



**Suffolk EfW Community Liaison Group
Meeting minutes**

Great Blakenham Village Hall
Tuesday 19 April 2011
6.30pm-9.00pm

Attendance:

Cllr John Field, (JF) - Chair
Mrs Pearson, (PP) resident
Desma Girling (DG)
Munaveer Wafgstaff, resident
Simon Harding (SH), Bury St Edmunds resident

Observers:

Cllr Lisa Chambers (LC), Suffolk County Council
Bryn Griffiths, (BG), Suffolk County Council
Emma Smyth, (ES), SITA UK
Anthony Durston (AD), SITA UK (minutes)

Presenters:

Phil Stevens, Plant Manager - Teesside, SITA UK

Apologies:

Cllr Roy Barker (RB), Mid Suffolk District Council
Cllr Michael Blakenham (MB), Mid-Suffolk District Council
Cliff Matthews (CM), SITA UK
Sophie Meudec (SM), resident
Cllr Sandy Martin, (CllrSM) Suffolk County Council
Mr Derek Lockwood, (DL) resident
Shirley Fairburn, (SF) Gt Blakenham Parish Council

Discussion	Actions
<p>1. Minutes and actions from the last meeting</p> <p>Apologies to Desma Girling who has twice been missed off the minutes as an attendee.</p> <p>JF requested that the SITA UK logo is dropped from every page of the minutes to save paper.</p> <p>Strength of light from the stack. An outstanding action from the last meeting was for ES to find out the strength of the light coming from the light that has been requested by the MOD on the stack. ES said that the strength of the light is 2000 candelas – one candela is equivalent to the strength of light from one candle. ES said that this is standard for any tall building and is the policy of the Civil Aviation Authority.</p>	<p>AD</p>

Action from the last meeting. ES provided an update on how the aquifer beneath the site will be managed during the construction of the EfW facility to avoid contamination in the water course:

A thorough risk assessment is carried out before any piling work (drilling) takes place. The key to reducing contamination is to minimise the amount of soils that are dragged down by the drilling into the aquifer. There is a low level of contamination on the site, which helps reduce issues of contamination. The risk assessment will also ensure that liquids are avoided during piling, again to lower the risk of contamination.

BG gave an update on the issue of highways, which was discussed at the last meeting:

A meeting has now taken place between Suffolk County Council's planning team and officers from Mid-Suffolk District council. The meeting was about the cumulative impact of new developments in Great Blakenham, which some people are concerned is putting the road network under pressure. SCC said that while they understand the District Council's position, the traffic impact comes from Snoasis and the new housing planned for the area – no increase is proposed when the EfW is fully operational compared to when the highways depot was fully operational.

Mid Suffolk has commissioned an independent traffic consultant to look further at this issue. SCC has asked to see a copy of this report.

A discussion followed about the possible need for a roundabout.

BG said that the Waste Disposal Authority does not accept that the development of the energy-from-waste facility would create the need for a roundabout, however, the county council is happy to look further at this matter, separately from the SITA UK application, and has asked the District Council to make the case, so this can be discussed with the Director responsible for highways. SCC is now awaiting a formal response from the DC before this matter is progressed further.

A discussion followed about a piece of land, which belongs to Suffolk County Council adjacent to the existing roundabout on Blackacre Hill. JF said that he had previously been informed that there is insufficient space on this land for an additional roundabout. JF said that this issue needs to be looked into again.

<p>MW said that, in her view, increased traffic is already evident. MW said that residents needed to keep up the pressure for a new roundabout and, also, a safe way for people to cross the road.</p> <p>JF reiterated the point that he had been told that there is insufficient space for a roundabout, which is why traffic lights were installed instead. JFs view is that the traffic lights work well, but this does not address the issue of having a safe crossing.</p> <p>MW said that traffic lights have a stop / start effect on traffic. MWs preference would be to have two lanes for traffic plus a dedicated lane for vehicles to turn into the site. MW requested that the Parish Council pursue this issue so that planning conditions are potentially put in place.</p> <p>MW raised the issue of community benefits of the development. It was agreed that residents needed to get together independently of the community liaison group meeting to debate the issue. Once recommendations have been made, elected members should be invited to help the community to make the case to the planning authority.</p> <p>AD said he had produced a paper, which highlights the community benefits of the proposed development. AD to circulate at the end of the meeting for discussion at the next community liaison group meeting.</p> <p>A discussion followed about the current usage of the highways and the fact that the highways depot is now closed.</p> <p>JF said that the planning authority will look at the capacity of the junction and will make a decision based on the evidence of usage. Highways planners will give specialist advice to the committee and evidence from the District Council will also be taken into account. The parish council can attend the committee meeting.</p> <p>Waste Transfer Stations</p> <p>BG reported back to the group about the issue of the number of waste transfer stations that will be developed in Suffolk, which will have an effect on the numbers of vehicles taking waste to the energy-from-waste facility.</p> <p>The first point that BG made is that traffic projections have been based on there being two waste transfer stations. However, this is the minimum number and the actual number is likely to be greater. The final figure will be partly decided by cost. Refuse collection vehicles deliver waste into waste transfer stations, where the waste is bulked up, and a smaller</p>	<p>Action – JF</p> <p>Action – AD</p>
---	---------------------------------------

<p>number of larger vehicles then take waste to the energy-from-waste facility (currently waste is bulked up and taken to a landfill site).</p> <p>BG reported that the Suffolk Waste Partnership is still working on a final solution and BG will report to the group when a decision on the number of waste transfer stations has been made.</p> <p>SH asked how for clarification on how many refuse collection vehicles would fit into one bulker. BG to find out the exact figure.</p> <p>Use of heat from the energy-from-waste facility</p> <p>MW asked SITA UK for written confirmation that the company has not yet guaranteed to provide heat from the energy-from-waste facility to Snoasis. AD said that it would be impossible for SITA UK to guarantee the heat to Snoasis as the company does not have planning permission for the energy-from-waste facility and Snoasis is not yet being developed. AD made the point that it is in SITA UK's interest, environmentally and economically, to find a reliable user for the heat.</p> <p>SH referenced the example of British Sugar, who had needed a reliable and constant user of heat, which was a by-product of their operations. SH said they had been unable to find a suitable user. SH asked if heating greenhouses had been considered. PS said that this was being considered on a new project in Teesside and would also be considered in Suffolk if a suitable project arises.</p> <p>Planning update</p> <p>ES said that the timetable is on course for the planning committee to decide on the application on the 21 July 2011.</p> <p>BG reported that the planning committee is to visit a Veolia site in Hampshire.</p> <p>SH asked for an update on the environmental permit application, which is being made to the Environment Agency. ES said that the application will be decided over the summer. The group asked if any delay to this would incur more cost for SITA UK. ES confirmed that would not be the case.</p> <p>Presentation</p> <p>PS gave a presentation on the health and safety measures that are in place in an energy-from-waste facility.</p>	<p>Action - BG</p>
--	--------------------

<p>A copy of the presentation will be circulated to the group and a paper will be produced with a round-up of the procedures and safety measures that are in place.</p> <p>AOB</p> <p>New members of the group</p> <p>Pamela Robinson from Great Blakenham Parish Council and Trevor Messenger from Claydon Parish Council have both requested to join the committee. The group was happy for these new members to join and agreed to invite both of them along to the next meeting.</p> <p>Next meeting dates:</p> <p>The following dates were agreed by the group:</p> <p>Tuesday 24 May at 6.30pm Tuesday 21 June at 6.30pm Tuesday 19 July at 6.30pm</p> <p>AOB</p> <p>MW reported that a break in has happened at the highways depot. SCC to investigate.</p> <p>PP asked if the community could have redundant floodlights from the site for a community tennis group. SCC also to investigate the availability of redundant portakabins from the site.</p>	<p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>SCC</p> <p>SCC</p>
---	---