

Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Monday 15 May 2017
Location	Sunbury Golf Centre
Recorder	Louise Morton

Present

Name	Initials	Organisation	Title / Role
Ken Snaith	KS		Resident, Chair
John Seaman	JS		Resident
Peter Francis	PF	LOSRA	Resident
Richard Hewitt	RH	Shepperton Residents Association	Resident
Jim Walter	JW		Resident
Andrea Koskela	AK		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
Jorge Hau	JH	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Technical Coordinator
Justin Hampton	JHa	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Plant Manager
Louise Morton	LM	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Communications Manager
Emma Jordan	EJ	SUEZ recycling and recovery UK	Corporate Affairs Manager
Sandra Dunn	SD	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Richard Smith-Ainsley	RSA	Spelthorne Borough Council	Councillor
Richard Parkinson	RP	Surrey County Council	Waste Group Manager
Richard Walsh	RW	Surrey County Council	Councillor

Distribution

<p>Participants and: Alan Stones and Stephen Jenkins (Surrey County Council Planning); Richard James (Environment Agency); Tracey Wilmott French (Spelthorne Borough Council Environmental Health), PCSO Colin Gibbons (Surrey Police), Cllr Mike Goodman (Surrey County Council), Sandy Muirhead (Spelthorne Borough Council).</p>		
1	Welcome	
2	Apologies	
2.1	Tim Evans, Julia Bachmann, Peter Hughes, Karen Howkins, Chris Lowe (EA)	
3	Approval of minutes from previous meeting	
3.1	JS had asked about the temporary AD stack and said that this had not been reported in the minutes.	
4	Matters Arising	
4.1	<p>JS asked why they were considering amendments to the infiltration basin but these were not being addressed.</p> <p>JCS replied that this has been addressed by the planning committee as one of the Non Material Amendments.</p>	
4.2	<p>PH raised that Item 10.2 is interesting but there is no answer.</p> <p>JCS answered that this will be addressed in today's presentation.</p>	
4.3	<p>AK asked about Item 4.3 and are we going to see the air quality report?</p> <p>KS responded that it was on the agenda for tonight.</p>	
4.4	<p>AK believes she did not receive the link to the planning app as stated in Item 6.2.1</p> <p>EJ to resend link</p> <p>AK would have preferred the matter to have been raised earlier. It matters to people that the PV cells have been moved and the canopy taken away. This should have been discussed.</p>	EJ
5	Commissioning presentation – JHa	
5.1	<p>SD queried how recruitment for roles was done and whether these were local or national.</p> <p>JHa stated that the jobs were advertised on Total Jobs, LinkedIn, Reed, signage at site, on SUEZ website and in local paper. Three of the team are very local, but the roles are also highly specialised so some recruits came from further afield. It was a multi-stage process with interviews and assessment and we look at culture fit and attitude as well as skill set.</p> <p>SD queried where training is taking place.</p> <p>JHa confirmed training is on site.</p> <p>AK asked if there are further vacancies.</p>	

	JHa confirmed they will be recruiting for operatives later in the year.	
5.2	KS stated the numbers seem light to run a 24/7 operation. JHa confirmed there would be three staff per shift on site at any time, five shift teams in total and three shifts available to cover if required.	
5.3	RH requested clarification that through commissioning, every test has to be completed before you can move on. JHa confirmed.	
5.4	KS queried the permit to work procedure. JHa explained the rigorous training and the roles of the senior ops to authorise permit to work and confined space entry etc. Also clarified that there would be rescue teams on standby when we have shut downs.	
5.5	EJ pointed out that the commissioning would also be signed off by a third party. RW questioned who the third party would be and how we can verify their independence. JH confirmed the commissioning would be signed off by AMEC Foster Wheeler. RP clarified that they have been appointed jointly by Surrey County Council and SUEZ.	
5.6	KS would like the Technical Sub Group to be involved in commissioning JCS confirmed that SUEZ have previously made a more detailed presentation to the TSG on this and would be happy to discuss actual commissioning progress during future TSG meetings.	
5.7	PF stated that he believes the most dangerous time is commissioning and questioned whether there is a plan to close the CRC and public areas. JHa stated that he would not put his team at risk and that the risks would be managed so there is no danger. GS confirmed that SUEZ does not compromise on the safety of the public or our employees.	
6	Project Update	
6.1	PH queried timings on the project. JCS confirmed that good progress was being made on site with the AD facility due to move into commissioning soon. The gasification facility is also progressing well, with the delivery and installation of the boilers. JCS also confirmed that the works programme is currently being reviewed and he expects to be able to provide more information next time.	
7	Air Quality Monitoring report	
7.1	RW asked how much we expect the readings to change when the plant is operating. JCS provided an indicative figure of +2 to +3%	

	<p>RW requested this data is kept so we can refer back to it later.</p> <p>RP confirmed that SCC would be keeping the records.</p>	
7.2	<p>JS queried if we need to know the wind direction to be able to interpret the data.</p> <p>PH commented that the wind is normally from the SE.</p>	
7.3	<p>JS requested that air quality monitoring data is presented more frequently.</p> <p>GS replied that the data needs to be looked at in perspective and that looking at small sections in isolation doesn't give a clear picture so it not helpful to understanding.</p> <p>JCS confirmed that the raw data is provided to the EA for monitoring.</p> <p>JW commented that the data appears to reflect traffic from the M3</p>	
8	Project Update part 2	
8.1	<p>AK queried mention of the residents' permit scheme?</p> <p>GS clarified that all visitors to the CRC should be asked for ID/ proof of address on first visit and given a sticker for their car for all subsequent visits. AK states she was unaware of this and has never been asked. GS to check this with staff at CRC.</p>	GS
8.2	<p>KS asked about hard plastic and whether it is recycled.</p> <p>GS explained that the value of hard plastic is linked to the cost of oil. When oil was high (150USD/ barrel) it was cost effective to recycle hard plastic. However now the price of oil has dropped, the cost of transporting the lightweight plastic outweighs the cost of its value as virgin raw material is cheaper. GS confirmed that we are looking for ways to make recycling rigid plastic financially viable.</p>	
8.3	<p>GS explained that the CRC is the busiest in Surrey, processing over 20,000 tonnes/ year. There are essential works required to resurface the CRC and to avoid disruption to CRC customers, this will be done over three to five evenings, week commencing 22 May. Consideration was given to the disruption to the residents should this work be done in the day and the site closed for the duration, but the decision to work overnight seemed the most appropriate and delivered the least disruption.</p> <p>JW commented that, due to the rise in fly-tipping, evening works was the better option rather than closing the CRC and risk further fly-tipping.</p>	
8.3.1	<p>GS questioned what materials are being fly-tipped</p> <p>JW stated it is building waste and rubble.</p> <p>KS stated that local papers report fly-tipping is going down, but that he doesn't see evidence of this. He reports on average three incidents of fly-tipping/ week. He feels that there is an issue but it's not clear if it's directly related to the charging scheme.</p> <p>RP explains that data for fly-tipping is difficult and unpredictable. The districts and boroughs all record information differently. The tonnage of fly-tipping coming into waste transfer stations is recorded and this figure has gone down, however the number of reported incidents has increased.</p> <p>RSA stated that he's only interested in Spelthorne data and this shows tonnage and incidents have gone up since the introduction of charging.</p>	

	<p>RP stated that fly-tipping has been going on since before the charges were introduced and that it's an anti-social behaviour that needs addressing and is being looked at.</p> <p>JS reported that the data does not take into account fly-tipping on council land so is not accurate.</p> <p>RP stated that fly-tipping on private land is an issue but that wasn't being recorded before the charges were introduced either. SCC can only record tonnage for the waste it has responsibility to clear.</p> <p>AK stated she watched a programme on TV that showed London boroughs had a large issue with fly-tipping and so she concluded it must be the same in Surrey.</p> <p>RW stated that some London boroughs have more restrictive CRC hours, which may encourage more fly-tipping than in Surrey.</p> <p>RP stated that the boroughs employ intelligence officers to find persistent offenders and that Spelthorne is doing well with this. Cllr Mike Goodman is very committed to dealing with this issue as it's a cost to everyone.</p> <p>SD stated that residents are having to pay for fly-tipping on private land and that this is not covered in SCC's figures.</p> <p>RP agreed and added that this is why it's a legal responsibility that if someone takes away waste they must be licensed</p> <p>GS stated that people need to be aware that the government's position is that the polluter pays so if waste can be linked back to a specific address, that person is responsible for it.</p> <p>GS also stated that the Charlton Lane CRC is the only one in Surrey open until 6pm.</p> <p>RW stated he tested the service in response to comments about queues by arriving at 8am and between 4-6pm and found no queues and friendly, helpful staff. He suggested people should visit in quieter hours and people need to be reminded of extended hours at site more.</p> <p>LM to send poster with site hours.</p>	LM
8.4	<p>JS requested that residents be encouraged to use kerbside/ charity donations for textiles/ small electricals to reduce congestion at the CRC.</p> <p>RP confirmed the Waste Partnership are encouraging residents make use of collection.</p>	
8.5	<p>PF objected to SUEZ cancelling the latest TSG meeting as the site visit was therefore also missed.</p> <p>EJ explained there was a misunderstanding and that they felt the site visit was incidental, and not the main reason for the meeting.</p> <p>JCS confirmed a site visit can be arranged.</p> <p>KS stated they are still waiting for data on other TSG matters.</p> <p>LM to arrange TSG site visit.</p>	LM
8.6	<p>KS asked whether the stack would be delivered in large loads.</p> <p>JCS stated that it will be delivered in three sections. He needs to confirm the delivery method, but it will not be on the same scale as the boiler delivery. If required, residents will be notified.</p>	

9	Questions	
9.1	<p>From Peter Crews</p> <p><i>Does SUEZ know of any other plant where municipal waste is being gasified successfully and, if so, will they be visiting the site to see how the process is controlled?</i></p> <p>JCS stated that there are a number of gasification plants in the UK, for example on the Isle of Wight, some in Europe and Japan. The most similar is a plant in Italy (Bergamo). It is not a gasification facility but it handles with same type of waste. SUEZ have visited the plant a number of times.</p>	
9.2	<p>PF asked if there are any other AD plants based on the same site as a CRC. Although previously told there were no such facilities, he requested SUEZ checks again.</p> <p><i>At the end of the meeting RP provided details of the Lyne Lane CRC site in Chertsey to PF, This CRC is located immediately adjacent to an AD plant operating on the neighbouring Thames Water sewage works.</i></p>	JHa
10	AOB	
10.1	<p>KS questioned the works being done on the site access.</p> <p>JCS confirmed it is being done in phases.</p> <p>KS requested SCC look at whether Charlton Lane can be looked at at the same time. RP to confirm with colleagues in the council's Highways Dept. whether any resurfacing works are planned for Charlton Lane.</p>	RP
10.2	EJ noted that a number of CLG members have not been in attendance for a while and suggested this is followed up to understand if they still wish to be involved.	LM
10.3	KS noted that this is EJ's last meeting and thanked her for her contribution.	
11	Date of next meeting	
11.1	Tuesday 18 July 2017	