



**Suffolk EfW Community Liaison Group
Minutes**

Great Blakenham Village Hall
Tuesday 22 March 2011
6.30pm-8.30pm

Attendance:

Cllr John Field, (JF) – Chair
Desma Girling, (DG), resident
Mrs Pearson (PP), resident
Sophie Meudec (SM), resident
Munaveer Wafgstaff (MW), resident
Cllr Roy Barker (RB), Mid Suffolk District Council
Simon Harding (SH), Bury St Edmunds resident
Shirley Fairburn (SF), Gt Blakenham Parish Council

Observers:

Cllr Lisa Chambers (LC), Suffolk County Council
Manda Henry (MH), Suffolk County Council
Cliff Matthews (CM), SITA UK
Emma Smyth, (ES), SITA UK
Anthony Durston (AD), SITA UK (minutes)

Presenters:

Dan Smyth (DS), RPS Group

Apologies:

Cllr Michael Blakenham (MB), Mid-Suffolk District Council
Cllr Sandy Martin, Suffolk County Council
Mr Derek Lockwood, resident (DL)

Discussion	Actions
1. Welcome & introductions	
Simon Harding, who is a resident of Bury St Edmunds, was introduced and welcomed to the group.	
2. Minutes and actions from the last meeting	
Minor spelling /factual amends were made to February's minutes. Potential new members of the group - JF spoke to Pamela Robinson at Great Blakenham who has expressed interest in joining the group. JF also spoke to Trevor Messenger at Claydon Parish Council. JF said that Barham Parish Council are also interested in putting someone forward to join the group.	PPS to follow up interest with these people.

<p>Outstanding action: RAF Wattisham regarding the lighting required for the stack. The lights will be fixed (not flashing) and medium intensity, half way up the stack and on the top of the stack. JF asked what medium intensity means. ES to find out if information is available yet.</p> <p>Query about vehicles at the EfW site. The group asked Cliff Matthews to find out how many HGVs could be accommodated on the site of the proposed EfW. CM reported:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Road prior to weighbridge – four vehicles 2. Layby – three vehicles 3. Weighbridge – one vehicle 4. Post weighbridge – one vehicle 5. Tipping Hall – six vehicles 6. Perimeter road – in excess of 20 HGVs <p>Normally lorries would route through 1., 3., 4., 5. (total 12 lorries) If lorries started to stack then up to 3 would be diverted to the layby (2. on the list).</p> <p>If the situation demanded it then we would route lorries internally by the perimeter road, enabling the additional 20+ places in the queue.</p> <p>Maximum lorries queuing without backing to Lodge Lane is therefore in excess of 35</p>	<p>ES to find out strength of light</p>
<p>3. General discussion</p>	
<p>Visual impact- SM asked if a standard visual impact assessment had been followed for the project. DS confirmed that it had.</p> <p>A discussion followed about the safety measures that are in place during construction and operation of the facility. CM agreed to provide a presentation on safety measures at the next meeting.</p> <p>A discussion about air quality followed.</p> <p>MW questioned the safety of the proposed facility in relation to ultra-fine particles and their effect on people nearby.</p>	<p>Action CM – to provide presentation on safety measures.</p>

<p>DS said that the air quality assessment that had been carried out. This looks in detail at ultra fine particles (pm 10s and pm2.5s). This had been assessed and deemed to be within acceptable levels.</p> <p>DS added that the Waste Incineration Directive, which sets standards that energy-from waste facilities must achieve, meant that the facility had to burn waste at a minimum temperature. If this temperature is not attained, then waste can not be burned. The significance of this point being that the heat of the furnace destroys the majority of pollutants.</p> <p>SH asked if the Environment Agency has information available on the regulation of energy-from-waste facilities.</p> <p>DS confirmed that they have and added that the Environment Agency is positive about this type of facility. Since the Waste Incineration Directive was adopted in 2001, the EA has been regulating EfW facilities for 10 years to modern standards.</p> <p>Discussion about ground conditions at the former highways depot site:</p> <p>JF said that there is an aquifer beneath the ground at the former highways depot.</p> <p>DS confirmed that no emissions to groundwater can be allowed.</p> <p>DS added that a sustainable urban drainage system will be developed at the site and there will be rainwater harvesting to reduce the amount of mains water that's needed to operate the facility.</p> <p>DS said that the facility is a 'low risk' project in terms of water management and there are procedures in place in the event of accidental spillages.</p> <p>DS to provide information to JF on how piling will be carried out in relation to water.</p> <p>The group viewed a video about SITA UK's Isle of man energy-from-waste facility, ahead of a proposed visit to the facility for some members of the group in May 2011.</p> <p>A discussion followed about the management of ash from the proposed facility, prompted by the video.</p>	<p>Action – DS</p>
--	--------------------

CM confirmed that ash would be processed on-site at the Great Blakenham EfW facility.

Incinerator bottom ash – which is an inert, non-hazardous material, is screened and crushed before being taken off-site and reused in road construction.

Fly ash – which is a hazardous material due to the presence of lime, which is injected into the air pollution control process, is stored in a silo before being taken away by tanker to a specialist landfill. CM said that research is ongoing to provide a use for fly ash, which is sometimes used by the chemical industry to neutralise waste acids.

CM said that the facility would produce 60 – 70,000 tonnes per year of incinerator bottom ash. On average 27 per cent of the material input to an incinerator comes out as ash (10 per cent by volume). Approximately 5-6,000 tonnes of metals will also be recovered and sent off for recycling.

CM explained that the amount of bottom ash produced at the EfW facility would be small compared to the size of the market in the UK. CM said that the price per tonne is approximately £2-3. At SITA UK's energy-from-waste facility in Teesside, approximately 100,000 tonnes of bottom ash is produced each year, all of which is sold and recycled into replacement aggregate.

JF observed that the ash processing facility will take up a considerable area of the site.

CM explained that screening will take place to crush large pieces of IBA and screening will sort larger pieces from smaller ones. Once the ash has been screened it is remixed to create a blend that is suitable for its end use.

CM described the building that will house the ash processing facility. The building has a roof to keep the material dry. Ash comes out of the facility wet and is dried before it is processed. Dust is not a concern due to the nature of the material.

Discussion about noise management at the bottom ash processing facility.

Noise assessments have been carried out on every piece of equipment. The ash processing facility has been located on the southern part of the site, away from the houses on Chapel Lane to the north of the site. The ash processing facility will only operate during the day.

Tyres question– CM confirmed that the facility will not take tyres. The facility will take defined types of waste – no clinical waste will be accepted at the facility.

Maintenance of the facility will be ongoing throughout the life of the facility.

Air quality discussion led by Daniel Smyth:

DS said that in line with EA guidance, monitoring will take place 10 kilometres from the proposed development site. Within three kilometres, where potential impacts are higher, air quality assessments are made taking into account current air quality, traffic emissions, and emissions from the proposed facility.

Use of hot water from the proposed facility:

The group asked if any plans were confirmed to use hot water from the process, to improve the efficiency of the EfW facility.

CM confirmed that SITA UK is keen to offer hot water for either industrial or residential use if possible. Snoasis has already been identified as a potential user.

The group discussed that a primary school has been earmarked nearby, which could be a potential user.

RB asked how much hot water will be available for export.

CM said that there would be between 10-15 MW available.

MW said that local residents should be first to have access to this.

RB said that SCC should be responsible for ensuring this.

JF mentioned a scheme in the Shetland Islands, where residents receive a discount on their bills and questioned whether a scheme could be worked out for residents in this local area.

4. Any other business	
<p>RB requested a group update on the number of proposed transfer stations in the county.</p> <p>Transport issue:</p> <p>Concerns were again raised about the resurgence of activity at previously underused buildings where freight is coming in and out of Lodge Lane.</p> <p>JF reiterated the group's concern that B113 into Lodge Lane needs to be improved to cope with HGVs.</p> <p>JF said that a dual carriageway should be considered from the traffic lights to the roundabout.</p> <p>MW agreed that a dual lane is needed, which would allow lorries to queue and enable the remaining traffic to carry on unhindered.</p> <p>MW felt this was an issue that they needed to speak to Suffolk County Council about.</p> <p>LC and JF agreed to discuss the issue of highways further.</p> <p>SF mentioned road improvements that had taken place that were associated with a housing development in the local area. SF's concern was that no one at the council looks at issues in their totality – focusing only on individual planning matters.</p> <p>LC committed to arrange for mid Suffolk District Council and Suffolk County Council's officers to meet together to over lay all the issues that have a potential traffic impact.</p> <p>LC commented on the issue of transfer stations. LC said that when the Suffolk Waste Partnership (which comprises Districts and Boroughs) has made its recommendations, representatives will come to this forum to present their recommendations.</p> <p>A discussion followed about the number of household waste recycling centres that are closing. LC confirmed that the number is seven across the county, however, alternative arrangements are being sought for Bramford and a meeting is due to be held.</p> <p>LC said that there are alternatives in each area – including the use of some third sector organisations etc.</p>	<p>Action – MH and JF</p> <p>Action – MH</p> <p>Action – MH</p>

