

Minutes of Energy from Waste Stakeholder Group Meeting			
Date	16.03.2016		
Location	SEPA, Inverdee House, Baxter Road, Aberdeen		
Chairperson	Pete Lawrence (PL), Aberdeen City Council, Waste Management		
Minutes	Pam Walker (PW), Aberdeen City Council, Waste Management		
Attendees	<p>Councillor Jean Morrison (JM) John Brownhill (JB), Nigg CC Alan Strachan (AS), Nigg CC Michele McPartlin, Cove & Altens CC Raymond Clark, Cove & Altens CC Andrew Giblin (AG), United Fish Industries Catherine Cowie (CC), Kincorth and Leggart CC David Fryer (DF), Torry Community Council Gary Mitchell (GM), Kincorth and Leggart CC George Smith (GS), SEPA Tim Poole, SEPA Linda Ovens (LO), Amec FW Pam Walker (PW), Aberdeen City Council, Waste Management Prof Rob Jackson (RJ), Jackson Associates Simon McLean (SM), Torry Community Council Gregor McAbery, FOE David Dunne, Aberdeen City Council</p>		
Item 1 Apologies	Alan Donnelly, Aberdeen City Council, Ray Grant (RG), John Lawrie Group, Joanna Mackie (JoM), ACC Communities & Partnerships, Hannah Lynch, ACC Waste Management, Sue Horrobin, Aberdeenshire Council, Alan Finlayson, ACC.		
		Action	Responsible
Item 2	Previous Minutes & Actions		
	The minute was agreed as a true reflection of the last meeting.		
	<u>Actions</u>		
	<p>Identification of Chairperson (PL). Potential for PW to chair or potentially has another potential candidate – will continue to pursue this for next meeting.</p> <p>Approach AHP for example costs re district heating. No further progress on this.</p> <p>Investigate Options for Community Trust. DF mentioned there was already a Torry Development Trust and he was the contact. JM suggested Fintry Development Trust was a good example.</p> <p>Identify some case studies of regulation activity – GM has done this and will pass information to HL for circulation.</p> <p>Animation/videos of EfW? LO provided links and these have been circulated. Complete.</p> <p>FAQs – no further requests for additions but can be updated at any time with additional questions.</p> <p>Dundee visit. Contact made with Dundee City Council and they are open to a visit. Date and arrangements to be made.</p> <p>Contact Marischal College about display boards. HL has made contact , awaiting response.</p>	<p>Identify potential suitable chairperson(s)</p> <p>Further work on potential financial benefits.</p> <p>Investigate options for Community Trust</p> <p>Info to be provided to HL.</p> <p>Arrange Dundee visit</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>PW/JM</p> <p>PW/JM</p> <p>GS</p> <p>HL/PW</p>

	Re-circulate links to business case, etc. and provide SM with copies on memory stick. Complete.		
Item 3	Transport		
	<p>LO gave a summary of the transport chapter from the EIA that was submitted as part of the planning application and highlighted where to find the relevant information. There were a number of questions from the group about the numbers and types of vehicles that would be visiting the site.</p> <p>SM asked if this had been modelled based on 150ktpa or more – confirmed that 150 ktpa was the case.</p> <p>AG asked if the export of the IBA was also included in the numbers – it was. As is the fly ash removal and chemical deliveries (which are few).</p> <p>RJ asked what mitigation measures were planned to be implemented? LO said that the EIA outcome showed that none were required although there would be some minor alterations to the entrance of the site and on-street parking.</p> <p>Queries also over the breakdown of City/Shire/Moray vehicles also were made and responded to.</p> <p>Suggested that a summarised table outlining vehicle numbers could be added to the FAQ document.</p> <p>DF asked about routes to the site – would these be specified to ensure vehicles only used a certain route? PL said ACC vehicles would deliver waste from around the city so would likely use the city centre road network but it was anticipated that Aberdeen shire and Moray would use the AWPR and come up Wellington Road from the south. This could be conditioned by the planning authority.</p>	<p>Produce summary table/graphical representation of vehicle numbers</p> <p>Update FAQs</p>	<p>LO</p> <p>PW/HL</p>
Item 4	Site Visit		
	<p>A party of 12 attended a site visit to Lincoln EfW on 15 March. PL gave a brief summary of this and outlined the details of the facility – 150,000 tonnes/annum capacity (same as proposal for Aberdeen), and plant has been running less than 2 years. The visit included presentations from the operators followed by discussion which was attended by local residents, town councillor, county council representative and the site manager.</p> <p>JB continued to describe the visit saying that the facility was built on a flat site in an industrial estate, local people seemed content with its being there. It is a big building – 45 m high and stack height of 75 m. The operators said they had had 17 complaints about the site since it became operational – most of these were internal complaints about odour inside the building. The plant produces electricity only but is “district heating ready” if a heat user can be established – in England there is no requirement to utilise the heat and power in the same way as there is in Scotland. Plant was very clean and JB was surprised at how little furnace heat was felt. The monitoring process is extensive with automatic shutdown in case of any issue. Plant operates within all of the allowed limits. Has had 91% availability so far. Bunker can hold about one week’s supply of waste – they have no other waste storage.</p>		

	<p>AS said he had previously visited a facility in Cleveland a few years ago which had a much bigger tipping area and had air freshener in the reception hall. He noted that the composition of the waste a Lincoln looked different – less recyclate - and the quality of the IBA was less contaminated. This may be due to better recycling services and education.</p> <p>RC noted that Lincoln had made some improvements to the roads in the area prior to commissioning.</p> <p>DF asked if they did off-site monitoring – LO responded that they did, in a nature reserve that was next to the plant. Also asked what recycling rate was prior to plant and after – Lincoln said it was 44% before and 51% now. Did they take third party waste? They did – this was part of the contract – modelled at one-third of the capacity but in practice they were taking less.</p> <p>AG asked about calorific value and variation of this – PL said that the value of MSW does vary but the proposed plant will be built taking account of the variances that occur within MSW, which are not that significant in any case.</p> <p>Question about the capacity of the plant and whether other waste types would be brought in if there wasn't enough waste – plant has been sized with the best estimate of what the three LA's expect their waste arisings to be at that point. GS said that if the waste type for the facility was to change this would require SEPA's approval to ensure that it would still be able to comply with its permit.</p> <p>DF asked if we can publicly state the facility is safe? SEPA require that the plant demonstrates that it will not create pollution. The permit commits the operator to meet high standards and requirements and the regulator has the power and resources to make this happen.</p> <p>JM stated that the plant will include continuous monitoring and the information from this will be publicly available. Also that the benefits of the district heating system in alleviating fuel poverty in the area were very important.</p>		
Item 5	<p>Planning Application Update & Public Consultation</p> <p>PL said that the planning application is now live on the Council's Planning portal and is open for comment.</p> <p>Query over timescale for the consultation – PL said that the planning service had confirmed that community councils were deemed to be statutory consultees in this type of application and the Planning Officers had indicated that they would be able to comment up until late May but that CC should liaise with the planners on this. Public comment is open from 28 days from date of press advert which has not yet been published. RJ was concerned that the CCs might not have adequate time.</p> <p>RJ said that his role would be to review the planning documents chapter by chapter and to write a brief synopsis of each which would be sent to the community councils. He would agree with the CCs how best to engage with them and to assist them with the information.</p>	<p>RJ to review and report to CC on content of Planning Application</p>	<p>RJ</p>

Item 6	Communication		
	<p>Public Consultation was held at end of Feb/early March. There were 77 attendees in total which was a little less than the November events.</p> <p>PW said that summarised sets of the banners used at the EFW Exhibitions are being produced and will be used to publicise the planning application round Aberdeen. Aberdeenshire and Moray will also have a set each of the same banners.</p> <p>PW circulated a draft copy of a plan detailing some proposed locations for the banners and asked the CCs for feedback on this. Also asked for details of any local community newsletters or websites/social media sites which could assist with raising the profile of the project.</p> <p>Information on the planning application reference and link to the relevant page has been circulated to the Stakeholder Group and the contact list. The information is also on the project website and will be further publicised on social media.</p>	<p>Send feedback on publicity plan and details of local newsletters, websites, etc to WasteStrategy @aberdeencity.gov.uk</p>	<p>ALL</p>
Item 6	AOB		
	<p>SM asked for a copy of the Halcrow Report that was referred to in one of the earlier reports. This to be provided on memory stick.</p>	<p>Provide copy of report.</p>	<p>PW/HL</p>
Item 7	Date of next meeting		
	<p>Wednesday 13th April from 4-6pm at SEPA, Inverdee house (venue tbc)</p>	<p>Confirm venue available.</p>	<p>GS</p>