

NEWHURST ERF LOCAL LIAISON COMMITTEE (LLC) MEETING NOTES
MEETING HELD 11TH JANUARY 2021, 1500- 1630HRS (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 Joan Tassell (JT)	Charnwood Borough Council Shepshed West
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 (DPB)	Independent Facilitator

Apologies for absence: Alan Twells (CBC) **Note** G Newborough has stated that he wishes to remain on the Committee; Ms M Havers has stood down; Mrs Howard's role dealt with under the item on Terms of Reference (ToR).

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 and vice versa.

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 David Best welcomed members to the meeting.
- 1.2 A copy of the papers circulated with the Agenda 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>
- 1.3 Noted that the protocol for the preparation of the papers and their circulation would be dealt with under AoB.
- 1.4 DPB stated that the meeting would be recorded to help prepare the meeting notes, but the recording would be deleted once these were approved at the subsequent LLC meeting. A question was asked if the recording would be available on the website. DPB replied that there may be GDPR or privacy concerns with this. He would obtain advice on this and include the conclusion of this in the minutes of the meeting.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting.

- 2.1 These had been previously circulated. There were no comments on them, and they were therefore adopted as a correct record, and will be lodged on the website with the rest of the papers.

3. Matters Arising not on the Agenda.

- 3.1 A question was raised as to the status of the Traffic Management Plan and the landscaping plan for the site (and post operations restoration). Covanta stated that the information required for the Green Travel plan had been submitted. Landscaping and restoration would be covered under the construction update.

4. Presentation on R1- M Revell, C Burdis

- 4.1 *Mark Revell* presented the meaning and application of R1 to the Newhurst facility. He explained as background that R1 is a shorthand for the position in the 13 stages of the Waste hierarchy contained in the European Waste directive. "R1" indicating the use of waste to generate energy. With landfill being the lowest and least favoured position on the hierarchy.

The key points were:

- Some Planning Authorities have stipulated that an assessment to provide an R number should be sought by the operator at the Planning stage.
 - The EA use the formula or method for computing the energy efficiency of the proposed plant based on the method of operation. This method is specified in the European Waste Directive.
 - In the case of the Newhurst plant the coefficient is 0.87 or 87%, considerably in excess of the figure of 0.65 or 65%% given in the directive as the necessary efficiency for an R1 assessment.
 - The EA has done this since it has the resources and capability to do so.
 - The Assessment has been done at the design stage on the basis of the method and technology of operation of the plant.
 - This rating will then be validated when the plant becomes operational based on the real-world output.
- 4.2 It was noted that the previously circulated papers contained a number of questions and answers provided by *Mr Revell*, specifically Papers 5.0 and 5.1. Papers under item 6 also refer.
- 4.3 *Mr Burdis* thanked MR for a comprehensive explanation. He added that since Newhurst was intended to be one of the most efficient plants in Europe, the current assessment provided some confidence that the efficiency, based on the Design of the plant would be high.
- 4.4 *Julia Howard* thanked MR for the answers previously given but asked if the figure excluded Heat take off, if that became a feature of the operation? She further enquired what would happen to the efficiency.
- 4.5 *MR* replied that if heat was taken off as well that may increase the efficiency measure, but that it needed to be understood that heat and electricity were complementary. Therefore, if heat was taken, then electricity generation would fall, since the heat is needed to produce

the electricity and if heat was taken then the volume of electricity produced and exported to the National Grid would decrease. The efficiency however would probably increase.

4.6 A question was raised that the calculation has been done at the design phase? It was noted that a further in-depth assessment would be done in the operational phase to assess the then efficiency of the plant against the original assessment. The assessment of efficiency is therefore an ongoing process.

4.7 Several supplementary points were made:

- Visual aids for this type of technical presentation would be helpful. *MR and CB* both agreed that should either of them be called upon to present in future a visual element to their presentation would be helpful.
- *Councillor Hunt* raised the question as to whether it was the normal situation to provide an estimate of efficiency without a detailed technical design. *Craig Burdis* responded that the operation is being designed and built on an iterative basis and having been scoped at high level, each element of the design is being designed in detail as the timetable requires. It is usual to proceed in this way.
- *Councillor Tassell* asked if any of the heat or electricity had been offered to companies on the opposite side of the A512 to the site. *CB* noted that the large valves that *Councillor Tassell* had observed were the water supply to the plant installed by Severn Trent. He further noted that discussion on the range of options to supply neighbouring businesses were underway and every opportunity was being explored.
- *Councillor Lennie* asked if any waste would be taken in from other countries. This was categorically declared not to be the case by *Covanta/Biffa representatives*.

5. Questions and responses previously circulated

5.1 *DPB* drew attention to the papers circulated of questions posed by the *LAQPG* and by *Mrs Howard*. *DPB* Asked if there were any matters of clarification or any supplementary questions that were unanswered.

- *Mrs Howard* had raised supplementary questions, which had been previously circulated and, in part responded to, about air quality monitoring and the benchmarking against which monitoring would occur. It was stated by *Covanta/Biffa* that although there was a requirement for a great deal of data to be submitted to the regulator, the current monitoring was of NO_x to determine background levels in respect of lorry movements before the plant commences operation. The monitoring of NO_x is a requirement of the planning permission.
- *Mrs Howard* questioned how the plant would comply with the new regulations regarding <2.5Um particulates and whether *Covanta/Biffa* would provide written assurances that the plant would comply with the new regulations. *Covanta/Biffa* provided concrete assurances that the plant would comply with any and all regulations in force at the time. This will be done through the issue of a revised permit at the appropriate time.
- *Mrs Howard* raised the issue of whether there was a restoration scheme for the plant. *Covanta/Biffa* stressed that there was a scheme for the restoration of the quarry, which is part of the overall site., With regards to the plant, there is no requirement to provide a restoration scheme for the site once the plant reaches the end of its operational life. The plant has a nominal life of some 30 years. Should it become necessary redevelopment would be subject to a fresh planning

application to the standards of the day. As with all planning consents for industrial development, this is a permanent consent.

- *Mr Wood* asked if the movement of the 30% of HGV movements not controlled by Biffa/Covanta would travel to the plant by the A512. Covanta/Biffa stressed that in their view the majority (c.92%) would come via the M1 from various waste transfer sites. The point was noted, and routing would be stipulated in contracts to supply waste. Sanctions would be applied if haulier firms were found to be breaching these contracts.
- *Councillor Hunt* raised the point that what was noted was not always acted upon. *Covanta/Biffa replied that* it was stressed that the county council as well as Covanta/ Biffa were likely to monitor HGV movements very carefully.
- A question was raised as to whether the HGVs would be able to easily navigate the turn off the slave road providing site access from the M1. Covanta/Biffa responded that the latest road planning software had been used and they were confident that all vehicles turning would have adequate space to do so. It was also emphasised that the whole junction will be controlled by traffic lights (pdf of the plan attached).

6. Terms of Reference of the Committee

6.1 *DPB* invited *Councillor Hunt* to speak to his previously circulated observations (item 7.1).

- *Councillor Hunt* reiterated the points made in his paper and referred to the Covanta/Biffa response which pointed out the limit to the numbers of members established by the S106 agreement.
- *Councillor Radford* objected to the proposal to recruit more Leicestershire County Council representatives on the basis that Loughborough had been slow to take an interest.
- The radius of 3 miles versus the expansion to 5 miles was debated. After some discussion, the sense of the meeting was that 3 miles was an adequate area for members representing local residents.
- For the elected members of councils (Leicestershire County Council for example) the radius of three miles did not apply.
- *Councillor Hunt* also pointed out that Loughborough could be regarded as underrepresented on the basis of the current membership and interests of Loughborough as evidenced for example by the questions posed by the LAQPG.
- Mrs Howard had submitted suggestions as to the method of selection of members of the Committee (see paper 7.3)
- This method, of selection by a panel with the suggested selection criteria was generally accepted except for the issue of when such a selection should be made.
- In discussing the terms of office, it was pointed out that elected members served for a term concomitant with their elected term of office.
- Three years (as per the ToR) was proposed for resident members with a start date of January 2021, but was not debated.

7. Newsletter.

7.1 *David Spencer* drew attention to the Newsletter to be sent out in the week of the 11th of January. This was to go to some 13,000 households.

- It was observed that this newsletter contained an article which invited the community to express interest in joining the LLC. The hope was that this would result in a number of expressions of interest.
- *Councillor Hunt* asked how such interest was to be responded to in light of the proposed method of selecting members.
- *Councillor Hunt* expressed the view that it was up to the Facilitator not just to chair the meeting, but to come up with compromise solutions to put to the committee on the subject of which selection and representation were good examples.
- A lively exchange of opinions ensued.
- The facilitator agreed to produce a paper recommending a way forward.

8 Construction Update

8.1 This was held over to the next meeting due to lack of time.

9. Date and time of next meeting.

9.1 The next meeting is proposed to be held on the **12th of April from 1500 to 1700** (please note the expanded time) an Agenda and invitation will be issued nearer to the time.

10. Any other business

10.1 It was noted that Ms Havers had stood down as the observing member for Charley Parish Council. Mrs Howard would continue to serve as a local resident member but had undertaken to brief charley Parish Council on the proceedings of the committee.

POSTSCRIPT

1. Please note that Mrs P Bailey has resigned from the Committee.

2. In response to *Cllr Hunt's* question on whether the recordings of the LLC meetings could be uploaded to the project website. *Biffa/Covanta* considered this request, however, due to data protection and GDPR implications, together with the personal safety of members and their properties, it was felt that this request could not be agreed to.

3. In correspondence following the meeting the resident members have expressed a preference for the three-year term to begin in January 2021.