



## Suffolk EfW Community Liaison Group Minutes

Great Blakenham Village Hall  
 Tuesday 25 January 2011  
 6.30pm-8.30pm

### Attendance:

Cllr John Field, (JF)  
 Mrs Pearson, resident  
 Sophie Meudec, resident  
 Munaver Wagstaff, resident (MW)  
 Desma Girling, resident  
 Cllr Sandy Martin, Suffolk County Council  
 Mr Derek Lockwood, resident (DL)

### Observers:

Cllr Lisa Chambers (LC), Suffolk County Council  
 Bryn Griffiths (BG), Suffolk County Council  
 Cliff Matthews (CM), SITA UK  
 Emma Smyth, (ES), SITA UK  
 Anthony Durston (AD) SITA UK  
 Rebecca Eatwell (RE), PPS Group (temporary chair)  
 Tim Otley, Head of SITA Energy Solutions

### Presenters:

Perry Hooper, Grimshaws (architect)  
 Paul Ellis, RPS Group (landscape architect)

### Apologies:

Cllr Michael Blakenham (MB), Mid-Suffolk District Council  
 Cllr Roy Barker (RB), Mid Suffolk District Council  
 Shirley Fairburn, (SF) Gt Blakenham Parish Council

Discussion	Actions
1. Welcome & introductions	
Tim Otley was introduced as an observer. Tim Otley heads up SITA UK's energy division – SITA Energy Solutions. The group was also introduced to Cliff Matthews, SITA's new Regional Manager for Suffolk.	
2. Minutes and actions from the last meeting	
The minutes were accepted. However, AD was asked by JF to ensure future minutes include page numbers.  Wattisham – the group asked if there had been any further conversations between Dan Smyth from RPS and RAF Wattisham regarding the lighting required for the stack.	AD  AD to speak to Dan Smyth and feedback to the group.



<p>PPS to check that Dan Smyth's presentation on air quality was circulated to all members of the group.</p>	<p>PPS</p>
<p>3. Election of a Chair for the group</p>	
<p>SITA UK met up with a potential chair for the group. SITA UK discussed the requirement to pay the Chair for his duties with the group.</p> <p>Members of the group expressed their discomfort with SITA UK paying for someone to carry out this role, as they felt the Chair would therefore not be impartial. BG said the County Council would not want to see the Chair receive any payment if the Group was not happy with such a proposal. A discussion followed and the majority of the group agreed with this view.</p> <p>Members of the group felt that JF, as Ward Councillor, would be the most appropriate Chair.</p> <p>A discussion followed regarding the feasibility of JF being appointed as chair and, at the same time, having the freedom to voice his opinions about the energy-from-waste project. JF was comfortable that he could chair the meeting in an impartial way and still have the ability to express his views.</p> <p>It was agreed that JF would take over the role of the Chair from the next meeting.</p>	
<p>4. Members of the group</p>	
<p>PPS has contacted all people who are on the reserve list to join the community liaison group. Three people have asked for more information and PPS will follow up to see if any are willing and able to join.</p>	<p>PPS</p>
<p>5. Project update</p>	
<p>ES said that the planning application for the energy-from-waste facility was submitted on the 11 January 2011. Suffolk County Council will begin its consultation process shortly.</p> <p>Mrs Pearson requested that the development control (DC) department of Suffolk CC considers parish council meeting dates when requesting feedback on planning applications. BG to feed this back to the DC department. Mrs Pearson said that the DC department had agreed to provide Somersham Parish</p>	<p>BG</p>



<p>Council with additional time to feed in their comments.</p> <p>The development control department of Suffolk CC has indicated that they may make a decision on the application in July 2011.</p>	
<p>6. Visit to the Kirklees energy-from-waste facility</p>	
<p>The group provided feedback on the visit to see a SITA UK energy-from-waste facility at Kirklees (West Yorkshire).</p> <p>AD said that SITA UK would like to offer to take members of the community liaison group and the parish council to see SITA UK's facility on the Isle of Man, to see what a newer energy-from-waste facility looks like.</p> <p>Feedback on the visit to Kirklees was largely positive and members of the group felt that it was the best way to understand the technology. Members of the group expressed their surprise that there was no odour emanating from the facility, nor smoke, and that if you drove past the facility you wouldn't know it was there.</p> <p>It was noted that the facility at Kirklees looks very different to the one proposed for Great Blakenham.</p> <p>DL's feedback was that the visit to the materials recycling facility at Kirklees was not useful, as most members of the group have been to Viridor's recycling facility in Gt Blakenham.</p> <p>DL also commented on the lorries that were waiting to deposit waste at the Kirklees facility and suggested that when the vehicles are idling they could turn off their engines.</p> <p>BG commented on the design of the Kirklees facility, saying that the design for the Suffolk energy-from-waste facility would be very different as it must be appropriate to a more rural Suffolk setting. Also, the Suffolk building will be designed to achieve an 'excellent' rating from BREEAM (the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method).</p> <p>In response to DL, CM explained that due to winter weather and the Christmas period, there had been a collections backlog, so the number of vehicles at Kirklees was higher than normal. He pointed out, however, that vehicles queuing were contained on the site and did not affect the roads around the facility. This would be the case with the Suffolk facility where</p>	<p>MW</p>



<p>there would be space inside the site for vehicles to queue.</p> <p>A discussion followed about traffic implications of the proposed energy-from-waste facility, which remains one of the community's biggest concerns.</p> <p>MW said her husband has images of HGVs queuing to get into a facility that's adjacent to the former highways depot. MW agreed to forward electronic images to the group.</p> <p>DL said that because the entrance to the application site is close to the dual carriageway he fears there could be a build up of traffic. At the moment, lorries carry on past the site and do not turn into it, which means they aren't causing a build up. He fears that traffic will increase through the village so he fears the problem could get worse. He said that if there's an accident on the A14 traffic diverts around the villages. He is also concerned that with 300 houses being developed there will be more traffic and this will add to the traffic coming out of Lodge Lane. DL asked when had the traffic surveys been carried out? What time of year? He is concerned that there are more heavy vehicles during winter when gritting roads and wonders if the assessments are correct?</p> <p>MW said that traffic lights are needed at Hackney corner where the new houses are to be built. MW said that vehicles currently indicate at the last minute and swing around the corner.</p> <p>It was agreed that an additional session on traffic was required for the group. SITA UK also confirmed in response to DL that traffic assessments had taken place in the summer (not winter).</p>	
<p>7. Newsletter update</p>	
<p>The latest Suffolk energy-from-waste newsletter was distributed to the group. This will be delivered to households from the 2<sup>nd</sup> February onwards.</p>	
<p>8. Presentation on the architecture of the proposed facility</p>	
<p>Perry Hooper, an architect at Grimshaws, was introduced to the group. PH explained that industrial buildings are one of Grimshaws specialisms.</p> <p>PH said that the design of the facility had been positively</p>	



received by CABE - a Government body that assesses the quality of architecture.

PH explained the logic behind the design of the facility. Three issues Grimshaws had to take into account were:

- Function – ensure it is a good working building.
- Position and local context – ensure it fits into the local surroundings
- Community interaction and educational value

PH said that site is on a major road network, which is a positive.

Minimising the impact of the building was a key consideration for Grimshaws.

The effect of the mass of the building has been reduced through the design – by breaking down the large mass of the building it changes character and appearance from different views.

PH described the polycarbonate skin with plastic louvers.

At some angles (Claydon for example) the skin of the building will appear darker, which is a deliberate design feature, to fit in with the local vegetation.

PH explained that the site had been deliberately designed to locate all the development as far from houses as possible to the south of the site. The ash reprocessing facility will be low down in the site near the road junction, and its undulating roof will be visible. The front part of the site (where visitors will enter) is where the landscaped area is located. This is designed to be a native meadow and wetland area.

The visitors centre will be accessed separately and will have views into the facility, plus a walkway, and over the wildlife area.

Overall the aim of the design is to take into account the design of buildings in Suffolk that are a part of the county's cultural heritage, combined with cutting edge buildings in the county. Charcoal coloured parts of the building reflect creosote treated buildings that are traditional to Suffolk. An interesting design feature has been created using a curtain wall of polycarbonate,



<p>with tilted louvers. This creates interesting patterns during the day and means there is some visibility into the main facility area.</p> <p>An overall ambition was to keep the height of the building as low as possible. The building is no bigger than is actually needed.</p> <p>Paul Ellis continued to discuss how the facility would look in the wider landscape.</p> <p>In terms of screening, the site is six metres lower by the road, which helps with the screening. There are also 10 metre high trees, on the boundary, which means there is good screening from the south and west of the site. Native species of trees will be used and existing pockets of trees will be reinforced with new planting including evergreen Scottish Pine.</p> <p>On site, there will be clipped hedgerows in the parking area. There will also be an inclined meadow. The reason the meadow is inclined is to ensure it is visible from the visitor centre.</p> <p>There will also be an attenuation pond on the site. This will also serve as a wildlife feature.</p> <p>PE described the view of the facility from the Gipping Valley. Approximately 1/3 of the facility will be screened by trees and the remainder will be visible. However, the massing of the building has been designed to reduce its impact.</p> <p>PE also described the view of the facility from Claydon, where it is more difficult to see from within the village. It is visible from a footpath by the side of the church at Claydon, although this is some way out of the village.</p>	
<p>9. Date / time of next meeting</p>	
<p>Date of next meeting was agreed as Tuesday 22 February 2011</p> <p>Further dates were agreed as follows:</p> <p>22 March 2011 19 April 2011</p>	<p>PPS to follow up with formal invitations.</p>



10. Any other business	
<p>Topics for future meetings</p> <p>There was a discussion about future meeting topics. The following were agreed:</p> <p>The planning process and how traffic levels from other developments are being taken into account by Suffolk County Council</p> <p>JF suggested there is a review with the Parish Council of outstanding issues that the community feel have not yet been resolved. Any identified issues can therefore be put forward for discussion by the group in advance, to enable responses to questions to be prepared ahead of each meeting. Issues mentioned by JF include: concerns about the cooling equipment, size of bunker and speed of tipping. Other issues will be identified by the group.</p>	<p>PPS to request a speaker from Suffolk County Council.</p>