

## Meeting record

Subject	Eco Park Community Liaison Group
Date	Monday 24 July 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
Karen Howkins	KH	Charlton Village Residents' Association	Resident
Malcolm Robertson	MR		Resident
Jim Maxwell	JM		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
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
Chris Lowe	CL	Environment Agency	PPC/RSR Officer 1
David Rushton	DR	Environment Agency	Environment Officer
John Shannon	JSh	M+W Group	Construction Manager
Casey Gedmintas	CG	M+W Group	Project Director

## Distribution

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).

<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
2.1	Tim Evans, Julia Bachmann, Peter Crews	
<b>3</b>	<b>Approval of minutes from previous meeting</b>	
3.1	PH noted he was present at the last meeting but his name had been listed in the apologies section in error.	
3.2	PH noted that in section 7.2 he commented that the wind direction was from the SW not SE.	
3.3	PH noted that section 8.3.1 should reference private land, not council land.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
4.1	<p>AK refers to section 4.4 and is unhappy that the planning amendment was not discussed at the CLG and with the lack of consultation.</p> <p>AK requests that any future planning changes are brought to the CLG in advance and that sufficient time is allocated in the meeting to discuss them.</p> <p>GS + JCS agree to the inclusion of future planning amendments being included as an agenda item.</p> <p>KS noted there is a duty on all members to read the project reports and documents thoroughly when they are sent out.</p>	GS + JCS
4.2	<p>PF referred to 5.7 and suggested that if we were not planning to close the CRC during commissioning, we should instead provide information to the public to advise them of the commissioning so they could avoid the CRC if they choose to do so.</p> <p>PF also asked what the requirement was for mandatory hazard warning signs.</p>	

	<p>GS replied that he was not aware of any requirement for mandatory hazard signs to be erected during commissioning. He reiterated that safety is paramount and SUEZ will have staff on site during all periods of commissioning and would not put their staff at risk, so there would be no additional risk to the public. He advised that SUEZ would be communicating progress, including commissioning, via normal communications including website updates and monthly updates. GS committed to reviewing the safety communications internally and to report back on this at the next meeting.</p> <p>CL added that they would review the situation nearer to the time and advise accordingly.</p>	GS
4.3	<p>KS asked what 3<sup>rd</sup> party public liability insurance was held for the site.</p> <p>GS confirmed that, under the SUEZ contract, we are required to have a number of risks insured and this includes public liability for all CRCs.</p>	
4.4	<p>PF refers to section 9.1 where a reference was made to the gasification facility on the Isle of Wight. PF notes that it has been announced since that the facility would be closed and replaced by an EfW.</p> <p><i>Post Meeting Note (PMN) – The Eco Park uses a different gasification technology.</i></p>	
4.5	<p>PF refers to 9.2 and advised that he visited the Thames Water AD plant in Lyne Lane, which is situated adjacent to a CRC and noted that the plant is a lot smaller than the development at Charlton Lane and that there is also a greater distance between the two facilities.</p>	
4.6	<p>JS asked whether the air quality monitoring data referenced in section 7 would be available to the public.</p> <p>KS confirmed that it would be provided here when it was available.</p> <p>JS asked whether it recorded wind direction.</p> <p>JCS confirmed that it does.</p> <p>JS questioned whether the reference to raw data meant that the data viewed previously was therefore adjusted data.</p> <p>JCS advised that the term raw data referred to the data output from the equipment and that this data was interpreted and displayed so as to be meaningful, but not adjusted in any way.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Technical Sub-group visit update</b>	
5.1	<p>PF reported that the Technical sub-group (PF, PH and PC) had visited the site and were impressed with both the health and safety culture on site and the quality of the materials and equipment on site.</p> <p>PF explained that they were all suited and booted with specialist Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) before entering the site and that at all times, they were escorted and routes were checked for traffic and other hazards as they moved around site.</p> <p>PH agreed with PF's summary.</p> <p>PF reported that he is still concerned about the size of the site – it being small and congested, and also on the location of the flare.</p>	
<b>6</b>	<b>Project Update</b>	

6.1	<p>JCS provided a summary of progress on site.</p> <p>Within the AD facility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cladding on AD building is complete.</li> <li>• Recycled water tank installed and tested.</li> <li>• Compressed air pipework was installed.</li> <li>• Cable pulling has started.</li> <li>• The bunded wall has been completed.</li> </ul> <p>The AD facility is expected to start accepting food waste late autumn, and will produce electricity from early next year. The site will be handed over in spring 2018.</p> <p>On the gasification facility the equipment has been delivered and installed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gasification train.</li> <li>• Pre-treatment equipment.</li> <li>• And more work has been completed on the building cladding.</li> </ul> <p>We expect the Gasification plant to start cold commissioning in late autumn, and for it to be taking black bag waste from spring with handover expected in summer 2018.</p> <p>JCS confirmed that these timescales are behind where we wanted to be, but that it's a very complex site and we are working to deliver the project as soon as possible.</p>	
6.2	<p>KH asked for confirmation of the delay.</p> <p>JCS confirmed the project is approximately eight to eight and a half months behind.</p>	
6.3	<p>KS asked about the temporary stack.</p> <p>JCS confirmed there will not be a temporary stack.</p>	
6.4	<p>GS suggested people may be concerned about the cladding used and asked JCS his opinion of the risk with the cladding.</p> <p>JCS confirmed that M+W Group are not using the same type of cladding that was on Grenfell Tower.</p>	
6.5	<p>JCS advised that the stack is due to be delivered on 07 August. In total, the stack will be 49 metres high and therefore will have to be assembled on site, it will be delivered in three pieces, to be erected on site.</p> <p>Due to the size of the delivery, these will have to come through Charlton Village. The delivery will be escorted, for safety reasons, but the delivery will not be on the same scale as the boiler.</p> <p>Two cranes will be required to erect the stack and this work needs to be completed in one day. Therefore, work will commence early in the day, likely to be 7am, and will continue after hours, expected to be 9pm.</p> <p>JCS confirmed that the planners had been advised.</p> <p>MR asked whether the stack comes with the flues inside or whether these are installed after.</p> <p>JCS confirmed that the flues will be placed into the stack after it has been erected.</p> <p>CG confirmed this.</p>	

6.5	<p>GS provided an update on the Recyclables Bulking Facility and confirmed it continues to operate well as the interim solution during the construction of the AD and Gasifier.</p> <p>GS also advised on work recently carried out on the Community Recycling Centre including improvements on the Reuse building to re-clad the roof.</p> <p>JW asked why visitors are still advised to use both lanes.</p> <p>GS stated that the use of the additional traffic lanes on the entrance to the CRC helped to prevent traffic build up on Charlton Lane.</p> <p>JW suggested that more assistance is needed to manage the flow of traffic here.</p> <p>GS thanked KW for the feedback and will review operations and signage.</p> <p>KH stated that she queues for one hour when visiting the site.</p> <p>RW stated that he visits the CRC site regularly and never has to wait. He advises that people avoid peak times and go when the site is quieter.</p> <p>GS states that the site has seen increased use of the longer hours and that this is the only CRC in Surrey open til 6pm.</p> <p>RW suggested signage to remind people of the opening hours and advise of the quieter periods would help. GS stated that he would look into providing a sign.</p> <p>JS provided feedback that the wood container is not easy to use as it's in the corner and difficult to access for visitors and staff.</p> <p>KS stated that he is still concerned about the turnaround of black bag waste and the potential to attract vermin.</p> <p>GS explained that our procedures require that no waste is on site for longer than 48 hours and a procedure is in place to ensure residual waste is taken off site in the same order it arrived, by using the additional bays, to prevent waste building up or sitting around for any length of time.</p> <p>KS reported that he witnessed a large farm tractor with trailer going over the weighbridge at 2.30pm last Wednesday full of green waste.</p> <p>GS stated that we are allowed to accept some commercial waste and that he will investigate.</p> <p><i>PMN – GS has investigated and confirmed that the green waste was from Spelthorne Borough Council.</i></p> <p>KH advises that there has been an increase in fly tipping green waste into the river at Sunbury.</p> <p>CL advises that all fly tipping incidents on or near watercourses should be reported to the EA.</p> <p>PF reported a strong smell last Monday morning.</p> <p>LM advised that she had received a previous complaint about a strong odour early last week but that investigations had failed to discover the source. It is not believed that the smell is coming from any part of the Eco Park. There is a cess pit in the area which could be the source.</p> <p>CL advised that the recent hot weather can cause the drains to smell more.</p> <p>JM reported that a local farm has been spraying waste as fertiliser, which could also be the cause of the odour.</p>	<p>GS</p> <p>GS</p> <p>GS</p> <p>GS</p>
-----	---	---



	<p>RP advised that the contract with SUEZ can be varied to change the level of service that SCC may require.</p> <p>JM asked whether it was possible to dip into reserves to cover shortfall.</p> <p>RP stated that the reserves are at an all-time low and are insufficient to plug the gap.</p> <p>RW confirmed this and stated that the auditors had visited recently and confirmed that the reserves cannot be cut further.</p> <p>KS stated that he felt the Eco Park should be excluded from the consultation changes.</p> <p>RW stated that as this site is the biggest and has twice as many visitors as the next largest, he would be recommending that it remains open seven days a week.</p> <p>JW observed that closures at other sites would put more pressure on this one.</p> <p>RP explained that the four sites at risk of closure only deal with 10% of waste in the county, so they are quite small. He recognised that they are valued by local residents but stated that there is capacity at other sites as overall waste volumes and visitor numbers are down.</p> <p>GS advises that residents can save the council money by separating all of their recyclables from their waste.</p> <p>PF questioned that as the cost of fly tipping comes out of the borough's budget is this just transferring cost to the boroughs as he believes fly tipping will increase.</p> <p>RP advised that although the boroughs and highways agency have the responsibility for clearing fly tipped waste, that Surrey County Council is still liable for the cost of disposing of it.</p> <p>RP also confirmed that there would be significant savings if people segregated their waste properly.</p> <p>KS asked about the removal of the free bag and whether or not this would generate savings.</p> <p>RP advised that, since the introduction of charging for non-domestic waste, volumes have dropped significantly and we now only receive 20% of that waste which was previously deposited. 75% of this is non-chargable as it's dropped off as the free bag, so it's not about generating revenue but about reducing our disposal costs.</p> <p>RP noted that the statutory minimum provision would be one CRC for the whole of Surrey. He also reiterated that this would be a difficult decision for members and they would try to minimise the impact to residents.</p>	
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>Questions</b></p>	
<p>8.1</p>	<p><i>Will the lorry route to the plant be revisited so that perhaps Charlton Village, Littleton Village and Halliford all get a share rather than as is currently where Charlton is an exclusion zone?</i></p> <p>KH advised that the reason Charlton Village is protected is due to the number of old cottages which have no foundations and are close to the roads, so are vulnerable to heavy traffic movements.</p> <p>GS confirmed that there is a planning condition in place that states how construction vehicles get to site and that Charlton Village should also be avoided for large HGVs.</p>	

	<p>MR stated that the protection of Charlton Village is limited as this only applies to bulk, HGV and construction vehicles related to the Eco Park.</p> <p>KS observes that the majority of HGV movements are unrelated to the Eco Park.</p>	
8.2	<p><i>Effects of planned closures of CRCs in Surrey and withdrawal of free non-domestic rubbish allowance?</i></p> <p>Covered in section 7.</p>	
8.3	<p><i>What's the impact of changes to service on traffic volumes?</i></p> <p>KS explains that the initial traffic survey stated there would be major benefits to the Eco Park in terms of a reduction in traffic volumes. But to assess this we need a baseline. He informs us that he has received recent data on traffic volumes over the weighbridge and is trying to understand the impact of any changes to service on the traffic volumes.</p> <p>GS advised that we currently still have waste coming in from across the network of CRCs and waste coming in from the districts and boroughs. Since the traffic survey was conducted we have reduced the number of trade vehicles coming in and reduced waste coming in from other CRCs as we are managing this across our other Waste Transfer Stations.</p> <p>GS stated that the volume of material and traffic coming through now is significantly lower compared to how it was before construction started. The old Waste Transfer Station was huge and traffic was regularly queuing onto Charlton Lane. We have made significant improvements to the site so this no longer happens and diverted waste elsewhere to reduce traffic volumes during the construction phase. Traffic entering the site varies from day to day so we would need to review input vehicle numbers over a longer time period to understand any trends.</p> <p>GS stated there is an initial, interim and post construction phase to the vehicles entering the site. We are currently in the interim position. GS offered to prepare some data and present on this at the next CLG meeting.</p> <p>RW suggests we need to wait until after construction to see how the Eco Park development has affected traffic volumes.</p> <p>JS reports that previously more data on traffic was shared.</p> <p>MR requested that yearly tonnages are provided.</p> <p>GS stated that all permitted sites are obliged to submit waste returns to the Environment Agency and could provide the group with tonnage returns.</p>	<p>GS</p> <p>GS</p>
8.4	<p><i>How much is the whole Eco Park project over budget to date?</i></p> <p>RP stated that the project is on a fixed cost contract with SUEZ so the budget remains at £91 million, as originally stated.</p> <p>MR reported hearing a higher figure of £103 million.</p> <p>RP confirmed that this higher figured included other cost items such as plant machinery and not just the cost of the Eco Park.</p>	
8.5	<p><i>How far are the behind schedule realistically?</i></p> <p>When can we expect the AD Plant to come on Line? Likewise the Gasification and Education Centre?</p> <p>Answered provided in section 6.1.</p>	

8.6	<p><i>When will member's of the CLG be invited around to see the plant as a lot of us never have been.</i></p> <p>JCS stated that due to Health and Safety concerns it would be difficult to accommodate a visit to the construction site, however he would be happy to arrange a viewing from the safety of the CRC where the construction site can be viewed.</p> <p>JCS also offered to arrange a pre-tour of the facility once it is complete.</p> <p>GS suggested that the viewing could take place from the safety of the CRC site at 4pm on the day of the next CLG meeting.</p>	LM
8.7	<p><i>Following the resignation from Brian Catt, what is the position with regards to member on the Committee and Tech Committee</i></p> <p>KS questioned whether the Technical Sub-group needs a new member.</p> <p>PF confirmed that most of the technical queries have now been answered so it's unlikely we would gain anything from anyone new joining.</p> <p>KS also questioned what we would gain from a new member joining the CLG at this late stage.</p> <p>AK questioned whether or not there was a waiting list of people wanting to join.</p> <p>LM confirmed we have a list of people who have previously expressed an interest, but we would need to go back and confirm and also ask for more names.</p> <p>KS stated that the voting level last time was abysmal and that he felt there was little point in repeating this.</p> <p>KH requested that we receive more information on potential new members this time.</p> <p>KS stated that this was unnecessary and that original members were not vetted or interviewed so it would be unfair.</p> <p>LM will add a note in the next E-update asking for volunteers for the CLG and will contact people who have previously expressed an interest.</p>	LM
8.8	<p><i>Will the installation of the temporary stack for the Anaerobic Digester need permission form SCC's Planning and Regulatory Committee?</i></p> <p>Answered in section 6.3.</p>	
8.9	<p><i>Have the HAZOP records been submitted to the EA and have they approved them?</i></p> <p>CL stated that they had not received them but that they would not be due yet.</p> <p>JHa confirmed the requirements state that:</p> <p><i>'Prior to the commencement of commissioning activities A1 to A5, the operator shall notify the Environment Agency of the completion of the HAZOP study.'</i></p>	
8.10	<p>JM asked if there are any defibrillators on site.</p> <p>JSh confirmed that there are three on the construction site.</p>	
8.11	<p>JS asked when the design of the dust and odour control system for the gasification was completed.</p> <p>JCS confirmed that the design has been completed.</p>	
8.12	<p>KH asked if there are any more planning applications due.</p>	

	<p>JCS answered that there are no new planning applications currently in progress or planned but that there may be changes to the design later on that would require applications.</p> <p>KH asked for confirmation that these would be brought to the CLG to be discussed.</p> <p>JCS confirmed that they would be.</p>	
<b>9</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
<b>10</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
10.1	Tuesday 17 October 2017	