

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

20 OCTOBER 2010

Present:

Councillor Philippa Broom (Chairman)

Councillor S.J Rough (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors:

Miss M.M. Bain

D.L. McShane

Jack D. Pinkerton

Mrs E.M. Bell

Mrs I. Napper

Mrs M.W. Rough

A.P. Hirst

Mrs C.E. Nichols

G.F. Trussler

H.R. Jaffer

L.E. Nichols

Apologies: Councillors S.E.W. Budd and K. Chouhan

Attendance:

Surrey County Council

Councillor Lynne Hack – Cabinet Member for the Environment

Trevor Pugh – Director for Environment and Infrastructure

Richard Parkinson - Waste Operations Manager

Ian Boast – Head of Waste and Sustainability

SITA

Emma Beal - Project Manager

Alison Bennett – Communications Manager

Gareth Phillips – Planning Manager

Gareth Swain – Regional Manager

Tina Wolter –Technology Specialist

Jean Claude Sartenaer – Advanced Thermal Treatment Technology Specialist

Consultants

Stephen Othen - Fichtner

Matthew Colledge – Studio E

Nick Roberts - Axis

Andrew Bell – Axis

Independent Expert Witnesses

Dean Hodson – Director of Transport

Dr Mark Broomfield – Technical Director

Professor Adam Read – Chartered Waste Manager

Spelthorne Borough Council

Roberto Tambini – Chief Executive

308/10A DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

The Chairman, Councillor Philippa Broom, reported that some members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were also members of the Borough Council's Planning Committee which at some point would be consulted on the planning application from Surrey County Council. Advice had been obtained from the Council's Head of Legal Services who had confirmed that there was no reason why members of the Planning Committee could not participate in the proceedings provided that they take into account the advice set out in the Borough Council's Planning Code and kept an open mind.

No disclosures of interest were made. However Councillor Mrs C.E. Nichols reported that she was also a Surrey County Councillor.

308/10B ECO PARK PROPOSALS FOR CHARLTON LANE, SHEPPERTON

The Chairman, Councillor Philippa Broom, opened the meeting by explaining that she had called this formal meeting due to the high level of interest from residents and other interested parties on the proposed Eco Park Development at Charlton Lane, Shepperton. This proposal was from Surrey County Council and its partner Surrey Waste Management Limited.

The Chairman confirmed that this was a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny committee in public but not a public meeting and therefore only members of the committee and those invited to give a presentation would be able to speak at this meeting. The questions that would be raised by the committee members would be based on the questions/concerns received from residents.

The Chairman expressed her thanks and appreciation to those residents who had submitted questions and had taken the time to attend the meeting. Over 200 questions had been submitted to date.

The Chairman confirmed that the scrutiny committee had a broad remit to consider all matters which affected the borough and the well being of residents. Therefore it would be looking at all aspects of the proposed development including issues relating to waste management generally, the County Council's strategy for dealing with waste, the technologies involved in the processes and the wider issues about the effects on the borough environmentally and economically.

The Chairman invited County Councillor Lynne Hack to introduce those Officers and representatives from Surrey County Council, SITA and their consultants.

To assist Committee members, residents and other interested parties to have a clearer understanding about the plans for a proposed Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton Ian Boast, Head of Waste and Sustainability at Surrey County Council gave a powerpoint presentation summarising the proposal and outlining the benefits of the proposed development. A Copy of the presentation is **attached**.

The proposed Eco Park would include

A batch oxidation gasification facility that would treat 60,000 tonnes of household waste each year.

An anaerobic digestion facility that would treat 40,000 tonnes of Surrey's food waste.

Facilities to manage recyclable waste such as paper, glass and plastics.

A community recycling centre (retain existing facility)

A visitor education centre

Additional land around the site had been obtained for landscaping and to encourage biodiversity.

Establish a fund for local environment projects

During the discussion and to help understand the complex waste technology it was explained that the batch oxidation gasification system enabled waste to be heated to produce a gas, which could then be burned cleanly at high temperatures to provide energy. Anaerobic digestion was a treatment by which food waste was broken down in the absence of oxygen to produce a biogas which is used to produce energy.

At the conclusion of the presentation the Chairman invited members of the Committee to introduce themselves. The Chairman advised the meeting that three independent expert witnesses were in attendance with a role to give independent advice to the committee on technical matters. The three experts were invited to introduce themselves and the meeting was reminded of the background information on the three witnesses which had been circulated with the agenda. During the introduction Dr Mark Broomfield reported that he had in the past worked for Enviro Consultants, who had undertaken work for Surrey CC. Dr Broomfield now worked for AEA a completely separate company.

At the conclusion of the presentation the Committee asked questions based on the questions/concerns received from residents. To enable a focus to be given to the questions these had been divided into six categories as follows:

Site Selection and Planning Policy

Visual Impact and Scale

Traffic

Waste Disposal Authority Cost and Contractual Issues

Pollution, Health and Technology

Others

1. Site Selection and Planning Policy

Question. *Please can you tell us the justification for the selection of Charlton Lane site versus alternatives in Surrey? Is it correct that Charlton Lane was not the first choice?*

Answer:

It is understood that the selection of the Charlton Lane site for the proposed Eco Park is a matter of public concern. Therefore I have addressed this issue at some length to ensure that councillors and the public understand how the

decision was taken and that there has been, and will continue to be, substantial provision for consultation with local residents.

In January 2006, the county council's Executive approved a draft Waste Disposal Authority Action Plan. The Council subsequently adopted this plan later that year. At that time the Waste Disposal Authority's preferred method of dealing with residual waste was through energy from waste incineration technology.

The Action Plan identified the preferred sites for energy from waste technology as Clockhouse Brickworks, Capel; land at Trumps Farm, Longcross and Charlton Lane, Shepperton. The report to the Executive in January 2006, went on to recommend that two energy from waste plants be developed to deal with residual municipal waste. The smaller of the two plants, some 100,000 tonnes per annum capacity, should be developed at Capel in the south of the county. A larger plant of 160,000 tonnes capacity should be developed in the north of the county at either Trumps Farm or Charlton Lane.

At the time the preference was to site the northern energy from waste incineration plant at Trumps Farm. Both the Charlton Lane and Trumps Farm sites had planning considerations. In addition, as the Executive report of January 2006 states, there were also 'some clear operational benefits in choosing the Trumps Farm site over the Charlton Lane site'. Those 'clear operational benefits' related to the existing operational use of the Charlton Lane waste transfer station and community recycling centre and the fact that if a 160,000 tonne per year energy from waste facility were to be developed on the Charlton Lane site, it would be necessary to close the site to the public and to local authority and trade customers for the duration of the building works.

The council's World Class Waste Solution proposes further reduction of waste arising as well as increased levels of recycling. This means that there will be less residual waste to be disposed of than was anticipated when the Waste Disposal Authority Action Plan was first drawn up in 2006. Some 160,000 tonnes per year instead of the 270,000 tonnes per year originally proposed.

The emergence of batch oxidation system gasification technology as a viable alternative to energy from waste incineration enables plant to be constructed on a much smaller scale. The plant proposed for Charlton Lane will deal with only 60,000 tonnes of waste per year rather than the 160,000 tonnes proposed for the energy from waste plant at Trumps Farm. The configuration of the plant also allows for a much smaller building to house the process. The maximum building height proposed for the Eco Park is just over 18 metres, compared with a height of around 40 metres that would be required for an energy from waste incineration plant. The height of the stack is also significantly less, 49 metres as compared to 80 to 90 metres for an energy from waste incineration plant.

The reduced scale of the buildings also means that it would be possible to continue to operate the Charlton Lane facility during the construction of both the gasification plant and anaerobic digestion plant. In addition the council has managed to secure short-term capacity for Spelthorne's residual waste at the

Lakeside energy from waste facility at Colnbrook and therefore the operational pressure on the Charlton Lane site, during construction, is reduced.

Since the scale of the buildings, types of processes and footprint of the proposed Eco Park are very different to that of a 160,000 tonne per year energy from waste incineration facility and since there had been significant changes to the adopted Waste Plan as a result of the removal of Capel as an allocated site, Waste Disposal Authority officers considered that it was necessary to undertake a new planning assessment for the proposed Eco Park. A firm of planning consultants, Enviros were therefore commissioned to undertake this assessment and this was used to inform the report to cabinet on the 'World Class Waste Solution' in February this year. The report, which was produced in November 2009 has been published on the council's website.

As a result of this detailed analysis, the Waste Disposal Authority believes that the Charlton Lane site is the most appropriate site for the development of an Eco Park. The principle of using the Charlton Lane site for waste processing, including thermal treatment, was subject to extensive public consultation during the development of Surrey Waste Plan.

The council adopted the Waste Plan in May 2008 following an examination in public, with the inclusion of Charlton Lane as an allocated site. The planning application that is being developed by Surrey Waste Management will include a thorough and up to date alternative site assessment. The planning application will be subject to public consultation and residents will be able to make their views known with regard to all aspects of the application, including the suitability of the Charlton Lane site for the Eco Park.

The demonstration of the suitability of the site is a material consideration for the council's Planning and Regulatory Committee when they consider the planning application. Therefore there has been and will continue to be further consultation with residents in relation to the principle of a waste processing facility at Charlton Lane

Question: *Will this mean that all of Spelthorne's waste will be dealt with locally?*

Answer:

All of Spelthorne Borough Council's residual waste would be dealt with at the proposed Eco Park, together with any kitchen waste that is collected separately by the borough council in the future. Spelthorne Borough Council make their own arrangements for other recyclable material and it is likely that recyclable material collected in door to door collections will continue to be taken to the Grundon materials recycling facility at Colnbrook. Spelthorne's garden waste is currently being taken to a composting site near Virginia Water. Any future decision about a destination for green waste will be a matter for Spelthorne Borough Council. The Community Recycling Centre element of the Eco Park will continue to deal with waste brought into the site by Surrey residents, the majority of whom are from Spelthorne.

Question: *We understand that it is proposed that 40,000 tonnes of Surrey's food waste out of an estimated 100,000 tonnes will be dealt with in the Eco*

Park, is the 100,000 tonnes a realistic figure and, if so, where will the balance of 60,000 tonnes be dealt with?

Answer:

A household waste analysis undertaken in November 2007 and March 2008 identified that kitchen waste comprised 40% of the weight of residual municipal waste. In 2007/8, district and borough councils collected 271,000 tonnes of residual waste and therefore if kitchen waste comprised 40% of this then there would be about 108,000 tonnes of kitchen waste in the household waste stream. Initially it is estimated that about 40 % of the 100,000 tonnes of kitchen waste will be captured by separate kerbside collections. However if capture rates and participation rates increase, then there may be the need for additional facilities to deal with this waste in which case the council and SITA Surrey would consider the appropriate sizing and location of such a facility.

Question: *If there is capacity at other nearby energy for waste sites such as the Veolia plant in Hampshire - Why do we need to build one in Surrey? Has Surrey County Council looked at other options for sharing waste facilities with other local authorities?*

Answer:

The Surrey Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (Policy 1) states that Surrey authorities will plan for net self sufficiency for dealing with waste in Surrey, through the provision of waste management capacity equivalent to the amount of municipal waste arising. The WCWS projects the need for 160,000 residual waste treatment capacity even after reducing waste further and recycling at 70%. In the short term SCC is sending 20,000 waste to the Lakeside facility at Colnbrook, but this capacity is only available for two more years. SCC also has an interim contract in place for 100,000 at Allington EFW in Kent which can last until 2019. The only other reasonably local option is Hampshire and we have been told in very clear terms that they have no capacity available for Surrey's waste. Therefore long term capacity at nearby facilities cannot be relied on and the Eco Park is the first step in addressing this issue. The WDA will continue to assess need and capacity and will bring recommendations to members in the future. The fall back position would be reliance on landfill which may not be available locally, is environmentally unsustainable, and would cost Surrey taxpayers around £11m a year in landfill tax alone within four years if we did not develop new solutions.

Question: *If the Eco Park goes ahead what are the plans for other waste collection sites in Surrey?*

Answer:

The proposed Eco Park is just one of a number of developments across Surrey that will be needed to handle Surrey's municipal waste. Waste is currently collected at fifteen community recycling centres and four waste transfer stations across Surrey and this number will increase as we develop more facilities to treat waste in Surrey.

We are currently sending our green garden waste out of county for treatment and we have identified in our plans that we require a site or sites to compost up to 80,000 tonnes of green waste. We also have plans to develop new

facilities at Guildford including a new community recycling centre, waste transfer station and a materials recycling facility for the dry recyclables currently delivered to the site. We are also looking to develop the existing site at Earlswood, Redhill to incorporate a new waste transfer station and bulking facility. We will also continue with our programme of refurbishment and improvements to the existing community recycling centres across the county to improve the service provided to customers and increase the recycling potential.

Question: *If this Eco Park development does not go ahead what is Plan B? What are the implications for waste disposal in Surrey?*

Answer:

If the Eco Park development does not proceed then the waste disposal authority would need to reassess how it will deal with the waste that will continue to be produced by Surrey residents. It is very likely that we would have to continue to rely on landfill, which has both environmental impacts and cost implications. Within four years, this would lead to £11m per year in landfill tax alone.

At the conclusion of this section of questions covering site selection and planning policy the Chairman invited the Independent experts to comment in particular why Charlton Village was a suitable place for the Eco Park. Professor Read indicated that with 228 sites looked at a very thorough investigation had been undertaken and Charlton Lane was already a waste facility. In his view everything had been done in line with 'best practice' to show that Charlton Lane was the most appropriate place to develop. However, it would be the Planning Committee to assess and determine if mitigation measures were appropriate.

2. Visual Impact and Scale

Question: *The Charlton Lane site was originally rejected from the Waste Disposal Authority plans for Energy for waste site due to visual impact, why is it suitable for an Eco Park?*

Answer:

The emergence of batch oxidation system gasification technology as a viable alternative to energy from waste incineration enables plant to be constructed on a much smaller scale.

The plant proposed for Charlton Lane will deal with only 60,000 tonnes of waste per year rather than the 160,000 tonnes proposed for the energy from waste plant at Trumps Farm. The configuration of the plant also allows for a much smaller building to house the process. The maximum building height proposed for the Eco Park is just over 18 metres, compared with a height of around 40 metres that would be required for an energy from waste incineration plant. The height of the stack is also significantly less, 49 metres as compared to 80 to 90 metres for an energy from waste incineration plant.

The overall visual impact of the Eco Park is therefore substantially less than that of an energy from waste incineration plant.

The reduced scale of the buildings also means that it would be possible to continue to operate the Charlton Lane facility during the construction of both the gasification plant and anaerobic digestion plant. In addition the council has managed to secure short-term capacity for Spelthorne's residual waste at the Lakeside energy from waste facility at Colnbrook and therefore the operational pressure on the Charlton Lane site, during construction, is reduced.

Since the scale of the buildings, types of processes and footprint of the proposed Eco Park are very different to that of a 160,000 tonne per year energy from waste facility and since there had been significant changes to the adopted Waste Plan as a result of the removal of Capel as an allocated site, Waste Disposal Authority officers considered that it was necessary to undertake a new planning assessment for the proposed Eco Park. A firm of planning consultants, Enviros were therefore commissioned to undertake this assessment and this was used to inform the report to cabinet on the 'World Class Waste Solution' in February this year.

The report, which was produced in November 2009 has been published on the council's website.

As a result of this detailed analysis, the Waste Disposal Authority believes that the Charlton Lane site is the most appropriate site for the development of an Eco Park. The principle of using the Charlton Lane site for waste processing, including thermal treatment, was subject to extensive public consultation during the development of Surrey Waste Plan.

Question: *What is the justification for the scale of the building and height of the stack?*

Answer:

The height of the eastern elevation of the gasification building is 13.5m, rising to the highest western elevation of 18.5m and the proposed stack is 49m.

The height of the process buildings and the stack are determined by technical assessments and the technology infrastructure inside the buildings.

The height of the stack is a balance between the visual impact (a taller stack has more impact) and the air quality impact (a taller stack leads to lower ground level concentrations of pollutants). The stack needs to be a certain minimum height to ensure that the dispersion of emissions is not affected excessively by the disturbance of the air caused by the facility buildings. Above this height, we modelled the impact of a number of different stack heights.

Due to the high levels of nitrogen dioxide which have been recorded in some parts of Spelthorne, the whole of the Spelthorne borough area has been declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). This is an area where the air quality objective (which is set in the National Air Quality Strategy and European Directives) is at risk of being exceeded. Because of this, we aimed to reduce the impact of nitrogen dioxide so that the concentrations at ground level due to the facility would be no more than 1% of the air quality objective within the AQMA, and so would be defined as "insignificant" by the Environment Agency.

Initially, we modelled the impact based on the gasifiers operating at the maximum permissible level under the Waste Incineration Directive. This led to a stack height of 70 metres, which was not considered to be acceptable. Therefore, we discussed the design of the facility with the technology providers and agreed that the emissions of nitrogen dioxide would be limited to 100mg/Nm³, which is half the permitted level.

We also reduced the emissions of nitrogen dioxide from the gas engines. As a result of these changes, the required target of 1% of the air quality objective will be achieved with a 49m stack.

The length of the building is determined by the primary BOS gasification compartments, which sit in a long line. In this case there will be twelve compartments in which the waste is heated in a batch system. Behind these are the three secondary compartments where the syngas is ignited and towards the back of the building and the centre of the site are the boilers. The boiler is the piece of equipment that sits tallest in the building bringing the height to 18.5 metres.

The BOS gasification process enables us to keep the building low in height in comparison to traditional energy from waste and makes it suitable in a setting such as Charlton Lane where minimising the visual impact is important.

Question: *What measures will be put in place to mitigate the visual impact?*

Answer:

Because the Eco Park buildings are proposed to be higher than the existing buildings on the site and because this is a green belt setting, we have deliberately designed the site structure and the buildings on site to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal from surrounding views. We wanted to produce a design which reflects the function and importance of the site as a world class facility but one which does not draw undue attention to itself by:

- Positioning the tallest piece of process equipment in the centre of the site away from the boundary to reduce its visual impact
- Making the buildings as small as they can be, given the size of the equipment inside.
- Positioning the lowest building elevation facing the most sensitive eastern boundary
- Curved eaves to the roof which slope up away from the eastern boundary to avoid shadows created by overhangs. As the roof slopes away towards the sky it will reflect the sky colour and merge with its backdrop
- One simple, un-fussy, slim stack finished in polished/bright annealed stainless steel to reflect surroundings and sky. It will reflect the sky colour and merge with its backdrop
- An Eco Park which is a single entity within its setting. The buildings and structures complement each other and fit the landscape
- A building form which favours soft edges over hard lines

- Increased landscaping and a 3.5m bund to the east to break up views towards the main process buildings
- The eastern length of the building screens site activities to the west
- Positioning solar panels on the buildings on the west side of the site so they have no additional effect on the visual impact

During the design stage we considered many different architectural forms and different site layouts. To give you an idea of the work that went into finding the current design, we considered stepping the main process building up to its height but the visual impact assessments showed that this created shadow and drew attention to the building. We considered a different layout with the buildings positioned in reverse but this drew attention to the highest roofline when placed in a different part of the site. We considered green roofs to the buildings but found that this made the buildings taller, which is not appropriate in this setting.

The architectural design of the Eco Park was consulted upon with the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). In their formal consultation response dated 19th August CABE stated that they “applaud the commitment to commission a well designed building. This scheme strikes us as a successful piece of architecture. It has the potential to become an exemplary facility and to offer an interesting visitor experience”. CABE also stated that, “This site seems appropriate for a waste management facility”.

There are three ways in which the visual impact of a development can be addressed, the design of the site, the architecture of the buildings on the site and the use of landscaping and geography to shield the site from view. Charlton Lane is quite an open site that has mature landscaping around it. We carried out a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment to understand how visible the development would be and to identify the sensitive viewpoints. The result of this assessment enabled us to draft a mitigation scheme and consult upon it with Surrey and Spelthorne Landscape and Biodiversity Officers. The purpose of the landscape mitigation scheme, which will form part of the planning application, is not to try and hide the proposed Eco Park but to break up the views to minimise the visual impact. A diagram of this was shown during the presentation.

Question: *Will there be light pollution given the site will operate overnight? and If so how will it be managed so that residents' lives are not affected?*

Answer:

The offices and visitor centre are designed to make the best possible use of natural light. All overnight operations will be undertaken solely within the gasification and anaerobic digestion (AD) building. There is no need for vehicular access in and out of these buildings during the night. Therefore external lighting will only be standard safety and security lighting with lights being standard down lights fitted with cowls to prevent light spill.

At the conclusion of this section of questions relating to visual impact and scale the Chairman invited the independent experts to comments. Dr Mark Broomfield who specialised in air quality and health issues responded. He indicated that the procedures being discussed were well established. With

regard to the height of the stack (49m)he confirmed that the taller the stack the lower the impact on air quality due to disposition although the flue gas cleaning equipment did meet EU standards and more.

3. Traffic

Question: *Please can you confirm what the operating hours for the new Eco Park are?*

Answer:

The community recycling centre will be open:

Mon-Fri 07:30 – 1800

Sat 07:30 – 18:00

Sun 08:00 – 17:00

The refuse bulking facility will be open:

Mon-Fri 07:30-18:00

Sat 07:30-18:00

Sun 07:30 – 17:00 (for CRC waste only)

Bank Holidays 07:30 – 18:00

Gasification facility will be open:

Mon-Fri 07:30-18:00

Sat 07:30-18:00

Sun 07:30-17:00

Bank holidays 07:30 18:00

NB Gates will be opened to HGVs at 07:00 to ensure no off-site queuing but they will not be allowed to enter the building until 07:30

The anaerobic digestion facility will be open:

Mon-Fri 07:00 – 17:30

Sat 07:00-12:00

Sun No deliveries

Bank Holiday 07:00 – 17:30

There will be no deliveries Christmas Day / Boxing Day / New Year's Day

The opening hours of the site are different to when the site is open to the public. This is to enable site staff to ensure the site is safe before customers and the public enter the site in the morning as well as to ensure that the final daily checks are completed before the site closes for the evening.

The processes on site do run 24 hours a day but waste reception and processing only takes place during allowed operational hours.

Question: *Currently heavy lorries are a big area of concern for residents - can you explain how the Eco Park will lead to reduced lorry movements?*

Answer:

At present Charlton Lane is used as a bulking facility. This means that waste is taken into the site on one vehicle and deposited in a holding area. This vehicle then leave the site empty. The waste is bulked and a bigger, empty vehicle comes to the site and is loaded with this waste before leaving again. This means that all waste received at the Charlton Lane site at present is ultimately exported from the facility by road. i.e. 100% of what comes to the site, will go back out again.

The proposed Eco Park scheme will include for waste processing on site in future, which will break down the received waste inputs and therefore deliver a reduction in the amount of final end product waste materials required to be exported from the facility. Just over two thirds of all waste to be received at the Eco Park will be subject to waste processing activities.

The proposed BOS gasification and anaerobic digestion facilities at the Eco Park will process waste and reduce received waste mass by 77% and 50% respectively. Therefore only 54% of all waste mass received at the site will be required to be exported, with a consequent reduction in vehicle movements.

In addition to the effects of waste processing, the Eco Park proposals are also anticipated to result in a further reduction in heavy good vehicle movements as a result of:

- i) a reduction in trade waste levels received at the site, and;
- ii) ceasing the receipt of waste associated with the Hounslow kerbside recycling fleet, which is currently using the site as a temporary waste reception area.

The reduction / removal of these existing waste streams from Charlton Lane as part of the Eco Park proposals will further help to reduce overall lorry movements.

The planning application for the Eco Park proposal scheme will be supported by a detailed Transport Assessment report, which has been prepared to accord with Department of Transport guidelines and which was scoped with both the Local Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) and the Trunk Road Authority (Highways Agency). The results of these assessments suggest that the development of the Eco Park scheme is anticipated to lead to a 49% reduction in the number of lorries travelling to / from the Charlton Lane site on weekdays.

At weekends, it is predicted that there will likely be a slight decrease in overall lorry movements on Saturdays and a slight increase in lorries on Sundays, when compared to current site operation. Any such weekend increases would be very low, being of the order of less than 20 a day, or equivalent to two additional lorry movements per hour (in+out).

Question: *With the increased drive to recycling, What are the expected increases in private vehicle movements?*

Answer:

The modelling of private vehicle movements for the Eco Park scheme has included for the following additional elements over and above current operation of the Charlton Lane site:

- Additional staff vehicle movements reflecting the increased staffing levels proposed at the Eco Park;
- Visitor movements associated with the visitor / educational facility at the Eco Park;
- 3% growth in observed public community recycling centre movements between 2010 – 2016;

In fact, over the past few years the number of private vehicles accessing the existing Charlton Lane community recycling centre has actually been falling, reflecting the impact of the Surrey County Council's resident scheme and van permit initiatives in discouraging unauthorised use of the site and the effects of greater kerbside recycling in reducing the need for residents to regularly visit community recycling centres. We would anticipate this trend to continue. Notwithstanding this, in order to ensure a 'worst case' appraisal of highway network impact and capacity within the formal Transport Assessment report, we have included a small level of growth in our traffic modelling of the community recycling centre.

Question: *Can you guarantee to local residents that waste vehicles going to and from the facility will not go through Upper Halliford or Charlton Lane?*

Answer:

Waste management activities have been taking place at the Charlton Lane site since the 1950's, with associated levels of heavy goods vehicle traffic movements. Indeed, the existing waste management facility creates of the order of 350 heavy good vehicle (HGV) movements per day (weekday) with much lower levels of HGV traffic at weekends. Some of the current HGV traffic movements are known to route via Charlton Road through Charlton Village (of the order of 20-30% of total site HGV traffic, based on our surveys of May / June 2010). Very little waste related traffic is anticipated to route via Upper Halliford Village except when serving local frontage properties.

The development of the Eco Park proposals will result in a substantive reduction in HGV movements to / from the Charlton Lane site, which will in turn result in a reduction in HGV movements on the immediate local network including through Charlton Village. The Transport Assessment report identifies that the development of the Charlton Lane Eco Park scheme would likely result in a 10.5% reduction in total HGV movements (including other non-waste related HGV traffic) through Charlton Village on weekdays.

As the Eco Park scheme will be operated to serve Surrey County Council municipal waste inputs it is anticipated that there will potentially be greater opportunities for the control of vehicle routing in future. Furthermore, the existing large vehicle routing strategy at the Charlton Lane site would be

retained and strictly enforced to ensure that no large (bulk) transfer vehicles use Charlton Road / New Road to the west of the site.

Question: *Have the proposed plans been examined in conjunction with Surrey's Minerals Plan to ensure that the said waste traffic reductions are not offset by increases in minerals traffic?*

Answer:

The Eco Park proposal is supported by a detailed Transport Assessment report, the scope of which was discussed and agreed with both the Local Highway Authority (Surrey County Council) and the Trunk Road Authority (Highways Agency). These scoping negotiations identified that the Transport Assessment should follow best practice and therefore directly include for the traffic effects of the following as part of network traffic modelling:

- 'Committed' major local development projects i.e. those schemes that have either received planning permission, but have yet to be constructed;
- Those schemes that are currently the subject of a formal planning submission, but yet to be determined.

Under this approach, the Transport Assessment for the Eco Park scheme has directly incorporated the predicted traffic effects of the approved Shepperton Studios re-development scheme.

In addition to the direct modelling of this local major committed development scheme, the Transport Assessment for the Eco Park development also includes for increases in total observed background traffic levels in order to model predicted future network traffic growth. The methodology adopted within the Transport Assessment for the modelling of such growth is highly robust, using growth factors in excess of typical growth levels to ensure a 'worst case' capacity assessment.

Given the above, the Transport Assessment does not directly include for the traffic effects of local 'allocated' sites (including minerals site). Scoping discussions with the formal highways consultees identified that direct modeling of allocated sites would be inappropriate, as they did not represent permitted sites and there could be no certainty as to when, or indeed if, such sites would ultimately be brought forward. Furthermore, little information is available as to how such facilities might operate in future, if permitted, and what planning or highways related restrictions would be placed upon such schemes.

It is important to note that traffic volumes associated with the operation of waste management facilities at the Charlton Lane proposal site are already part of existing network traffic volumes and therefore inherent within existing observed baseline traffic flows. Given that the proposed Eco Park scheme is predicted to result in a reduction in traffic volumes when compared to current site operation, the proposals will actually result in a general improvement in local traffic conditions and therefore are unlikely to impact on the future viability of any local allocated site.

Ultimately, the assessment of the transport suitability of an allocated site is best undertaken at the planning application stage, when each proposal can be

assessed on its own merits, when viewed against the prevailing highway conditions at the time.

Question: *Is it possible to access the site from the M3? What other options are there to transport the waste? Rail?*

Answer:

SITA UK wrote to the Highways Agency requesting permission to build a slip road off the M3 to the site. However, they replied refusing us permission as it goes against national Government policy.

The Highways Agency's letter stated: *"There is a general presumption that there will be no additional accesses to motorways and other routes of strategic national importance, other than the provision of service areas, facilities for the travelling public, maintenance compounds and, exceptionally, other major transport interchanges. Access from other types of development to motorways and other routes of strategic national importance will be limited to existing junctions with all-purpose roads. Modifications to existing junctions will be carried out only where traffic flows and safety will not be adversely affected. Connections to slip roads and/or connector roads will not be permitted."*

In terms of potential rail access, the railway line near the Charlton Lane facility is a busy commuter route which is highly unlikely to have the capacity to transport waste by rail. Furthermore, an exporting railhead would need to be constructed to load the waste material onto rail in the first place. Rail works well with economies of scale transporting bulk materials over long distances. Those economies of scale would not be available for transporting relatively small quantities of waste within Northern Surrey by rail. The land that sits alongside the railway to the east of the Charlton Lane site is greenfield land within the Green Belt.

At the conclusion of this section of questions relating to traffic the Chairman invited the independent expert to comments. Dean Hodson indicated that a robust and thorough assessment had been made on the levels of traffic including assessments made on the site access, queuing systems and in his view a thorough investigation had been undertaken. The increased capacity to be put in place on the site itself would also lessen the impact of traffic on the public highway.

4. Waste Disposal Authority Cost and Contractual Issues

Question: *What is the updated cost projection for the construction and commissioning of the facility should it be given the appropriate planning permission?*

Answer.

SITA will shortly be going to market for the construction of the Eco Park. The exact cost will be known following completion of the construction tendering process. The Estimated capital cost for the construction of the Eco Park is circa £50 million. It is important to emphasise that the cost of continuing to rely on landfill will far outweigh the cost of developing the Eco Park.

Question: *Are Surrey residents paying for the entire cost of the project from their council tax payments? If not how will it be funded?*

Answer:

The financial responsibility for disposing of municipal waste and providing community recycling centres rests with Surrey County Council.

The contract between Surrey County Council and SITA Surrey requires SITA Surrey to provide and operate infrastructure to deal with municipal waste. The cost of providing and operating these waste facilities is recharged to Surrey County Council over the life of the contract. Surrey County Council's sources of funding are the general government grant, PFI grant and council tax

Question: *Who bears responsibility for ensuring the project comes in on budget if approved? Who would pay for any cost overruns?*

Answer:

SITA UK is responsible for ensuring that the project is delivered within the agreed timescale and budget. In general, any cost overruns will be the responsibility of SITA UK or the sub contractor.

Question: *Who will actually own the plant? Surrey County Council?*

Answer:

The plant will be built, owned and operated under lease by SITA until the end of their contract with Surrey County Council in 2024. The facility will then become the property of Surrey County Council.

Question: *Did this go out to tender? If so, why were Sita successful?*

Answer:

In 1999, SITA Surrey, which was then called Surrey Waste Management were awarded a 25 year Public Finance Initiative contract to deal with Surrey's municipal waste. The contract was awarded following an extensive tendering exercise.

Question: *As I understand the process, there are three by products going to be produced that have a commercial value; compost, hardcore ash that can be used by the construction industry, and electricity. Who will get the income (not the profit) generated by these three commercial by products? Surrey County Council or Surrey Waste Management?*

Answer:

Income from sales of electricity, digestate and any value from ash will be collected by SITA Surrey and be used to reduce the operating costs of the plant. This will in turn reduce the amount Surrey County Council has to pay SITA Surrey for operating the plant.

Question: *We keep hearing that similar gasification and anaerobic plants elsewhere in the UK have had problems in their operation, how can we be assured that similar situations will not arise at these plants, and have the relevant detailed risk assessments been completed? Has the Health and Safety Executive granted its approval in respect of the plant proposals?*

Answer:

SITA UK employs industry experienced consultants and contractors to design, project manage and construct its new waste treatment facilities. SCC and SITA recognise that they have a legal duty under the Construction (Design & Management) Regulations 2007 (CDM) to satisfy themselves that any teams that they engage or appoint are competent. This code is produced by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and has been approved by the Health and Safety Commission, with the consent of the Secretary of State.

Prior to engaging any contractors SITA UK will rigorously evaluate the tenders to assure itself of their competency in the field for which they will be employed. In order to provide consistency in the way in which competency assessments of companies are carried out "core criteria" have been agreed between the Construction Industry and the HSE. (House and Safety Executive)

In preparing or modifying a design, designers must reduce or eliminate hazards which may cause foreseeable risks to the health and safety of those constructing, maintaining or working in the structure, as far as reasonably practicable. A form of risk assessment should identify what hazards have been created by the change that may affect personal safety, and what action can be implemented to reduce or eliminate the risk.

Hazard and Operability Studies (HAZOP) have been used for many years as a formal means for the review of chemical process designs and are a quantitative risk assessment technique. A HAZOP study is a systematic search for hazards which are defined as deviations within these parameters (Hazard and Operation) that may have dangerous consequences. In the process industry, these deviations concern process parameters such as flow, temperature, pressure etc.

Before construction work begins SITA UK will check to ensure that the construction phase plan has been prepared by the Principle Contractor. The plan should set out the way in which key health and safety issues will be managed (i.e. risk assessments, detailed method statements, etc) and should include the applicable site safety rules.

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) will be a consultee for the planning application for an Eco Park at Charlton Lane. The Eco Park proposals do not need prior approval from the HSE before being submitted to the planning authority and the HSE do not undertake such as approval process for sites of this type. However, the HSE has stated to Surrey County Council Planning Authority that once the application has been submitted and they are formally consulted that they would normally defer to the comments of the Environment Agency.

At the conclusion of this section of questions relating to cost and contractual issues the Chairman invited the independent experts to comment. Adam Read confirmed that industry best practice had been followed

5) Pollution and Health and Technology

Question: *We have been informed that at another site in Dumfries the plant is not operational; would you propose to open something here that does not work?*

Answer:

SITA UK is not the operator of the Dumfries site but it is the reference site for the BOS gasifier proposed for the Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton. SITA UK follows the operation at Dumfries very closely and has a good relationship with Scotgen, the plant's operators.

The Scottish plant has been operating successfully but inevitably there will be issues that need to be resolved during the commissioning phase. This is quite common with commissioning of a new plant. The main issue at Dumfries was that the facility did not have the correct type of boiler. The boiler was reconfigured last winter and used as a 'cooler' before a new type of boiler is installed. Since March 2010, Scotgen has been adjusting the plant and processing thousands of tons of waste. The commissioning period ended on 1 November 2010.

SITA UK technical experts consider that there is no concern with the actual gasification process and we are confident that BOS gasification is a sound technology and is the right facility for Surrey.

SITA UK's experts have extensive experience of thermal waste treatment methods and have thoroughly assessed the suitability of the technologies proposed for Surrey

Question: *What other examples are there of putting waste facilities together like this development? How does this benefit Spelthorne?*

Answer:

Although this is the first Eco Park of its kind in the country, the technologies proposed are in use elsewhere. SITA UK has extensive experience of older style Eco Parks with co located facilities of different types. These include:

- SITA Kirklees, which is in an urban setting and co-locates energy from waste and material recovery facility technologies;
- Londonwaste Eco Park (where SITA was a 50% shareholder) is in an urban setting and co-locates energy from waste, in vessel composting and bulky waste recycling;

It is SITA UK's intention to develop other Eco Parks across the country to modernise existing sites as well as at new sites to provide the UK with much needed infrastructure to recycle and recover energy from waste.

The benefits to Spelthorne of developing the Eco Park are that it secures a reduction in heavy goods vehicle traffic in the local area and it also secures the presence of the community recycling centre, which is a very important and busy local asset. Were the Eco Park not to be developed then the waste transfer station and material recovery facility would need to be retained for wastes to be bulked locally and transported somewhere else for recovery and disposal. Therefore there would be no reduction in heavy goods vehicle traffic

Question: *What is an Anaerobic Digester - What does it do?*

Answer:

Anaerobic digestion (AD) has been used in the waste-water industry for decades and almost every big sewage treatment plant in the UK has an AD

plant as part of the water treatment. AD of solid and semi-liquid waste streams (e.g. food waste) is a more recent development, but has been used for around 15 years now. Germany alone has more than 4,000 AD plants and the number of plants in the UK is growing continuously. SITA Surrey Ltd, through SITA UK and Suez Environnement, has considerable technical expertise and our technical experts have thoroughly assessed the suitability of the technologies proposed

Anaerobic digestion is a process in which biodegradable material – e.g. food waste – is broken down by micro organisms in a sealed container in the absence of oxygen. This produces a gas (known as biogas) consisting of methane and CO₂, which can be converted into electricity, heat and digestate.

The process also produces what is known as a “digestate”. This product is dewatered and the solid part is similar to compost and can be used on land to replace artificial fertilisers.

Question: *What exactly is batch oxidation? What does it do and is it safe?*

Answer:

BOS gasification is a process where waste is heated in reduced levels of oxygen to temperatures above 650 degrees but not set on fire, to produce a gas. The gas (known as synthetic gas or syngas) is then used as fuel and burned at high temperatures to provide energy in a similar way to natural gas. A flue gas treatment system cleans the gas before it is released to atmosphere by a chimney or stack. BOS gasification is proven and safe, as is recovering energy from waste. Waste thermal treatment plants are amongst the most strictly regulated industrial processes in Europe and are closely monitored in England by the Environment Agency. SITA UK operates three thermal waste treatment plants safely and efficiently across the UK and Suez Environnement, our parent company, operate 50 in Europe.

Before the Eco Park can operate it must have an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency (EA), which is the industry regulatory body. This permit will set out conditions of operation and if these are breached the EA can – and does – shut down sites. We would not be issued with an Environmental Permit if this site posed an unacceptable risk to safety.

Question: *There are concerns from residents about potential pollutions Can you tell us what are the emissions and health effects for water – bearing in mind 20% of Spelthorne is water.*

Answer:

The gas engines connected to the anaerobic digestion units will release oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide while the batch oxidation system gasifier will release products of combustion (nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds), acid gases (sulphur dioxide, hydrogen chloride), particulate matter, heavy metals and trace elements including dioxins and furans.

Gas cleaning systems will be installed to ensure that the levels of any emissions from the plant comply with all the relevant European emissions standards. In addition the Eco Park will have a chimney-stack to effectively disperse emissions and this will be 49 metres tall.

A number of the reservoirs and other water bodies in Spelthorne Borough are protected as part of a Special Protection Area (SPA) and/or as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). In order to assess the impact on these sensitive areas, dispersion modelling was used to predict the concentrations of oxides of nitrogen and sulphur dioxide above them and compared this with the air quality objective for the protection of sensitive ecosystems. This showed that the impact would be insignificant.

According to the Environment Agency guidance, the impact can be screened out as insignificant if the concentration is less than 1% of the acceptable level on a long term basis and less than 10% on a short term basis.

As part of the Human Health Risk Assessment, we also considered the potential for pollutants to land on the water, accumulate in the water and contribute to concentrations in drinking water. It was assumed that residents of Spelthorne took all of their drinking water from the closet reservoir. The additional ingestion of pollutants through this route was found to be insignificant.

Both Surrey County Council and SITA UK are committed to ensuring that emissions from the Eco Park are as low as possible. For example, the EU standard for Nitrogen Oxide is 200 mg/Nm³ but the clean up technology for the proposed gasification plant will reduce the emissions of Nitrogen Oxide to 100 mg/Nm³, which is a significantly lower level.

Question: *There are concerns from residents about potential pollutions Can you tell us what are the emissions and health effects for air bearing in mind Heathrow and the motorways impact?*

Answer:

The exhaust gases from the Eco Park will mainly consist of nitrogen, oxygen, carbon dioxide and water vapour, but there will also be small amounts of potential pollutants. The gas engines connected to the anaerobic digestion units will release oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide. The BOS gasifier will release products of combustion, (nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds), acid gases (sulphur dioxide, hydrogen chloride), particulate matter, heavy metals and trace elements including dioxins and furans. Emissions will be minimised by various flue gas treatment methods.

However, merely stating that pollutants are released is not sufficient. We also need to consider how much is released and how much, if any, reaches humans to have a health effect. This is worked out using dispersion modelling to predict concentrations at ground level, which are then compared with acceptable levels, including air quality objectives.

For those pollutants that are not screened out further detailed assessment, including background concentrations, has been carried out and this confirms that the impact is negligible.

Question: *There are concerns from residents about potential pollutions _ can you tell us what are the emissions and health effects for noise and how will this be managed bearing in mind the proximity of the M3 to the proposed Eco Park.*

Answer:

A detailed noise assessment has been undertaken taking existing background noise levels and adding predicted operational noise levels on top of background levels. This noise assessment has shown compliance of the proposed Eco Park not only with British Standard BS4142 noise levels, but also the much more stringent Surrey County Council noise guidelines.

Question: *Can you categorically confirm there is nothing about operations of the site which will be detrimental to health?*

Answer:

The waste management industry is strictly regulated by the Environment Agency. We would not be allowed to operate any facility that poses a significant risk to human health. The Environment Agency can – and does – shut down non-compliant sites.

The risk to human health has been assessed in detail and has been found to be insignificant. This is worked out using dispersion modelling to predict concentrations at ground level, which are then compared with acceptable levels, including air quality objectives.

For those pollutants that are not screened out, further detailed assessment including background concentrations, has been carried out and this confirms that the impact is negligible.

Question: *How will these emissions be monitored? Will the public have access to the data?*

Answer:

There will be a continuous emissions monitoring system installed for the gasifier, which will monitor nitrogen oxides, sulphur dioxide, hydrogen chloride, volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide and dust. Other pollutants are released in such low concentrations that continuous monitoring is not practical, so samples are extracted from the exhaust gases every three months for analysis.

The results of the monitoring will be sent to the Environment Agency, where they will be made publically available.

Recent tests at the batch oxidation system gasification plant in Dumfries indicated that dioxin levels were well below that permitted under the environmental permit.

Question: *At the last Area Surrey Councillors meeting at Knowle Green it was stated that the residue from the anaerobic digester process will be 20 K tonnes a year which will be sold onto farmers for soil improvement. I want to know the process envisaged to store and transport this material away from the site as it is likely to have a very strong smell?*

Answer:

All operations at the anaerobic digestion plant will be undertaken within the proposed buildings or within the sealed vessels, to minimise any possibility of odour. There will be air extraction within the buildings to hold them in negative

air pressure, so that air is drawn in rather than any potential odorous air escaping out.

There will also be fast acting roller shutter doors to enable vehicles to go in and out but no air will be able to escape whilst this is taking place. This extracted air is fed through a biofilter to remove odour.

The process also produces what is known as a “digestate”. This product is dewatered and the solid part is similar to compost and can be used on land to replace artificial fertilisers. This will be stored on site inside a building under negative air pressure for a period of two weeks to allow it to mature and to ensure that the organic process has completed and produced a stabilised, processed material.

An odour management plan is being compiled in support of the Environmental Permit application, which will be submitted to the Environment Agency in November 2010. If the permit were granted then the Environment Agency would monitor the site through regular unannounced site inspections.

Digestate from the anaerobic digestion plant would be matured for a period of time within an enclosed building. It would then be transported from the site in covered vehicles.

Question: *Why are you intending to build the facility so close to houses? What are the risks and how will they be managed?*

Answer:

There are examples of thermal treatment plants being installed close to or in the middle of towns. These include:

- SITA Kirklees, which is in an urban setting and co-locates EfW and MRF technologies;
- Londonwaste Eco Park (where SITA was a 50% shareholder) is in an urban setting and co-locates EfW, IVC and bulky waste recycling;
- There is a plant in the centre of Paris on the banks of the river Seine;

Our technical experts have thoroughly assessed the suitability of the technologies proposed and we know that we would not be issued with an Environmental Permit if our facility posed an unacceptable health risk.

Waste treatment plants are amongst the most strictly regulated processes in Europe and are closely monitored in England by the Environment Agency. SITA UK operates three thermal waste treatment plants safely and efficiently across the UK and our parent company Suez Environnement operates approximately 50 in Europe.

Should we receive planning permission for the Eco Park, SITA UK will perform a Hazard and Operability study (HAZOP). This is an in depth assessment that evaluates and identifies possible issues that may arise. This assessment will take place during the detailed design stage of the project and will review all issues in order to guarantee that the facility is safe to operate. Going forward, the plant will be subject to 24 hour monitoring by trained, professional staff.

Question: *Will there be any hazardous materials or by products of the process stored at the site? If so how will this be managed?*

Answer:

The BOS gasification process produces what is known as a fly ash, which is a by-product of the flue gas treatment and is classed as hazardous waste. This is collected in specially designed bags during the gasification process and is removed from site to a specialist disposal facility. The facility at Charlton Lane would generate around 2,500 tonnes of this material per year.

Question: *How will a major fire and consequent toxic gas explosion at the site be prevented? How will you manage health and safety?*

Answer:

Hazard and Operability Studies (HAZOP) have been used for many years as a formal means for the review of chemical process designs and are a quantitative risk assessment technique. A HAZOP study is a systematic search for potential hazards such as flow, temperature and pressure.

The BOS gasification and anaerobic digestion processes will have already been subject to individual HAZOP studies and if we receive planning permission for the Eco Park, SITA UK will perform a HAZOP on the combined operations.

This assessment will take place during the detailed design stage of the project and will review all issues in order to guarantee that the facility is safe to operate. Once operating, the plant will be subject to 24 hour monitoring by trained, professional staff.

Question: *What is the difference between Energy from Waste and BOS Gasification?*

Answer:

Batch Oxidation System (BOS) gasification and energy from waste (EFW) are two different processes. With BOS gasification waste is treated in batches rather than burnt continually. It involves waste being heated with little air in a compartment to produce a gas. This gas is then set alight in a secondary compartment, to produce energy. BOS gasification allows for a lower building height, such as standard low-level industrial use buildings.

Alternatively, energy from waste (EfW) burns waste in the presence of lots of air. This means there is full combustion in only one compartment and the waste is fed continuously on a moving grate. EfW is cost effective on a larger scale than BOS gasification, for example 450,000 tonnes per year as opposed to 60,000 tonnes per year. This means that the facilities tend to be bigger.

Question: *What will be done to mitigate odour?*

Answer:

The Batch Oxidation system (BOS) gasification building will be run under a slight negative air pressure, as a way to mitigate any potential odours. This is a standard operational practice to control odour egress on facilities where odour could be produced. There are also odour suppressant fans spraying odour neutraliser onto the waste during loading operations as and when operations require. These fans can be left to run on timers throughout the night. An odour management plan is being compiled in support of the

Environmental Permit application to be submitted in November and this will then be regulated by the Environment Agency during their regular unannounced site inspections.

Food waste would be delivered to the plant in sealed containers which would be emptied inside the enclosed reception building of the anaerobic digestion plant. The anaerobic digestion reception, process and maturation buildings are run under deliberate negative air pressure with three air changes per hour and a biofilter to treat the waste air.

At the conclusion of this section of questions relating to pollution, health and technology the Chairman invited the independent experts to comment in particular was the site going to be detrimental to the health of residents. Reference was made to the issues that occurred at the Dumfries site.

Dr Mark Broomfield confirmed that he believed that all waste materials and gases had been assessed and was satisfied with how these were being dealt with. He did suggest to ensure coverage of all issues further assessments on potential deposition to water and ultra fine particles were covered.

6) Other

Question: *Will the scout hut need to be moved?*

Answer:

The proposed planning application for the Eco Park does not include the area that is currently occupied by the Scout hut. The Scout group can therefore continue to occupy these premises during the construction and operation of the proposed Eco Park.

Question: *Will this affect house prices? If so, what will SCC do about it?*

Answer:

The proposed Eco Park is designed to be an attractive facility, including a carefully designed stack, which would reduce its visual impact. There would also be benefits of enhancements to the local landscape and a reduction in heavy goods vehicle traffic compared with the existing operation.

We therefore do not believe that the Eco Park will affect house prices in the area.

Question: *What will be the benefits for Spelthorne Residents?*

Answer:

Spelthorne residents will benefit from the following:

- A reduction in Heavy Goods Vehicle traffic associated with the site
- Access to an attractive landscaped area adjacent to the eco Park
- Improvements to the community recycling centre access to reduce queuing
- Improved recycling facilities including a reuse centre on the site
- Attractively designed iconic buildings to replace those currently on site

1. **The committee resolved:**
 - a. To note the main concerns expressed by residents via the questions submitted on the proposed development of an Eco Park at Charlton Lane, Shepperton; and
 - b. To note the advice provided by the three independent expert witnesses.
2. **The Committee recommended that** the County Council should provide accurate baseline assumptions for both air and water-borne pollutants, and to establish satisfactory monitoring procedures with publically available results, if, the facility is developed.
3. **The Committee further:**
 - a. Identified the need to ensure that a rigorous process was established to monitor traffic/vehicle movements against assumptions made at the time of the Planning application;
 - b. Arrange for written answers to be obtained for all questions submitted by the residents and be published via the Borough Council's website - Questions submitted after the meeting to be processed in the same way;
 - c. Consider that appropriate penalties for non compliance to achieving environmental contributions should be established and enforced; and
 - d. That Surrey County Council hold a further open forum for all members of the public to attend.

The findings were agreed by the majority of committee members with Councillor Mrs E.M. Bell abstaining and Councillors Mrs C.E. Nichols and L.E. Nichols voting against.

At the conclusion of the meeting the Chairman placed on record her thanks and appreciation to all concerned including Councillors, residents of the Borough who attended the meeting and submitted questions, representatives from the Surrey County Council, Sita, the Independent expert witnesses and Halliford School for hosting the meeting

The Chairman also confirmed that the views already submitted by residents and any late submissions would be forwarded to Surrey County Council for a response. These together with the answers received to date would be placed on the Council's website with any other relevant information and sent to the residents concerned.