



ENVIRECOVER COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP (CLG)

Minutes of twelfth meeting, held at the HZI site office.

Monday 12th December 2016 at 17.00 hrs.

Attendees

Caroline Macdonald (CM) - OggaDoon
Ian Barber (IB) – Marketing Director, Severn Waste Services
Richard Woodward (RW) – Waste Services Manager, Worcestershire County Council
Eve Jones (EJ) – Member of Hartlebury Parish Council
Sheridan Tranter (ST) – Chair of Hartlebury Parish Council
John Jordan (JJ) – Clerk to Ombersley and Doverdale Parish Council
Paddy Kelly (PK) – General Manager, Severn Waste Services
Doug Ingram (DG) – Chair of Ombersley and Doverdale Parish Council
Cllr Nigel Dowty (ND) – Local Member, Wychavon District Council and CLG Chair
Sarah Dennis (SD)– Environment Agency
Kate Stott (KS) – Education Officer, Severn Waste Services
Phil Merrick (PM) – Head of Community Services, Wychavon District Council
Mark Bishop (MB) – Planning Development Control Manager, Worcestershire County
Richard Williams (RWi) – Senior Practitioner WRS

Apologies

James Homer (JH) – Chairman of Elmley Lovett Parish Council

Invited but no response

Nicolas Wright (NW) Clerk to Elmley Lovett Parish Council
Peter Tomlinson (PT) – Ward Member, Worcestershire County Council
Javier Nicolas (JN) – Technical Manager, Mercia Waste Management

1. Welcome and Introductions

ND welcomed all to the meeting and introductions were made.

EJ: Some residents have asked to come for a site visit.

IB: After the hand over, I'm sure we can arrange. We can organise a group visit.

PK: This can happen after the hand over and once the facility is running properly.

ND: So we are looking at March?

PK: For big groups, we need time due to H&S issues particularly for the general public.

KS: Do they want to visit the site or have a better understanding of the process and construction?

EJ: Both.

2. Actions from last meeting

IB: I completed the EJ action. I haven't sent the standing information, as there is no site visit.

EJ: I have a supplementary question about the wet and dry question. I will supply this to Paddy directly.

1) *The values for the flue-gas volumes from the Hartlebury Incinerator:*

The values for the 'Wet' and 'Dry' gas volumes emitted from the stack were recently given by Mercia/HZI as 120,000 Am³ 'Wet' and 160,000 Nm³ 'Dry'. After checking information from a number of similar facilities it is apparent that typically the 'Wet' volume is a larger value, and the 'Dry' volume is a smaller value. As an example of this, the volumes quoted for the Javelin Park Incinerator are 201,000 Am³ 'Wet' and 163,000 Nm³ 'Dry'. Javelin Park has a waste capacity of 190,000 tonnes pa, so is similar in size to the Hartlebury plant. It would be reasonable to assume that the volumes from the Hartlebury facility would also be similar. Both the recent Cross Green [Leeds] and Fengate [Peterborough] Incinerators also follow the same "Wet/High and Dry/Low" pattern of flue gas emission volumes. On the basis of this information would Mercia/HZI look again at the figures given to us at the recent CLG meeting in October 2016.

Action: EJ to supply and send CM an electronic copy

3. Update from Mercia/HZI and commissioning plans – see attached update

About the noise issue

IB: Other facilities have the steam bypass arrangement inside but not in this building. Temporary lagging has had some immediate effect. We told HZI that they have to do something permanent for when the turbine is down. They have put a thicker set of lagging around offending pipework and lagged around the top of the pipe. During the on going issue, we took eight complaints from named people; the Environment Agency had the same amount (could be the same people). Walton Lane was most affected, as it is downwind and closest. I spoke to or responded individually to each one with the information provided to CLG and in the update. We apologise for that – HZI moved as quickly as they could.

We've now got a permanent mitigation solution with more noise pollution monitoring this week.

SD: We had around 15-20 complaints, I can't tell IB who they are due to Data Protection Act. We asked all complainants if they wanted to be on the construction update email distribution list and if they did, we passed the information on. It was clear that the main source was the pipe, which required something temporary as well as permanent in terms of a solution. Temporary measures were requested, and plans submitted in time of the request. The temporary measures made quite a difference.

DI: Were the Environment Agency there when you redo the tests?

SD: The permit doesn't say about noise levels, more about causing a nuisance.

When I visited with temporary lagging in place, I found it had improved. I came two weeks ago and there is another meeting in the New Year as there are a number of improvement conditions that we need to go through.

ND: Where do WRS fit in?

RWi: WRS responsibility is to make sure that the construction phase environmental impacts are controlled correctly so to prevent unnecessary interference with residents use and enjoyment of their homes. Operationally the site is regulated by the EA. Hence operational noise complaints should be directed to the EA.

SD: Now any noise from the trading estate park will be linked by residents to the EnviRecover site; we need to investigate whether it is or not

RWi: There are many noise sources on the estate some of which are subject to on going regulation through the A2 permitting regime that WRS regulate. Notwithstanding this there are other sites that generate noise but aren't subject to any ratified complainant(s). WRS have laboured the point on many occasions that complaints cannot be randomly investigated where there is no affected party coming forward as noise assessments in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990 must be made at the affected residents.

On the determination of noise sources, it is advised that due to the size of the estate and the characteristics of noise transmission incorrect assumptions can easily be made as to origins of the noise. It is therefore recommended that any complaints of noise should come to the attention of WRS first so that the source can be correctly determined.

SD: There was a complaint from a lady who said that there was no monitoring; I replied letting her know that continual emission monitoring is happening. Paddy sent screen shot, also explained what there is etc.

4. Feedback from Mercia

IB: I've had several commenting about light and responded to each two issues have been raised:

1. Working outside in the evening, just after clocks changed increased the lighting use
2. Flare off boiler house: HZI is working in the evening and need light for safety reasons which is fine. But we need to have good housekeeping and turn off the ones not needed. One day, two admin block levels were lit up however when the facility is operational, these will move to sensor trips.

ND: The admin block lights seems to be on all the time at the moment.

IB: Yes, but the light management system is not currently working but will be done by hand over. There will also be blinds in the windows.

ST: (passed a photo around) top field in the corner has the most light. Forest Garden and now Stobart Lorry park.

IB: The permanent lighting scheme approved by the planning authority should be less.

ND: So by hand over, there should be less lighting.

RWi: We have undertaken lighting assessments on the construction light at the EfW facility recently and confirm that there were no compliance issues. However residents must get in touch directly with WRS if they have a complaint. It is the way the law is, and WRS can't do that without direct complaints/concerns.

EJ: There is a different view on lighting in well-lit areas anyway; this is a light pollution free area

RWi: WRS investigated recent complaints in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Engineers guidance on obtrusive light and subsequent compliance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990 for statutory light nuisance. During the assessments we assess the lights directionality and intensity. IPL guide takes into account the nature of the surrounding area's light when assessing impact and categorises the location(s) from rural(E1) through to town center(E4). Hartlebury has a E2 semi rural classification and this sets the threshold for acceptable lighting. Light complaints are then assessed on the vertical plane using accurate light meters at the complainants property (not garden).

IB: We've registered concerns about smoke, a thick plume was seen by a gent in Rushock, 5 pm. It was a still calm day, looking east to West as sun going down so plume looked dark but it was steam. I responded to him and he realised this. Separately there were some dumped plastic sacks on Crown Lane and another tenant on the estate said it was us but not.

RWi: Steam will change colour depending on atmospheric conditions. If there is a gap between top of stack and cloud above it is steam, if there is no gap, it isn't due to particulate matter.

SD: The particulate matter is 0.24 particulate which is very low.

PK: The classroom training almost complete; operations guys are hands on with 2/3-3/4 complete. After the restart, SWS is operating with HZI looking over. 40 operational staff are now employed.

ND: Traffic – where are we?

IB: Shows graph. For the planning application we estimated around 120 HGVs per day comprising waste in, consumables deliveries and IBA/APCr out. We are currently getting mid-nineties per day but there may be a few more from bulky waste collections. Whilst there is no planning condition on traffic numbers we are round about where we said we would be.

IB: Early APCr materials are going to Grundons at Bishops Cleeve to be characterised to see that it meets specification to be treated in specialist plant in Avonmouth. We are hopeful that it can go back in to a construction afteruse. The treatment provider has advised that for this material- around 8,000 tonnes – they have achieved End-of-Waste status. Bottom ash is going to H&M landfill and we are hopeful of an arrangement with a specialist contractor to come to H&M and recover some of non-ferrous metal out. This needs a modification to planning permission which is in with WCC.

EJ: Publication of emissions form out put values;

2) *The publication of emissions output values from the Hartlebury Incinerator: We would like to know . . .*

- a) *Whether the values for the flue-gas emissions from the Hartlebury facility will be published on the Severn Waste Services Website.*
- b) *How often during the year this will take place.*
- c) *What period of time will be covered by these figures.*

As an example of this, we note that Veolia are publishing the emissions values for the 'Cross Green' Incinerator in Leeds every month on the Veolia website. A link to this information is included below . . .

<http://www.veolia.co.uk/leeds/our-proposal/our-proposal/leeds-emissions-air-data>
The monthly values are shown in the 'drop-down' section at the foot of the webpage.

PK: It is under consideration with a proposal to shareholders. We intend to do that which will be monthly, to report for previous month.

5. Terms of Reference

Went over the history of the CLG again to compare with other EfW CLG groups around the country, including for instance the Gloucestershire EfW facility. Then there was a discussion about representation following a question from EJ:

3) A re-constituted CLG along the Guidelines in the Variation Business Case V4.0 – 2:

There have been a number of representations to these meetings to ask for the terms of reference for the CLG meetings to be revised to better reflect the wishes of the Community. We are now representing the Community and requesting this tonight. First of all the Variation Business Case Version 4.0 – 2, under Stakeholder Communications in section 9.1.1 dated July 2014, states that the liaison group would consist of "Representatives from Local Interest Groups" - amongst others.

((Note that: District Councillors are not listed as representatives of the local community. In fact District Councillors are not included in the VBC list at all, only County and Parish Cllrs.)).

Other groups around the country are set up to allow people affected to attend. For instance Javelin Park Liaison Group have superior terms of reference to that which was set up for Hartlebury. Elmley Lovett has one councillor and one from Ombersley (with their clerks) and since an objection was made two members are allowed from Hartlebury parish council (but no clerk). That is four members representing the Community attending the Group Meetings from the Hartlebury area.

Clerk amend: There are six CLG members representing the community: 2 x Hartlebury, 2 x Elmley Lovett and 2 x Ombersley and Doverdale

The Objectives of the Terms of Reference for Javelin Park are, and I quote, "To give local residents and other interested groups an opportunity to discuss any matters arising from the site operations." Two members from eight local parish councils (making 16 local councillors) plus members of the local community are allowed to attend. "The Aims of the T.O.R are to maintain liaison and rapport between(the various bodies)..... and the LOCAL COMMUNITY". It is also to "inform interested parties in advance of any new proposals or any submissions to amend or vary the approved scheme of operations".

These Javelin Park T.O.R's are to be "reviewed on the request of UBB OR Members and as a MINIMUM once a year". They (UBB) state that they have sought the views of how best to ensure the membership represents a cross section of the community.

We are therefore, asking that the T.O.Rs for the community around Hartlebury is reviewed and a more inclusive CLG is set up. We are happy to have a meeting with Ian (Barber) to this effect.

.

Action: proposal for representation from Parish Councils.

6.Topic for next meeting

Handover towards end of February.

Next meeting is 20th February 2017.

7. AOB

None.