Rookery South ERF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 3

20th March, 18.30 - 20.10

Marston Forest Centre Seminar Room The Forest Centre Station Road Marston Moretaine Bedford MK43 0PR

Attended -See attached

Chaired by Kate Fairweather, contact details: Phone 01227 738618, Mobile 07802 250508 email kate@cmcaustmarketing.co.uk

1. Actions from Meeting 27th October 2016

· Veolia is offering a visit for CLP members to an ERF they operate to see how traffic is managed

Action CLP members to email Kate Fairweather if they wish to take Veolia up on this offer, on the understanding that the date will be arranged to meet the availability of everyone who wishes to go and is likely to be at a weekend.

- Covanta-Veolia to investigate the road surface of Green Lane: This work has been completed
 as part of the pre-commencement conditions.
- Covanta-Veolia to review issue of radiation detectors: DC confirmed that radiation detectors are included in the specification of works for the facility
- Covanta-Veolia to provide information about the development to the local community via a Newsletter, due to be published in December 2016: CLP members said that they were very disappointed that the Newsletter had not been distributed in December particularly because the EA Permit consultation has begun and many local residents are still unaware of the development. Judith Harper apologised for the delay, which was the result of problems putting suitable information together, and issues with finding an available distributor, but stated that the Newsletter would be distributed in the next few days to all residents in the S106 area and showed the draft to the CLP. She stated categorically that there was no intention to leave residents without information at the start of the EA Permit consultation.

Action Covanta-Veolia to publish in the Newsletter organisations represented on the CLP but not individual members' names to avoid the members being inundated with questions from residents in their area, and so that CLP members are not seen to be endorsing the development: These should be addressed to Covanta-Veolia who is better able to respond.

Action Covanta-Veolia to consider including Brogborough residents in the Newsletter circulation as the village is as close to the site as Ampthill and Maulden. Judith will check and respond as soon as possible.

2. Update on the Permit Application. Iris Soler, Director of Permitting and Environmental Control, Veolia: See presentation attached. Ross McIntyre, PPC Compliance Officer, Environment Agency also provided support

Iris confirmed that the Permit had been submitted to Environment Agency (EA) by Covanta as the Operator and was now in the Determination phase: The application had been duly made and EA had commenced the public consultation, advertising this in the local press and advising the CLP directly of the website where the online consultation is available.

Question: How long does the determination process take?

Ross explained that the statutory time for the determination process is 4 months, but that as this application is classified as 'high public interest' it does not have the same timeframe so there is no limit.

The CLP expressed strong concern that local residents do not have enough information about the Permit to be able to participate effectively in the consultation.

Sue Marsh (Principal Minerals and Waste Planning Officer, Central Bedfordshire Council also providing planning input on behalf of Bedford Borough Council) advised the CLP that the Council had written to EA today requesting that they provide an exhibition and consultation forum about the Permit application: This is because the Rookery South ERF development is a very large facility, the permission was granted some time ago, after which Covanta suspended their UK operations and the local population believed the development would not go ahead, and because so much additional housing had been built in Marston Moretaine in particular since the DCO was published in 2013, resulting in a large proportion of the population being completely unaware of the development. People planning to move into new houses are asking the Council for information about the development in order to decide whether they should go ahead. Because of this the Council feel it is only fair and reasonable for there to be a public exhibition, and that a purely on-line consultation is inadequate.

Bedford Borough Council has also seen major housebuilding projects in the last six years with 700 more houses being built in Stewartby. At a recent meeting of residents it emerged that none of the new householders had heard of the development, it had not come up on solicitor's searches.

Sue Marsh confirmed that the development is clearly in the Minerals and Waste Plan for both local authorities, so should have appeared in solicitor's searches.

The CLP strongly agreed with this, advising that residents are asking for more information about the development and CLP members do not have enough information or the capacity to answer questions. The Permit Application contains 46 documents which is too much for residents to cope with.

Ross stated that EA is aware of the request and understands the issue; the local EA office could discuss the regulatory role but as determination is at national level it requires national officers who are able to address the questions that would be raised. He will discuss with colleagues the opportunities for a drop-in session to meet local information requirements. This will be during the second consultation.

The CLP expressed strong concern that this would not be in time for the current consultation, due to finish on April 18th.

Ross explained that although the process is to move to a technical determination and then to a second consultation on the Draft Permit, in practice EA will take local representations into account at any stage, and members of the public can make comments and ask questions throughout.

EA have to consider all comments and ensure all issues are responded to.

Action EA to advise dates and arrangements for the information sessions to KF to distribute to the CLP.

Question: How often does EA visit the facility once it is running?

Typically every 2 weeks or once a month, more often in the early months of operation. If a facility is performing well visits will be infrequent. If a facility is performing badly in monitoring reports then EA will visit more often. It depends on the reports, EA have to be confident that the ERF is meeting standards.

There would be more unannounced visits if there are a lot of complaints. EA will make resources available for this monitoring activity.

Question: What happens if the ERF doesn't meet requirements?

Non-compliance leads to a fine. If the issue isn't addressed then EA imposes an improvement action plan under legal notice. If the facility continues to be non-compliant then this would result in a stop notice. The final stage would result in the Permit being revoked.

Question: There isn't much in the application detail about traffic management and movement emissions?

Traffic movement emissions are not part of the Permit Application. But it does affect the background air quality data in the assessment made in 2015, and has been taken account of as part of this.

EA can't regulate traffic so this is not included in the Permit process, however if it is raised in the consultation it will have to be responded to.

Question: The traffic assessment completed for the DCO was made seven years ago, but traffic levels have increased with local population growth and the new school on Green Lane so this won't be accurate for now?

Neil Grimstone made the point that the traffic emissions forecast from deliveries to and from the ERF are planned to be less than stated in the DCO because Covanta-Veolia will use larger trucks and have fewer truck movements than originally planned.

Action item: Covanta/Veolia and EA to present the detailed plans for water discharge pollution controls covered in the Permit – Iris confirmed that water from the ERF will be in a closed system. Only clean surface water (rain water) will be pumped to Stewartby lake as it does at present. .

Stewartby Water Sports Club stated that the lake already floods several metres during storms, flooding over the road at worst. The Club has had severe damage to their jetty from storm flooding, so are very concerned that water pumped from the ERF holding lagooncould cause a similar problem.

Action David Cowan to investigate how to prevent water pumped from holding lagoon causing damage to the Water Sports Club facilities.

3. Update on the rail crossing and update on potential for delivery of waste by rail Neil Grimstone: See presentation attached.

Neil stated that delivery of waste by rail is under constant review by Covanta-Veolia, but under current market conditions requires ½ million tonnes per year from one point to be viable. At present Covanta-Veolia do not have contracts for this volume of waste from a single point. Waste will be coming from about ten different points so delivery by rail is not currently economically viable.

David Cowan said that there is potential for a rail head on the site for the future.

Neil confirmed that the barrier solution has been decided with Network Rail on safety grounds, and commented that the bridge option may be considered in future, should the line be electrified and Network Rail wish to close the crossing for example.

A bridge would be less environmentally attractive as traffic would produce more emissions climbing the slope; additionally there would be more noise than crossing the track as at present. A bridge would also be clearly visible from Stewartby.

The CLP are very concerned about traffic pollution emissions from the truck movements for the ERF, reporting that with barriers down for 4 minutes at present traffic is queuing for 10 minutes each time the crossing closes, which is twice an hour. They feel that adding 10 trucks per hour into and out of the ERF site will cause both extra pollution and could gridlock Green Lane, up to the A421,particularly with the proposed increase of trains to four per hour.

Neil confirmed that the ERF will receive on average 108 trucks per day into and 108 trucks out of the site, with an average of 10 trucks per hour in and out during the day. He stated categorically that the 108 trucks per day number should not increase unless the ERF starts taking waste from the immediate area, and explained that the 594 movements (247 in and 247 out) allowed by the DCO were based on using smaller trucks. One truck would be in the queue each time the barriers are down. These are modern trucks with low emissions, and automatic engine cut-out when the truck stops so waiting in a queue would not add to pollution. He also confirmed that the trucks would only use the routes as presented to the last meeting (See slide 17 and 18 of the presentation from 17/10/16 meeting 2 attached).

Action Covanta-Veolia to produce a statement about the traffic management model used that explains clearly the pattern of traffic movements and pollution resulting from these, and what the impact on residents and the school will be. Also to consider how traffic levels on Green Lane have increased from the original traffic assessments made in 2010 as reported by the CLP. The CLP would like a simple explanation that CLP members can communicate to local people.

Question: Are waste contracts in place for this facility?

David Cowan stated that Veolia was in the process of negotiation for contracts. The nature of the contracts is commercial information and not available.

Question: Last meeting Covanta-Veolia said that they were actively seeking local municipal waste contracts, how would this waste be transported to the ERF?

David commented that local municipal waste is not part of the plan right now. Should contracts be gained the waste trucks already collecting in the area would in general take their waste to a transfer station and then the waste would be loaded onto the larger trucks for delivery to the ERF.Local waste trucks are already part of the traffic movements in the area so would not increase traffic movements, although their movements to the transfer station would be different from current ones.

Question: How does the ERF fit with the EU target of 70% waste recycling?

David confirmed that the ERF is in compliance with the EU target as it only receives non-recyclable waste, to avoid it going to landfill. It is part of the UK Waste Strategy. Legislation is providing statutory obligations on all waste producers to recycle efficiently. Veolia is targeting waste of no value for the ERF.

Iris stated that because recyclable waste is of value means that no producer has any incentive to send it to the ERF, so the percentage of recyclable will be very low.

Question: There is an acceptance that some recyclable waste will end up in the ERF waste stream. What percentage of the total would that be?

David confirmed that the waste being targeted is comingled waste, residual waste was defined by the waste producer. Each industry has to make arrangements to manage waste effectively so that recyclables are taken out.

4. Electricity Subsidy Scheme update by Neil Grimstone. See presentation attached.

Neil explained that the 10% Electricity Subsidy Scheme has to be agreed with the two local authorities. He had reviewed the date that the Scheme covers: It is noted that there is a conflict in the s.106 agreement regarding the date that Scheme commences, referring to 2011 when the DCO was granted, and also the date when Covanta opens registration. This will therefore be in 2018, assuming that agreement on this is reached with the local authorities.

Question: How is the 10% subsidy calculated?

Neil confirmed that the subsidy will be 10% of the national average electricity bill which is currently £600 a year, so the subsidy would be £60 a year for 35 years, rising with inflation.

He confirmed that both householders and tenants will be eligible for the £60 subsidy, as will households that move within the area. The only households excluded will be those moving into the area after a date to be determined following further analysis of data on additional households in the Electricity Subsidy Area since the 2011 census..

Neil also explained that he is reviewing the scope of the Scheme in response to the CLP's request for other parishes to be included; he needs latest data on how many households there are in each parish to evaluate how much leeway Covanta-Veolia have for extension of the Scheme.

Judith said that inclusion of the not for profit organisations and village halls was under review and Covanta-Veolia would come back to the CLP on this.

The CLP suggested using the Electoral Register for a latest count, but advised that there are a lot of houses currently under construction so information from the local authorities on numbers will be required for an accurate count.

Covanta-Veolia will be engaging with the Councils in the next month or so. Neil will come back to the CLP with his final evaluation.

The CLP felt that there was a strong case for including Brogborough in the Scheme as it is part of the Historic Brickworks Community, is as close to the site as other villages that have been included, and is close to the A421 so will feel the effects of the additional traffic to the plant.

Neil felt this would be feasible but needs to do his evaluation of households numbers before confirming.

Action Detail of the final proposals for Electricity Subsidy Scheme including Covanta-Veolia review of the eligibility cut-off date and the parishes included in the Community Trust Fund and Electricity subsidy to be presented to a future CLP meeting.

Restoration works presentation by David Cowan. See presentation attached.

David explained that the contract for the build has not yet been let, but this is due to be completed soon. The contract for the restoration works will be let very soon so that these can go ahead from April. The main development could then begin in October/November at the earliest.

Question: Are the works going to progress even though the Permit has not been granted?

Judith commented that the restoration works have to be completed by the site owner as a condition of the ROMP (review of minerals permissions) irrespective of the ERF development. David stated that Covanta-Veolia has to complete this work now at their own risk.

Question: Will works make the pit even deeper?

No, the work involves digging into the hill and making the site level, increasing the overall level of the base by about a metre overall and forming a plateau. There will be some activity from April, but once the plant is on site there will be no intrusion on the local community.

6. Any other business

A CLP member had asked for additional information about the effectiveness of bag filters in preventing harmful emissions from the stack in February but not yet had a response.

Judith apologised for the delay, she was waiting for some detailed information from the engineers about the query to ensure that the response was as thorough as the CLP required. She *expects* to be able to provide a complete answer by March 24th. The EPC contractor designs the filtration equipment and Covanta-Veolia hasn't appointed the EPC contractor. David Cowan said that the appointment was close to being made, but that the response to the CLP question would be made from similar technology in use already.

Action KF to circulate the Covanta-Veolia response to CLP members.

7. Date of next meeting and items to cover

The next meeting is planned for 12th June 2017, 18.30 at the Forest Centre.

This meeting to cover:

- Issues arising from the EA Consultation and Covanta-Veolia response to these
- Details of the cause of the recent fire at a Covanta plant in the US and why that couldn't happen here

Items for future CLP Meetings:

- Detail of the final proposals for Electricity Subsidy Scheme
- Development of the Community Trust Fund Memorandum of Understanding
- Network Rail to be invited to a future CLP meeting
- Covanta-Veolia to present the public Rights of Way improvement plans when the project reaches this stage including Covanta-Veolia review of designation of cycle ways to bridleways

CLP Membership

| Sarah Watt | Houghton Conquest Parish Council attended |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Peter Neale | Marston Morteyne Parish Council attended |
| Jennie Thomas | Millbrook Parish Meeting attended |
| David Cooper | Stewartby Parish Council attended |
| Michelle White | Brogborough Parish Council attended |
| Andrew Penn | Lidlington Parish Council attended |
| Tim Hill | Elstow and Stewartby Bedford Borough Councillor attended |
| Sue Clark | Cranfield and Marston Central Bedfordshire Councillor apologies |
| Rod Calvert | Beds Chamber of Commerce apologies |
| Ruth Ivory | Stewartby Water Sports Club attended |
| Nick Webb | Forest of Marston Vale attended |
| Hugh Roberts | MMAG attended |
| Robina Chatham | Lidlington Resident apologies |
| Richard Franceys | Maulden Resident apologies |
| Ed Hiam | Stewartby Resident apologies |
| Sean Tyrell | Ampthill Resident apologies |
| Independent Observers | |
| Ross McIntyre | PPC Compliance Officer, Environment Agency attended |
| Sue Marsh | Principal Minerals and Waste Planning Officer, Central Bedfordshire Council attended |
| Covanta/Veolia representatives | Covanta –Judith Harper, Neil Grimstone |
| | Veolia –David Cowan, Iris Soler |
| Kate Fairweather | Independent Chair |