

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 7 Notes

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 7 Monday 22nd February 2010, 18.30 – 20.50

Attended – See attached.

Introductions and actions from last meeting

Actions from January Meeting:

- Further sensitive receptors identified by the Community Liaison Panel (CLP) members to be advised for consideration – none further received
- Presentation on Policies on protection of the landscape – on the agenda for March CLP
- Issues arising from the Preliminary Environmental Report (PER) for further agenda items – Kate Fairweather (KF) apologised to the CLP members that the PER had not been delivered to them on 19th February as promised as there had been some doubt as to whether CLP member addresses could be released to the distributing company. In light of that query it was decided that Rachel Ness (RN) would distribute the PER plus Non Technical Summaries and exhibition posters at the CLP meeting (non attendees have been advised that they can collect their copies from Covanta, or arrange local delivery if they wish). KF said she would contact all members after the site visit date to gather their issues on the PER and arrange for these to be presented at the March/April meetings.
Action KF to contact all CLP members after 27th February for issues for future agenda items
- Consultation Strategy document to be printed and sent out to all CLP members who did not attend the December meeting – KF has posted out
- Formal Statement of Community Consultation to be emailed to CLP members – the content was advised to CLP members with the January Meeting Notes; however they had not had a copy of the document published in the local press. **Action Covanta to provide to KF to circulate: This has now been emailed to CLP members.**
- Covanta to clarify the balloon flight issue – the detail was sent with the January Meeting notes, but there is still some debate about where the balloons will be flown as there are technical and safety issues arising from the water in the base of the pit and the seasonal changes for great crested newts. This means that the balloons may not be in exactly the position of the building and stack for the exhibition, but Covanta still hope to fly one indicating the height of the stack and one indicating the highest point of the building.
Action Covanta to confirm any further developments
- Site visit now planned for 27th February and 11 CP members have asked to attend. Agreed 10.00 start time, joining instructions provided at the meeting and emailed to non attendees.
- CLP members to state specific things they want to see at the site visit – it was agreed at the meeting that CLP members wanted the footprint of the building to be indicated in position (this would be done on the pit sides due to presence of water in the base of the pit), orientation maps to be provided, and to walk along the new access road route. No additional requirements specified.
- CLP members to provide details of people they would like to attend a further site visit if this can be agreed and arranged – no nominations received to date.
- Covanta to provide the dimensions of the Isle of Man facility in the Plume presentation, and why this building appears to be smaller than the proposed Rookery facility. **Action Covanta to provide to the next meeting**

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 7 Notes

- Covanta to arrange additional exhibitions in Millbrook and Ampthill – these have been arranged.
- Covanta to circulate the draft exhibition feedback questionnaire for CLP comment. **Action Covanta to circulate this week**

Outstanding design/photomontage requests

Alister Kratt (AK) presented the new design for the building following comments from CABE and English Heritage (EH) – it is a simplified design but still based on the interlocking box concept and building design code presented to previous meetings.

AK presented a number of photomontage views.

Questions:

The CLP requested additional photomontage views from the high point of the village green in Stewartby Village, a possible night time view from Ampthill Park, and Houghton Conquest at either end of the village where it joins the B530 (at The Grove or Bedford Road).

Action Covanta agreed to provide the Stewartby view after a review of additional information provided to EH upon their request which may be sufficient. Covanta will consider provision of night time and other views as part of the feedback from consultation process on the PER.

Have Ampthill Park managers been consulted as part of the design process?

Covanta explained that they have consulted from the beginning with English Heritage (EH) Regional and District managers who are responsible for the Park and Garden. They have also consulted landscape and heritage officers from Central Bedfordshire Council, Ampthill Town Council and Ampthill Park House residents throughout the process.

The CLP asked if they could have EH contacts to speak to them directly about the proposal.

Action Covanta happy to provide contact details for English Heritage managers involved in the consultation – provided via email.

Would it be possible to see photomontages from Ampthill Park House itself?

Covanta agreed to consider this request but these are private views and the residents would need to be asked if these could be made public. As a general point Covanta advised that private views are not a material planning consideration – no one has a right to a view. The photomontage presented was a private view agreed with EH to assist in the consideration of the setting of the building. The view from the right of way west of the house was the public view that could be provided.

Why have the specific views presented been chosen for photomontages - they do not seem to be typical views for residents?

Covanta confirmed that the views had been agreed with English Heritage and Local Authority Landscape Officers in accordance with good practice. The views are from publicly accessible locations with views from private land only selected in support of matters being considered by EH at Ampthill Park House.

Has any thought been given to reorientating the building to reduce the impact from Ampthill Park?

Covanta noted that the PER outlines the basis of building orientation. The issue is one of balancing effects on receptors who view the building at different distances. The longer distance views had different sensitivities from nearby receptors. The issue of orientation was of particular importance in addressing nearby receptors - for instance if the building was placed on a north south axis the effect on the Forest Centre would be more significant with a long elevation being more extensive in the view. Whilst the orientation of the building in longer range views is relevant the issue of integration and sensitive materials selection is key. Operational matters have been a

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 7 Notes

consideration and influenced the orientation permitting the use of the pit slope to support the tipping apron as well as facilitate any future consideration of rail connection from the rail line to the west.

From Ampthill Park there will be a view under the condensers to the lake, increasing the “industrial” nature of the building view.

Covanta advised that there was a lattice of support legs under the condensers and that, with the angle of view, views between these supports would be very limited and backed by trees.

The view from Ampthill Park is the most intrusive surely it will be impossible to hide such a large building in the landscape?

Covanta advised that the open space function of the park is recognized in the assessment and its amenity function. The view from the park has been given considerable attention in developing integration strategies. It has always been accepted that Covanta would not screen the building but seek its integration through consideration of building design, material finishes and colour and the proportions and finishes for the chimney stack. In addition the integration strategy seeks to establish a fringe of woodland that screens the lower portions of the site and operational movement so that it appears as a static building in the landscape.

Traffic issues update

Brian Plumb presented a review of the transport aspects of the project – see handout attached.

Questions:

Can Covanta confirm volume of traffic presented (180 vehicle movements per day)?

Covanta confirmed that the 180 vehicles referred to HGV movements, and it covers two way journeys, so means 360 HGV journeys per day – this figure does not include staff journeys to and from the site during the day.

Covanta also confirmed that the level of traffic quoted refers to an operating capacity of 585,000 tonnes throughput of waste, the transport impact assessment will take into account up to 10% above this level.

When will the 12 bulk loaders based at the site be on the road?

Covanta confirmed these would leave between 5.00 and 7.00 in the morning and return during the day from Local Authority waste transfer stations.

The CLP remain very concerned that there may be regular evening HGV movements because Covanta have stated that operating hours will be until 23.00.

The CLP feel that the forecast that HGVs will generally operate up to 17.00 is not robust, as Covanta have yet to gain contracts for Municipal and Commercial and Industrial Waste and their customers may want later collections of waste from their sites. Jason Baldwin (JB) explained that the forecast is based on normal practice at other locations, local authority waste transfer stations generally close at 19.00 so HGV movements would finish once these last loads are delivered. Commercial and Industrial waste deliveries tend to be between 6am to 4pm and are rarely later than these hours as drivers are governed by laws relating to the maximum number of hours per day that they can physically drive.

Covanta confirmed that the PER accounts for the noise of traffic movements up to 23.00. RN said that it was for Covanta to make the case that noise levels would be acceptable at this time should these be the “fixed” hours.

Can the IPC put working hours planning conditions on the application, and how would Covanta change these working hours if customers wanted later waste collections, for example if they wanted to avoid day time traffic congestions?

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 7 Notes

RN said that the IPC may put planning restrictions on approval for the project, and would check the process for applying for a change to working hours at a later date. **Action RN to check and confirm the IPC process for changing working hours post application**

The CLP asked for an example of vehicle delivery hours from the Belvedere EfW Facility. **Action Covanta to provide information from the Belvedere facility**

Can Covanta provide more detail about the forecast additional 4% increase in traffic flows on the A421 towards Marston Moretaine?

They asked for detail of the proportion of HGVs in the 871 flow in the HA model, as this provided a better comparison. BP pointed out that the 39 additional vehicles from the Project will be both cars and HGVs – only 16 will be HGVs in am peak hours. **Action Covanta to confirm the level of HGV vehicles in the HA model.**

What would happen to transport movement in the case of a major traffic incident on Green Lane?

Covanta (JB) confirmed that they do have to put contingency plans to local authority customers in case of this type of emergency. Generally this involves holding waste at transfer stations for longer, or if the road is locked for days they would redirect waste to another facility/landfill. JB pointed out that the emergency services have an obligation once their investigation is completed to open road access as soon as possible, so lengthy closure would be very unlikely.

Does the PER include use of rail?

Covanta confirmed that in the PER rail use is considered (work done by Arup), but that it is not included in the current application, although it may be considered at a later date. A technical report on this would be provided in the application submission.

Who would own the new access road to the site?

Covanta confirmed that the detail of an option agreement is being worked up and further information on this would be provided to the CLP in due course.

Other items

A CLP member commented that Covanta has made no mention of its existing preferred bidder status with Buckinghamshire County Council in the consultation documentation. The CLP member felt this was to allow residents to believe that most of the waste would come from Bedfordshire, where Covanta has no contracts. RN strongly disagreed with this view, stating that the documents clearly state that Covanta “intend to source waste from Bedfordshire and the Luton sub region and from nearby local authority areas, subject to contract awards”. She pointed out again that tenders will be invited for Bedfordshire waste and Covanta will be tendering for these contracts.

Date of next meeting and items to cover

Next meeting 15th March 2010 in the Seminar Room at the Forest Centre, 18.30

Items to cover are:

Agreement of issues arising from the site visit on 27th February (and the PER as required)

The detailed explanation of why Rookery South was selected

The detail from the Preliminary Environmental Report on landscape impacts with reference to relevant policies PPS 7 and 15 and local policies including the Marston Vale Forest Plan

The CHP issue requested at the December Meeting

Additional items suggested for a further meeting:

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 7 Notes

Request from N Milway for a presentation from Covanta on benefits to the local community of hosting the plant.

Rookery South RRF Community Liaison Panel Meeting 7 Notes

Attendance

Nigel Milway	Chair of "Revamp" Ampthill Apologies
Hugh Roberts	MMAG Attended
Barry Halton	Volunteer with Beds CPRE Attended
Kim Hewlett	Head Teacher Broadmead Lower School
Tony Talbot	MD Forest of Marston Vale Attended
Gary Summerfield	Ampthill Town Council Attended
Lisa Frangiamore	Houghton Conquest P. C. Attended
Jennie Thomas	Millbrook Parish Meeting Attended
David Cooper	Stewartby Parish Council Attended
Alan Barnard	Maulden Parish Council Attended
Peter Neale	Marston Morteyne Parish Council Attended
Richard Franceys	Resident Attended
Ed Hiam	Resident
Tim Hill	Bedfordshire Borough Council
Covanta representatives	See below
Kate Fairweather	Independent Chair

Attending this meeting for Covanta:

Rachel Ness Director of Planning, Jason Baldwin Director of Transport and Logistics, Simon McKee Planning Manager

Presenters:

Alister Kratt LDA Design

Brian Plumb Waterman Boreham