> <p>JW noted that traffic spills out onto the road on occasions.</p> <p>GS confirmed that traffic does back up at peak times.</p> <p>AK commented that this year's stickers are useless as they keep falling off.</p> <p>RP confirmed they are already aware of the issue and have complained to the supplier and obtained a refund for the cost and will look for a new supplier for next year.</p> <p>PC stated that there's an ongoing problem with the layout as there's conflict in the area immediately after the barrier as people want to wait for the popular bays to be available, so there's traffic and pedestrians walking between cars.</p> <p>GS agreed and stated that Charlton Lane is the busiest site. He also noted that the site currently has four fewer bays than it will do, as these are currently within the construction area, but will be available once construction is complete. More available bays will help to reduce congestion on site.</p> <p>CJ observed that we record a significant number of near misses on site as a result of pedestrians not using the marked pathways, which are there for their protection.</p> <p>AD stated that more people should reverse park into the bays as this is safer and that there should be someone available to direct the people and traffic to do this as people are not as familiar with the site.</p>	

	<p>GS stated that not everyone welcomes instruction and guidance from our staff on site.</p> <p>ES commented that another change to the site was the confirmation that change of use at Ivydene has been approved so people may start to see activity on that site as it is prepared for use.</p> <p>GS added that there are no changes being made to the building at this point, other than making it suitable for use.</p> <p>MR asked for clarification on if that meant there would be no re-use shop.</p> <p>GS responded that there would be, but only after construction was completed as it would not be appropriate to have members of the public on the construction access road.</p> <p>JW asked if the items sold through online selling would be posted or collected from site.</p> <p>GS confirmed they would be posted.</p> <p>JS asked if items would be dropped off there or at the CRC.</p> <p>GS confirmed items would be dropped off at the CRC, as they are now.</p> <p>GS mentioned that across Surrey, our sites has recently raised over £2000 for Macmillan, which is our corporate charity. This was part of a nationwide event aiming to raise £80,000 for the charity this year, bringing the company's total donations to Macmillan to £250,000. The money was raised through collections on site and a sponsored walk.</p>	
6.2	<p>LM provided an update on communications over the last period, as well as information on recent comments and complaints.</p> <p>LM highlighted the usefulness of people reporting where they witness drivers in violation of the routing strategy and requested people provide registration numbers, dates and times for traffic issues so driver can be investigated.</p> <p>GS advised that one driver was identified and given a final warning as a result of feedback. Any further infringements will result in him being banned from site.</p> <p>LM also explained the five odour complaints that were received and investigated and deemed to be unrelated to the Eco Park.</p> <p>CJ explained that, following receipt of the complaints, we assessed the site and local area and believed the odour was not caused by our site. The complaints referred to odour from the AD facility which is not yet operational or taking waste.</p> <p>CL added that he conducted an unannounced visit a few days later. He also assessed the local area and identified a strong smell of bitumen related to the recent road re-surfacing work. He concluded that there had been no issues at the Eco Park and that the site was not responsible for the recent odour issues.</p> <p>RW commented that the roads were resurfaced around that time.</p> <p>LM explained that the house sale enquiry was a complaint that a house sale in Charlton Lane had fallen through due to the Eco Park. The environmental report stated that the house was within 25m of a historic landfill and therefore was classed as contaminated land and the buyer had requested an indemnity policy was purchased by the seller.</p>	

	<p>On investigation it was discovered that a significant proportion of the area, including some parts of Charlton Village, have been built on ex-gravel quarries, which were historically backfilled with less scrutiny than modern day regulations would allow. Notably, the map shows that the Eco Park land was not historic landfill and was more than 25m from the relevant property, hence was unlikely to be the subject of the environmental report.</p> <p>JW commented that he had noticed a strong boggy smell.</p> <p>CJ stated that advising SUEZ directly of any odour issues at the earliest opportunity gives us the best chance of identifying the issue and resolving it.</p> <p>CL advised that residents can report odours direct to the EA – 0800 80 70 60 but that SUEZ is required to also report any odour complaints they receive to the EA so there is full transparency in any event.</p>	
6.3	<p>JHau presented on the recent air quality monitoring report.</p> <p>First he explained that the report would be changing from covering April to April to looking at a calendar year, as this is more helpful. So as an interim, this report covers both April 17 to April 18 and also 2017 as a calendar year. The next report will show data from 2018 as a calendar year.</p> <p>JHau explained that the limit on PM10 is that there should be no more than 35 occurrences where the recorded levels are higher than 50 so the graph shows this was not breached.</p> <p>There is no such limit for PM2.5 as they cannot be recorded as accurately.</p> <p>RSA referenced the spike shown on the graph in November and suggested this could be as a result of bonfire night and fireworks.</p> <p>SD asked how big the maintenance gap was.</p> <p>JHau stated that it was a couple of months and we can confirm the exact dates.</p> <p>PMN: the PM2.5 Data analyser equipment was down between 16th May and 1st August last year.</p> <p>SD asked who discovered the equipment wasn't working.</p> <p>JHau responded that we would investigate.</p> <p>DH explained that the major concern is where the monitoring equipment is sited, in the triangle and dominated by emissions from the M3. Due to the prevailing wind, any emissions from the Eco Park will be lost and won't be identified as from the Eco Park.</p> <p>JHa responded that that's not the purpose of this air quality monitoring and that the Continuous Emissions Monitoring (CEMs) on the stack would record emissions from the site. He further explained that the system is a dual system, meaning there are two sets of equipment running to ensure we always collect data, in the event that one set fails.</p> <p>KS asked if the data from the CEMs would be publically available.</p> <p>JHa confirmed that it would be and that we will be reporting on it at every CLG meeting once we are operational.</p> <p>JW asked how much background pollution the CEMs will pick up.</p> <p>JHa responded that the CEMs is located inside the stack and monitors the flue gas directly so it won't pick up any outside pollution.</p>	JHau

	<p>TE asked if there are any comparisons of air quality in other areas.</p> <p>KS commented that Sunbury Cross is one of the worst areas for NOX.</p> <p>DH explained that we are in a notably bad area, between the M4, M3 and M25 and all the ground traffic from Heathrow.</p>	
7	Questions	
7.1	<p>LM read two questions from the agenda submitted by JS.</p> <p>The first question was ‘A report about the Eco Park published in Let’s Recycle includes a comment regarding a series of delays that have been put down to problems with the regulatory process which saw the date pushed back and costs increase’. JS wanted to know what the regulatory problems were and why they were not reported to the group.</p> <p>LM answered that she was approached by Let’s Recycle for an update on the Eco Park, which was provided and published in the article. The comment on behalf of SUEZ made no mention of any regulatory issues causing delays. Hence LM assumes the reference is to the initial delays to the start of the project as a result of the protracted planning process.</p> <p>LM read the second question which was ‘Are excavated materials classed by the Environment Protection Act as “controlled waste”? If they are, why was soil from the Eco Park site deposited near to the railway line and allowed to remain there?’</p> <p>ES responded that the soils by the railway line were excavated from the construction site and are being stored there but will be used in the landscaping on site, subject to planning permission – SUEZ will be submitting a planning application for the landscaping bunds proposal which was shared with the CLG earlier this year. She explained that it’s best practise to re-use excavated soils on site, where possible, as it reduces vehicle movements.</p> <p>CJ clarified that soils are only classed as waste once they are removed from site. There is current activity to screen the soil and remove materials not suitable for re-use within the landscaping</p> <p>JW stated that the soil screening is creating a lot of dust.</p> <p>KS stated that there ought to be dust control.</p> <p>JW commented that the noise from the bulldozers and diggers was loud and prevented him having a normal conversation in his garden. He reported that his neighbours have complained to him.</p> <p>RSA stated that this should be reported to Spelthorne Environmental Health.</p> <p>MR questioned if that was a breach of planning.</p> <p>CL commented that SCC planning should be picking it up.</p> <p>JW stated he had no concerns with the plant itself but that the dust and noise from the soil bunds is a problem.</p> <p>JCS stated that the risk assessment includes the necessity of dampening to reduce dust and offered to investigate the matter further.</p> <p>JHa stated that there is a water bowser on site constantly, to reduce dust.</p> <p>KS asked where the waste from the soil grading was going.</p>	JCS

	<p>GS confirmed that any material leaving site would go to an appropriately permitted facility and offered to confirm this detail.</p> <p>JS stated that dust monitoring was required when construction started and asked if this is still happening.</p> <p>JCS confirms that regular dust monitoring still takes place and that it would be reviewed.</p> <p>CL explained that the figure used to assess dust pollution was 200 micrograms of particles per square metre, below is acceptable and above this limit is not. However, there's no data on where is number came from and the level of acceptability can vary according to the type of dust material and how heavy it is.</p>	GS
8	AOB	
8.1	<p>SD stated that she had received an enquiry from a local resident regarding the Scout Hut next to the site and commitments made to asphalt the front that now seems to be stalling.</p> <p>GS explained that there had been a breakdown in communication with M+W but that SUEZ would work with the Scout movement to resolve this.</p> <p>JHa offered to report back at the next CLG on progress.</p> <p>CL asked if they could apply to the SUEZ Communities Trust for funding.</p> <p>CJ explained that whilst the money in the trust fund is greatly reduced as the volume of material going to landfill is greatly reduced it's linked to the landfill tax paid, but yes, they could still apply. He offered to provide the link to the Trust's website.</p> <p>PMN: link to SUEZ Communities Trust website https://www.suezcommunitiestrust.org.uk/projects/</p> <p>JS stated that he was at the CRC towards the end of the day and that there were gulls on site. He asked what was attracting them.</p> <p>GS responded that birds are clever and they are looking for water from the nearby lagoon, shelter and somewhere to rest on the building and food from the waste. He reiterated that using the RBF for food and residual waste is an interim solution until construction is finished and bird control is in place and used when necessary.</p> <p>PC asked if there was an update to the environmental permit.</p> <p>CJ stated that the permit was in place and the different requirements are being progressed.</p> <p>PC requested an update at the next meeting.</p> <p>CJ agreed to this.</p> <p>CL explained that some of the pre-op conditions have been discharged and some have not. He added that some are not due to be discharged until the site goes into operation.</p> <p>DH asked if the technical sub group would be continued.</p> <p>PC answered that the facility was agreed and built under a contract that the CLG was not part of and did not have access to. He felt that the only input the group was able to have was at the design stage and that this time has now passed so there is now a limit to what the group could achieve.</p> <p>DH asked if anyone would mind if she met to discuss air quality.</p>	JHa

	<p>There were no objections.</p> <p>KS requested that this was fed back to the group.</p> <p>AD expressed concern regarding the air quality and the location on the monitoring equipment. She asked if there were plans to add another one in Charlton Village.</p> <p>CL explained that the EA looks at emissions from the stack and that Spelthorne will look at local air quality, regardless of the vicinity of the Eco Park, and are already monitoring air quality in Charlton Village.</p> <p>RSA stated that Spelthorne has monitoring at various points.</p> <p>AD stated that the data needs to be published to establish a baseline before the Eco Park is operational.</p> <p>CL responded that the data is on the Spelthorne website along with an action plan that mainly focuses on car pollution.</p> <p>PF requested that the air quality data is not simply issued as slides but as a separate report.</p> <p>LM agreed to this.</p> <p>MR asked for the full report as well.</p> <p>RP agreed to the full air quality report being published.</p>	<p>LM</p> <p>RP</p>
9	Date of next meeting	
9.1	<p>Tuesday 2nd October 2018 at 6.30pm</p> <p>PMN: The Golf Club is unavailable on 2nd October so the meeting has been moved to Tuesday 9th October.</p>	