

Minutes

Padworth Liaison Group

6.45 pm, Thursday 3 December 2009

Holiday Inn, Padworth

Attendees:

Name	Representing/Company/Department
Jeannette Buckle	Chairperson (Veolia Environmental Services)
Ron Charlton	Resident
Carol Coker	Resident
Mr. Coker	Resident
Matt Kendall	Environment Agency
Simon Tapley	Environment Agency
Matt Meldrum	West Berkshire Council (Planning)
Cllr. Keith Lock	Padworth Parish Council
Janis Daly	Resident
Owen Dimond	Veolia Environmental Services
Tracey Reilly	Veolia Environmental Services
Andrew Deacon	West Berkshire Council (Waste Team)
Cllr. Hilary Cole	West Berkshire Council (Member for Environment)
Anna Smy	West Berkshire Council (Environmental Health)
David Evered	Padworth Parish Plan Committee
Samantha Lee	Padworth Parish Plan Committee
Mr. Keith Gilbert	Padworth Parish Council
Bill Goudge	Padworth Parish Council
Keely Gallagher	Veolia Environmental Services (Minutes)

Apologies:

Gary Cranford	Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce
David Copley	Kennet & Avon Canal Trust
Chris Perkins	Oil & Pipelines Agency

Item	Subject	Action
1	Welcome and Introductions The chairperson invited the group to introduce themselves and their reasons for being involved in the group.	



Minutes

2 Terms of Reference

- 2.1 The chairperson invited the group members to review the Terms of Reference, then invited comments.
- 2.2 David Evered pointed out that the Terms of Reference refer to “members of the public”, but that this fails to recognise the significance of the planned development for the local community. This will have an impact on those living in close proximity to the site, the users of the village hall and the community more widely. He pointed out that there are three major partners in the liaison group: Veolia Environmental Services, West Berkshire Council and the Community of Padworth. A number of other organisations have a legitimate but more limited interest and certain official agencies have an important regulatory function. It was essential that the Group should recognise the particular situation of the host community and those who had a specific role in representing the views of local residents. KG(VES)
- 2.3 Matt Kendall stated that the Terms should include a reference to the agencies involved in the operation of the site, such as the Environment Agency.
- 2.4 Jeannette Buckle proposed an amend to the text to read: *‘The Group consists of various local community representatives, members of the public, representative/s of West Berkshire Council, Regulatory bodies, other interested parties and Veolia Environmental Services to represent Padworth Sidings site and neighbours.’* (After the meeting an alternative was put forward which has been taken on board).
- 2.5 It was agreed to re-draft the Terms to include the points made above and then re-circulate them to the whole group.

2a Membership of the Liaison Group

- 2a.1 David Evered pointed out that it may be necessary for different representatives of the Parish to attend depending on their availability. David will provide contact details to ensure that information is circulated to all concerned. DE



Minutes

2a.2 Janis Daly stated the view that the group should avoid becoming fragmented, into different groups, with different points of view.

2a.3 Tracey Reilly stated the wish for a level of consistency in membership of the liaison group, which would benefit the group and its aims as a whole. The parties agreed, but accepted that representation from the Parish may vary from time to time due to personal commitments of representatives.

3 Overview of the Contract

3.1 Tracey Reilly provided the group with a presentation on the history and contract that Veolia Environmental Services and West Berkshire Council hold to manage waste in the district. Following the presentation, questions were invited.

3.2 Cllr. Keith Lock asked for a clarification on Landfill Tax, regarding the targets and the resulting cost should those targets not be met and waste should be landfilled.

3.3 Jeannette Buckle asked what the specific penalties were for exceeding the Landfill allowance. Andrew Deacon provided the figure of £150 per tonne, but noted that with the provision of Padworth, West Berkshire was predicted to landfill only 10-12,000 tonnes of waste per year once the Contract and facilities become fully operational.

3.4 Mr. Keith Gilbert and Janis Daly wished to have a comparison of the cost of landfilling waste, to the cost of building and operating the facility at Padworth, in regards to the government loan to be repaid.

3.5 Andrew Deacon clarified that PFI credits are not a loan but a sum paid to West Berkshire Council on an annual basis over 25 years to build Padworth IWMF and operate an integrated waste contract.

3.6 Janis Daly requested a comparison between the cost of current waste management strategy and the cost of the new integrated waste system at Padworth.

3.7 Tracey Reilly agreed to return at the next meeting with data to demonstrate the 'financial logic' of the facility at Padworth.

TR



Minutes

- 3.8 Andrew Deacon noted that the cost of doing nothing would be more expensive, both financially and environmentally.
- 3.9 Mr. Keith Gilbert asked if the product of the composting facility would be saleable, given that he had seen another site producing low quality material that had been subsequently landfilled.
- 3.10 Tracey Reilly confirmed that the product would be sold, Veolia Environmental Services already produces and sells organic soil conditioner and has done so for a number of years. She also noted that the sale of the product would not provide any profit, but offset some costs associated with operation of the facility.
- 3.11 Jeannette Buckle confirmed from personal experience that the product, branded Pro-Grow, was of a high quality and also certified by the Soil Association.
- 3.12 Mr Keith Gilbert asked whether the product would be available to local Padworth residents for free, or at a discount. Tracey Reilly stated that amounts of soil conditioner would be available for promotional events.
- 3.13 Samantha Lee stated that in Tracey's presentation listed the benefits for the general public in West Berkshire but had made no reference to specific benefits for the people of Padworth. The Group stated that it would be good to see investment by Veolia in Padworth so that the local community could see a positive aspect of the site being located in Padworth. Some ideas were discussed briefly but, to ensure that ideas are properly documented and collated, Tracey asked that members should bring suggestions to the next meeting. .
- 3.14 Tracey Reilly stated that this group provides a mechanism for the local community to present opportunities to Veolia Environmental Services so that the company can help the community achieve its aims.
- 3.15 David Evered stated that he saw an opportunity for the Education Centre at the site to be a place to educate people on local wildlife and natural habitats.



Minutes

- 4 Current Activity on site & next three months**
- 4.1 Andrew Deacon provided an update on recent and current operations on site, including decontamination, bioremediation, removal of buildings.
- 4.2 Additional contamination has been identified and will be dealt with appropriately. Services (electricity and water) will be brought to the site and the operations as a whole should be mainly complete by the end of the year. Off-site highway works have been delayed, but will be started and completed in the early part of 2010. Following the completion of on-site works, the site will be handed over to Veolia Environmental Services and the programme of construction is due to start in March 2010.
- 4.3 Janis Daly, on behalf of other local residents, stated that they feel that there has been a lack of information regarding the plans and works on the road (Padworth Lane and the A4 junction in particular). In relation to the pavement, they are unsure which side of the road it will be on, and they have concerns about the practicalities of crossing the road.
- 4.4 Owen Dimond stated that the approved plans for the road are available from West Berkshire Council's website (planning section).
- 4.5 Jeannette Buckle suggested that a finished plan of the highway works be provided to the group, by email or post depending on practicalities of size. KG(VES)
OD(VES)
- 4.6 Tracey Reilly asked if the Parish Council would be willing to display a copy of this plan on their notice board. Mr. Keith Gilbert agreed. KG(PC)
- 4.7 Matthew Meldrum stated that he was not aware of any diversion from the plan for the highways works, and offered to circulate the link to the group. MM
- 4.8 David Evered noted that the improvement of communications was an issue to be addressed, but also that the current contractors have been very accommodating and helpful towards local residents.



Minutes

- 4.9 Cllr. Lock asked if Andrew Deacon had received any update from the Oil & Pipelines Agency in relation to the road works on Padworth Lane. Andrew Deacon confirmed he had heard nothing further. It was stated that although the OPA had objected to the highways works, there was no additional response from them.
- 4.10 Tracey Reilly in response to a question stated that the contractor for the construction work would be Vinci Construction UK.

5 **Planning Update**

- 5.1 Owen Dimond provided an update on the S73 planning application, to amend drawings previously submitted to West Berkshire Council.
- 5.2 David Evered requested confirmation of the location of the vehicle depot and washing facilities. Owen Dimond showed the group the location on a plan of the facility. The vehicle depot and wash is located in the centre of the buildings which make up the Integrated Waste Management Facility.
- 5.3 Mr. Keith Gilbert asked if the new sorting equipment for the Materials Recovery Facility would sort recyclables automatically. This was confirmed to be the case, although there will be some manual (negative) sorting, i.e. staff remove any remaining contamination at the end of the line to improve quality of recycle.
- 5.4 Mrs. Coker asked where electrical items would be taken by members of the public in the mini-HWRC. Owen Dimond identified this on the plan.
- 5.5 Mr. Keith Gilbert noted that the mini-HWRC site would only accept recyclable waste materials, not 'black bag' waste.
- 5.6 Jeannette Buckle stated that an A3 plan of the site would be provided to all members before the next meeting of the group. KG(VES)
- 5.7 A question was asked if there was a requirement for all people visiting the site not to use Padworth Lane, east of the canal. It was replied that all Veolia vehicles will be



Minutes

required to turn left out of the site, unless they are specifically working in that area of Padworth village, for example collecting domestic waste and recycling from households.

- 5.8 Cllr. Lock suggested a physical barrier should be placed at the entrance to prevent a left turn into the facility from Padworth Lane. David Evered stated the lane south of the canal was used heavily by walkers, riders and horses, and by nursery school children crossing the lane.
- 5.9 Matt Meldrum responded that Planning and Highways had the view that a physical barrier would be ineffective and that such a barrier could even cause dangerous situations, where road users may try to circumvent such a barrier. He also quoted Newtown Road HWRC as an example where site users have been known to deliberately ignore the “anti turn” traffic island, risking potential accidents in the process.
- 5.10 Mr. Charlton asked for specific details on traffic figures for operational and visiting vehicles using the site. Jeannette Buckle agreed this would be provided at the next meeting OD(VES)
- 5.11 Samantha Lee asked why the road had been designed in this way, as it was her view that the use of single track access was dangerous.
- 5.12 Jeannette Buckle recommended that Owen Dimond and the Highways department provide a short report to the group regarding the reasons behind their choices on design and how these are part of the planning application. OD(VES)
- 5.13 Mr. Keith Gilbert stated that the residents of Padworth had been promised that a Civic Amenity site would not be part of this facility.
- 5.14 Janis Daly noted that this site did not include a Civic Amenity site, as the mini-HWRC is not the same as a Civic Amenity site, which accept non-recyclable waste streams.
- 5.15 Tracey Reilly clarified the difference between the two in terms of design, purpose and operation.
- 5.16 Cllr. Lock stated that they had originally been informed



Minutes

that a 'bring site' would be included in the design, but was then removed and subsequently added back in.

5.17 Andrew Deacon noted that with a Civic Amenity site, the vast majority of traffic is generated by the delivery of non-recyclable waste.

5.18 Cllr. Lock stated that the traffic on Rectory Road had been slightly overlooked at the Planning Committee meeting.

5.19 Matt Meldrum noted that the traffic management plan applied to the HGVs travelling to and from the site.

5.20 David Evered and Matt Meldrum suggested that the West Berkshire Council Highways Department attend the next meeting of the group, in order to answer queries directly.

AD

5.21 Matthew Meldrum suggested that the group should look at the traffic modelling, which includes the details about reduced hours of operation for the mini-HWRC.

5.22 Mr. Keith Gilbert stated that with the mini-HWRC operational on the weekends, there would be no quiet traffic days in the village.

5.23 Simon Tapley questioned the plans in regards to the area within the boundary surrounding the site. Owen Dimond responded with an outline of landscaping belt, woodlands, wetland areas and a spider habitat.

5.24 Jeannette Buckle stated that the site plan and the landscaping information would be provided to all group members for their information packs.

KG(VES)

5.25 Mr. Carlton noted that West Berkshire Council had purchased Venture Fair and queried its intended use in relation to the site. Andrew Deacon stated that plans for the property at Venture Fair were unconfirmed, but that it would not be used to gain vehicle access into the Padworth facility.

5.26 Janis Daly asked if there was any intention to monitor air quality specific to the In-Vessel Composting Facility and bio-aerosols. She noted that this was a crucial concern for residents living close to the site boundary. She also



Minutes

- requested that residents have access to results from on-going monitoring.
- 5.27 Matthew Randall noted that a schedule of monitoring would form part of the permit required for operation of the facility, taking into account the risk assessment and conditions of the site. Pre- and post-monitoring (annually) would be normal for this type of facility.
- 5.27a Veolia Environmental Services recommends that the subject of monitoring and exactly what will be monitored be addressed at a later meeting.
- 5.28 Janis Daly stated that noise was an issue for residents.
- 5.29 Anna Smy stated that nuisance noise was the responsibility of the Environmental Health Officer.
- 5.30 Matthew Meldrum noted that the Environmental Impact Assessment was a public document, and any data submitted would also be published on the West Berkshire Council website in the planning area. Documents here are accessible to the public.
- 5.31 Janis Daly asked what the difference was between planning department responsibilities, Environment Agency permits and planning conditions. Owen Dimond noted that further monitoring of noise is required by one of the planning conditions.
- 5.32 Mr. Keith Gilbert asked if there would be continuous monitoring of odour. Owen Dimond replied that the permit for operation requires an odour management plan, of which monitoring schedules would form a part. This plan is starting to be prepared, based on Veolia's experience with a comparable site in East Sussex.
- 5.33 Tracey Reilly assured the group that Veolia Environmental Services has to show that any testing done is independently checked and evidenced that the technology used is robust and suitable for its purpose. Veolia is using the site in East Sussex as an example.
- 5.34 Janis Daly asked if it would be possible for the group to visit the site in East Sussex to see how it works. Mr. Keith Gilbert asked if it would be possible to see the biofilters.



Minutes

- 5.35 Jeannette Buckle described the biofilters to the group, which are similar to a layer of wood chips, which filter the air from the facility. Jeannette Buckle agreed to investigate visit arrangements for the group. JB
- 5.36 David Evered stated that this group should have input into the suitability of barriers, noise limits, etc. Anna Smy described the reasons and the process for identifying suitable noise limits.
- 5.37 Janis Daly stated that this group should have direct input into the designs of the facility. Owen Dimond responded that the purpose of the group included the role of advising on impacts that affected residents once the site was operational. It was pointed out that local residents also had concerns of possible negative impacts on the local environment during the construction phase.
- 5.38 In response to statements about changing the layout of the road or other aspects of the Planning Permission or Environmental Permit, Jeannette Buckle stated that this group could not take authority from organisations such as the Environment Agency or the Planning Department and indeed they are the experts in their relevant field, but through this group seek clarification and discuss the matter with the relevant organisation to address any issues members of the group may have.

6 Future meetings

- 6.1 Jeannette Buckle asked the group members to suggest a suitable date for the next meeting or the frequency of meetings, bearing in mind that construction will not be starting until March 2010.
- 6.2 Cllr. Cole suggested that quarterly meetings would be suitable.
- 6.3 David Evered suggested that the next meeting should be sooner to allow issues from this meeting to be resolved, such as lighting design and landscaping. He added that he felt the landscape plans are not detailed enough. Owen Dimond replied that the landscape plans are accompanied



Minutes

by lists, which identify trees down to species; also that the approved lighting plan on file would be superseded by a more detailed version. It was agreed that detailed landscape plans would be provided for members of the Group.

- 6.4 David Evered suggested that the next meeting should be held in six weeks time and that a representative from the Highways department should also attend. AD
- 6.5 Anna Smy recommended that the construction contractor should also be represented at future meetings. TR
- 6.6 Jeannette Buckle suggested a meeting in early February to allow the construction management plan to be available to the group.
- 6.7 The date of Thursday 4th February 2010 was agreed by the group for the next meeting.
- 6.8 Issues to be added to the agenda for the next meeting were the Construction Management Plan and Highways/Traffic.
- 6.9 The location and timing of the meeting were agreed to remain the same: 6.30 pm for 6.45 pm start, at the Holiday Inn on Padworth Lane. KG(VES)

MEETING CLOSED

