

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 4 Notes

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 4 Monday 16th November 2009, 18.30 – 20.40

Attending – See attached.

The meeting chaired by Kate Fairweather, contact details: Phone 0800 035 1556, email kate@cmcaustmarketing.co.uk

Introductions and actions from last meeting

KF apologised that design books and red books (emission data from Meeting 1) had not yet gone out to remaining CLP members – there had been a delay as the information had had to be printed, but had now been delivered and would be coming out shortly.

Covanta have some design actions outstanding which should be available for the next meeting.

KF had re-sent all meeting notes and documents to new members.

Other actions are on the agenda for this meeting.

Covanta response to Union allegations

Confidential item

MC made a response to claims made about emission violations – see paper attached.

Processes within the EfW building, energy efficiencies, power station credentials, why the building is so large

PC presented papers attached covering these issues.

Questions:

Does metal extraction during the process affect the temperature required?

It has an insignificant impact on the temperature in the furnace because the quantity of metal in the waste is small and therefore, does not impact significantly on the efficiency of power generation.

Metal recovered after it has passed through the combustion process is sterile and does not require additional processing before being sold off for further recycling, and is therefore a better method of recovering metals.

Is it still part of the plan to take heat out to the local area?

Heat in the form of hot water and / or steam can be removed from the system for CHP purposes. The facility will be built with extraction points in the steam and condensing system so that this can be achieved but as yet (and this is quite usual for a proposal at this stage) Covanta do not have a contract to provide CHP, and if/when they do, they will submit a separate planning application to put in pipelines to deliver.

Why does this plant have to go to government for planning permission?

The plant produces 65 MW – plants less than 50 MW are determined by Local Authorities. Larger than 50 MW and applications have to go to the Department of Energy and Climate Change as they are deemed to be power stations (but see item below on planning application update).

What happens to hazardous waste from the process?

The only hazardous waste is the flue gas treatment residues which represent approx 4% of the waste input by weight. It is the lime content in this residue (lime is added in the process for emissions control) which results in it being classified as a hazardous waste as it is an irritant if in

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 4 Notes

contact with skin. It will be transported in sealed containers from the site to one of a number of hazardous waste landfill sites in the UK where it will be mixed with other wastes to neutralise it.

What happens to the bags?

They are re-used; the lifetime of the bags is forecast to be 3 years. **Action Covanta will come back with information on how the bags will be disposed of.**

Will the plant produce a huge vapour plume as can be seen on plants on the continent?

The system is designed to reduce the visibility of the plume using dry or semi dry scrubbers to clean the flue gasses. However, on very cold days the plume will be visible above the stack; this is caused by the moisture in the flue gas condensing with the cold air. Whereas on the continent wet scrubbers are used that use more water, thereby producing a large plume at the stack.

The proposed EfW process will use a closed loop steam / water system, using air cooled condensers to condense the stream; these are large fans that blow air over a bank of radiators to condense the steam back to water. This is used instead of water cooling towers that use water in an open system to condense the steam, and will therefore produce large plumes of water vapour. The use of an air cooled condenser prevents this water vapour loss and dissipates heat into the air, some of this waste heat can be recovered prior to reaching the condenser for use in the CHP process as discussed above.

Layman's interpretation of the A421 model

Covanta are not yet ready to present the detailed graphical version of the traffic forecast as some other operational aspects that directly affect traffic flows (e.g. opening hours, noise levels) have not yet been finalised due to the need to complete detailed technical appraisals.

Action Covanta to present this item at the next meeting (the CLP wants to see flows at local junctions and along the routes to be used as a graphic, comparing current traffic levels with those taking all agreed developments into account and with those with the Covanta plant in operation).

Planning application process update

RN presented papers attached covering this issue.

RN informed the CLP that it is still in consultation with key bodies and that it is unlikely to be fully ready to submit an application until the spring, rather than before Christmas as previously advised. This (amongst other reasons) has prompted Covanta to decide to take a different route for the application and, rather than use the Section 36 process under the Electricity Act 1989, take the application to the new Infrastructure Planning Commission, which is receiving applications from 1st March 2010. Covanta will take forward to this new process all of the design, environmental impact and consultation work completed so far.

There are two main differences with the IPC process – it is intended to be a faster process to avoid applications becoming stuck in the system for years, as is often the case at present, and it aims to be fairer as it gives better opportunities for public participation.

A key part of the IPC process is that there has to be much wider and more robust consultation with key bodies (e.g. English Heritage) and the local community than previously required. The IPC will only accept as valid those applications where enough time has been given to allow as much information to be provided to consultees as is appropriate for meaningful engagement. There is also a requirement to demonstrate that the outcomes of consultation have been considered and addressed appropriately in the finally submitted proposals.

Covanta has already consulted widely and well beyond the formal requirements of the Electricity Act 1989. However it now needs to agree a consultation strategy with the Local Authorities to fully

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 4 Notes

meet the IPC requirements. RN has a meeting with Central Bedfordshire Planning Officers and has invited Bedfordshire Borough Planning Officers to also attend in order to agree this strategy. In the next few weeks Covanta will submit to the Local Authorities a draft Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) which will set out the proposed consultation strategy going forwards until the IPC application is submitted. The Councils have 28 days to respond to the SOCC. Covanta will then publish the SOCC in a local newspaper along with a notice advising of Covanta's intention to submit an application to the IPC. The public and the CLP will be consulted again by Covanta on the evolving proposals (including via an exhibition) prior to the application being formally made to the IPC.

When they make the application to the IPC Covanta will submit a Consultation Report documenting the Community Consultation covering all its activities, and this includes the CLP as well as exhibitions. The report will have to include all feedback received, whether positive or negative, and this information would be in the public domain. There would also be further opportunities to make representations when the application has gone to the IPC.

The CLP discussed the issue of participating in the consultation process. The consensus view was that the members were there to provide information on issues of concern to the local community to produce a proposal that, should consent be granted, would be as acceptable to them as possible, and so are committed to participating in the consultation process. This does not in anyway mean that CLP organisations would not object strongly to the Covanta proposals if that was felt to be appropriate.

Questions:

Is the IPC route possible, as it is still being formed and many aspects of its working are open to discussion, also it may be changed if there is a change in Government

Covanta feel the IPC route would remain in one guise or another should there be a change in Government as there is a cross party recognition that renewable energy applications need to be decided more quickly if the UK is to meet carbon emission targets, so if the IPC cannot do the job another body will have to be put in place. If the IPC is not in a position to decide on the application by the time Covanta is ready to present its case, the application will go the Secretary of State for a decision as would have happened anyway. The additional consultation is worth doing as best practice in either case.

How do local viewpoints get registered/advised to IPC

This happens in a number of ways. The Consultation Report prepared by Covanta has to include all feedback whether positive or negative. Covanta puts forward in the report its response to the feedback, and in its other application documentation will still make the case for the facility. CLP members' organisations and individuals will be able to make representations when the proposed application is formally advertised and again directly to the IPC once the application is made to them. Representations have to be made against the policies that are applicable to the application. **The CLP commented that local communities are not really in a position to counter the case that Covanta will make with the benefit of specialist support at their disposal.**

MC said that this process is more balanced than has been the case in the past, the style of the IPC examination is not aggressive, there will be a more limited role for lawyers and representations have to be published and responded to in the application.

How do organisations and individuals know what policies apply so that they can make effective representations

Covanta can provide detail of these to the CLP. **Action Covanta to provide presentation on the policies that the application has to address to the next CLP meeting**

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 4 Notes

What is the consultation strategy and timescale

Strategy to be agreed with Local Authorities, intend to start in January. **Action Covanta to provide consultation timetable as soon as possible, and to come back to the CLP with the consultation strategy next meeting**

The CLP proposed ideas for improving the consultation process:

- Have a permanent exhibition at e.g. the Forest Centre so that residents can come and look at the proposal
- Include a architectural model of the facility in the context of the Vale and with detail of road, rail, towns and villages and other developments (NIRAH, Cardington Hangars etc) so that people can see the overall effect
- In all exhibitions/ other consultation methods :
- Include the photomontage views from villages and Ampthill
- Include details of policies application is being measured against so people can make informed comments
- Include feedback sheets for people to give views back to Covanta and promote the members of the CLP as additional place to register feedback and ask questions for the CLP to bring to the meetings

Carbon credentials of the RRF

MC presented to the paper attached.

Questions:

Have wider impacts such as the embodied carbon in the building itself and carbon produced in transporting waste to the site been included in these figures.

Research elsewhere has indicated that these “capital burdens” contribute between 5% and 10% of the overall emissions per tonne of waste managed at a plant like the Resource Recovery Facility.

Covanta’s calculations are that the additional efficiency of energy recovery of a larger, centralised plant over smaller, more local facilities more than off sets the carbon emissions resulting from the additional miles travelled in transporting waste to the much larger facility. The margin is significant, and sufficient to justify transport across the planned catchment area of the Resource Recovery Facility.

Date of next meeting and items to cover

The next meeting will be on Monday 14th December at 18.30 in the Forest Centre Seminar Room.

Items on the agenda are:

- Graphical representation of the traffic effects of the facility
- Public Consultation strategy details
- Details of the policies that the application is matching itself against

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 4 Notes

Attended:

Nigel Milway	Chair of "Revamp" Ampthill
Hugh Roberts	MMAG
Barry Halton	Volunteer with Beds CPRE
Kim Hewlett	Head Teacher Broadmead Lower School – did not attend
Tony Talbot	MD Forest of Marston Vale
Gary Summerfield	Ampthill Town Council - Apologies Margaret Wright substituting
Lisa Frangiamore	Houghton Conquest P. C.
Jennie Thomas	Millbrook Parish Meeting
David Cooper	Stewartby Parish Council
Alan Barnard	Maulden Parish Council - Apologies
Peter Neale	Marston Morteyne Parish Council
Richard Franceys	Resident – Apologies Sean Tyrell substituting
Ed Hiam	Resident
Ian Tomkins	Resident - Apologies
Tim Hill	Bedfordshire Borough Council - Apologies
Covanta representatives	See below
Kate Fairweather	Independent Chair

Attending this meeting for Covanta:

Malcolm Chilton Managing Director, Rachel Ness Director of Planning, Paul Cole Engineering Director

Presenting:

Simon Davis – PBA, traffic modelling

Simon Aumonier – ERM, carbon credentials of RRF