

NEWHURST ERF LOCAL LIAISON COMMITTEE (LLC) MEETING NOTES

MEETING HELD 12TH OCTOBER 2020, 1830-2000HRS (VIA ZOOM)

In attendance:

Cllr Christine Radford (CR)	LCC County Councillor, Shepshed
Cllr Max Hunt (MH)	LCC County Councillor, Loughborough North West
Cllr Jane Lennie (JL)	Shepshed Town Council
Cllr Peter Grainger (PG)	Shepshed Town Council
Cllr Maureen Havers (MH)	Charley Parish Council
Cllr John Savage (JS)	Charnwood Borough Council (CBC) Shepshed East
Julia Howard (JH)	Local Resident
Peter Wood (PW)	Local Resident
Peter Cunnington (PC)	Local Resident
Daniel Galpin (DG)	LCC Planning Officer
Mark Revill (MR)	Environment Agency (EA)
Ann Green (AG)	CBC Environmental Protection
David Spencer (DS)	Covanta
Craig Burdis (CB)	Covanta
John Orchard (JO)	Biffa
Mary Tappenden (MT)	Biffa
Dr David Best (DB)	Independent Facilitator

Apologies for absence: Pat Bailey, Helen Powers (EA), Alan Twells (CBC)

Disclaimer: Membership of the LLC does not imply either support for, or objection to, the Newhurst Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) development. Rather it is an opportunity to facilitate the flow of information between the developer and local communities.

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

- 1.1 MT introduced everyone present at the meeting. It was agreed that MT would chair the meeting on this occasion with Dr David Best taking over as Independent Facilitator at the next meeting.
- 1.2 A copy of the slides that were used during the meeting will be available on the Newhurst ERF website after the meeting has concluded. The link for the website is:

<https://info.covanta.com/newhurst#communityengagement>

2. **Introduction of Independent Facilitator**

- 2.1 Dr David Best introduced himself. His background includes being a consulting partner with Deloitte for 14 years. During that time, he trained in Gestalt therapy and facilitation. His experience includes being a facilitator for many years with Anglo American and also for the Gas Industry Engineering body around topics like carbon monoxide (CO) poisoning from central heating devices. This was a difficult forum including both the industry side and those whose lives had been affected by CO leakage. He has also facilitated at Queen Mary University in their strategy development and with a number of other organisations.

- 2.2 DB said his approach to this type of role is to make sure everyone is heard, but also what they mean to say comes across to others in the audience. He added that he will approach the role in an even-handed and independent way. His objective is to make sure that all points of view are heard and there is confidence that people can speak freely and safely even if what they have to say is quite difficult.
- 2.3 DB said that if anyone wishes to send him a note after the meeting then please do so. His email is: david@drdavidbest.net. He also sent the email address via “chat” during the meeting.

3. Minutes of the Last Meeting

- 3.1 MH asked where the slides from the last meeting could be found. DS/MT confirmed these are now on the website.
- 3.2 JH asked if the minutes are on the website. MT confirmed they would be once they have been approved as a true record .
- 3.3 The minutes of the meeting held on 27th July 2020 were accepted as a true record of the proceedings (they are now on the web site).

4. Matters arising (not covered elsewhere on the agenda)

- 4.1 There were no matters arising, not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

5. Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Committee

- 5.1 The draft ToR had been circulated before the meeting. MT ran through the new draft document, which was prepared after researching other ToRs on other developments. The new draft document attempts to cover all of the issues that are of interest to members.
- 5.2 Mark Revill (MR) expressed some reservation about the EA being a member of the committee rather than an invited professional advisor. MR did not think the EA needed to be present for the meeting to be quorate. It was agreed that the EA will send a representative when one is available, or when requested to attend on a specific issue. It was further agreed that the EA’s role would be more significant once the plant is in commissioning and operation.
- 5.3 MT added that a lot of questions have been raised by members of the Committee around issues such as R1, emissions and carbon capture. They are quite complex questions to answer and are more wider ranging questions about energy from waste generally. Biffa/Covanta can produce answers or position papers on these issues, but the EA position would also help members of the committee.
- 5.4 MH commented that as long as MR can be contacted and is responsive, then this is fine but if he needs to attend then the Committee would like him to be there.
- 5.5 DB referred to the issue of professional advisors. He said that compiling the agenda early would provide the opportunity and the time to invite any professional advisors to address any of the issues that will be discussed.
- 5.6 The remainder of this part of the meeting considered the criteria and the mechanism for appointing members as set out in the ToR under review. There were wide ranging views which are set out below.

5.7 It was generally agreed that individuals who are “active in the community” should be a primary requirement for members.

- MH suggested that there may be individuals within residents’ associations or large employers who would be interested in joining the LLC.
- PW commented that whilst “active in the community” is a good criterion, it then depends on what you meant by active in the local community.
- JH suggested making the selection “skills-based” with a list of essential and desirable skills. A desirable skill would be, for example, someone who understands waste management and air quality. Someone who can converse knowledgeably. She also agreed that being active in the community was an essential skill.
- MH suggested diversity should be considered and observed that the committee at present is not very diverse.
- JL expressed the view that if nominations are only open to people with experience in waste management or environmental impact then we will get no-one.

5.8 The “mechanism for finding volunteers” was discussed. It was generally agreed that new members should be identified through local press adverts, and through an article in the project’s community newsletters DS said generally new volunteers are sought by putting adverts in the local press. Once a list of prospective members is received, that list, with the credentials of the individuals is considered and the members vote. This is a diplomatic and transparent way of electing new members. He further suggested including a piece in the next community newsletter with a call for someone to come forward who wants to join the LLC.

- JT said the free magazine “Your Local” would be a good start and suggested an article for the magazine.
- JH put forward two Nanpantan residents who are interested in joining, Richard Price and Anthony Goodwin. The only other nomination so far is from Bill Bebbington from Shepshed.
- CR asked that everyone has access to and looks at the details of prospective candidates.
- PW thought that a deadline for nominations should be set such that a decision can be made at the next meeting.
- JL suggested advertising locally in Shepshed and the parts of Loughborough that are affected.
- JH added that there must be a lot of people in Loughborough who are interested, particularly as the development is now impacting on Loughborough rather than just Shepshed as was the case when the project was a landfill.
- CR commented that, in appointing someone, we have to recognise we have a site with planning permission and a permit, and we have to work with what we have got. The only issue is – how will it affect the local residents when it is up and running and that includes MH’s area (north west Loughborough) and Shepshed. Nanpantan will not be affected as much.
- DB commented that we need to reach people who have an interest in the area by virtue of the fact that they live, and are active in, the area rather than anyone who has specific domain knowledge about the development. We will have access to professional advisors to give that information. We need wider representation through Parish Council’s, free magazines, noticeboards and social media.
- DG suggested that a list of local community groups and businesses that are relevant to the community is drawn up. From that list it could be refined and then we could work from that. He also felt that a boundary should be set for where we draw members from.

- CR asked what area the newsletter going to cover? She suggested it should cover the whole of Shepshed, the whole of MH's area and also Hathern and Nanpantan.
- JH referred to the last minutes where it was stated that the newsletter would go out to a 3-mile radius. It will catch Woodhouse Eaves, Charley etc. DS said we were discussing this, but 3 miles was an arbitrary figure. He suggested we may consider mirroring the consultation zone for the ERF application. JH said it needs to go back to the 3-mile zone as she has already told people locally that the newsletter will be delivered in that zone. PW suggested this would cover all of the necessary area.
- Biffa/Covanta agreed to consider the extent of this area.

5.9 It was generally agreed that “Representation” needs to cover both the Shepshed and Loughborough sides of the M1.

- JH commented that there is a large part of Loughborough that isn't covered and referenced that the emissions from the plant will travel over Loughborough.
- JL added that this is not the only issue. Shepshed gets the motorway, congestion, and traffic fumes.
- JT said that the prevailing wind direction is across Garendon and the new houses for 90% of the time.

5.10 It was generally agreed that all resident “terms of office” (including current representatives) should be 3 years.

- JH suggested the term of office for resident members should be 3 years – including the incumbent members. When information goes out inviting people to apply to join, it should be for all the spaces on the committee i.e., 6.
- JH suggested the same should apply to the local Borough and County members on the Committee.
- CR commented there is no say as to who the elected members are. It is decided by the Council. She and Max were put on the committee because they are the local County Councillors, and it is the same with the Borough and the Town Councils.
- JH said she understands the process but there are more residents that need to be represented through elected members than there are at the moment. She added that the message she is getting at the moment from the local residents in her area is that it is desperately unfair.
- CR commented that she and MH fought against the project and did not get any support from anyone in Loughborough. She lives less than a mile away from the facility as does JT.

5.11 Summary and Actions:

- Biffa/Covanta to amend ToR in line with the discussion. Amended version to be circulated to members before next meeting.
- Biffa/Covanta to prepare and circulate the first community newsletter, including items on LLC and membership.

6. Newhurst Construction Update

6.1 CB presented a construction update. The slides accompanying the presentation are on the web site. The presentation included details of the site Covid Action Plan.

6.2 MH asked if the site has a first aider and if anyone is living on site. CB said the medic is a health professional. No one is living on site.

- 6.3 PG asked how many local residents have been recruited. CB did not have the numbers but commented the workforce is currently transient due to the nature of phased construction works. The operational side of the employment will be more local with 40-45 high quality jobs for the next 20-25 years.
- 6.4 PW asked about site visits and expressed some disappointment that it is not currently possible. CB said the current Covid rules mean only essential (construction related) visits are allowed but he will keep this under review this going forward.
- 6.5 PC added that it is important that the members of the Committee are familiar with what is going on at the site so that they can feed back to others who may be interested. PC agreed and commented the sooner site visits can be arranged the better.
- 6.6 DS said Covanta has a short film that explains how an EFW works. This is now on the Newhurst website (<https://info.covanta.com/newhurst#constructionprogress>). HZI has a side profile of an EFW plant that can also be used.
- 6.7 PW asked if a site manager has been appointed. The link between the Manager and the local community is very valuable. CB said that when the plant manager is appointed, they will be taking over his role at the LLC meetings. They will be appointed about 12 months from the start of the plant's commissioning phase.

7. Questions raised since last meeting (answers provided)

- 7.1 A document addressing all of the questions raised during and since the last meeting has been produced and is on the website.
- 7.2 JH asked for the results of the Biffa background air quality monitoring to be made available. MT will make the results available to the committee.
- 7.3 JH asked, how, when the site is operating will Biffa/Covanta avoid allowing any hazardous waste to be brought on to site. This was answered in the meeting. Biffa/Covanta has also produced a list of FAQ's and these are now available on the project web site. This question is considered under FAQ 18,20 and 22.

8. AOB and next meeting Agenda Items

- 8.1 DS asked for any agenda items for the next meeting to be notified in advance. It was agreed that a short presentation would be given by Biffa/Covanta on R1.

9. Date and time of next meeting

- 9.1 **Monday 11th January 2020 at 1500hrs.** Format to be advised closer to the date.