Devonport Incinerator Liaison Committee Meeting

Date: 20th August; 2014

Weston Mill Oak Villa social club: 7 - 9 pm

Present:

Statutory bodies:

- George Wheeler GW (PCC)
- Jane Ford JF (MVV)
- Alistair Macpherson AM (Low carbon Team, PCC)
- David Mudge DM (EA)
- Sarah Taylor ST (EA)

Guests:

• Mr Uglow - MU

Resident members:

- Melv Chislett MC
- George Cooke GC
- Janis Uglow JU
- David Angove DA
- Steve Carder SC

ITEM		ACTION
11 - 141		AOTION
1.	Apologies	
	Mark Turner (SWDWP)Paul Carey (MVV)	
2.	Terms of Reference and Membership	
	It was agreed that membership should remain flexible and welcoming to enable residents to attend meetings when specific issues are being raised / discussed. MC agreed to chair this meeting and was thanked by the committee.	
3.	Minutes from previous meeting	
	One amendment from the EA was noted and the minutes will be updated before being published on MVV's website.	JF
4.	Vehicle Movements	
	JF provided details of lorry movements associated with the operation of the EfW CHP Facility, as requested by the committee.	
5.	Forthcoming activities and other updates	
	PCC Low Carbon Team AM was present to talk about fuel poverty, district energy and Plymouth Energy Co-operative. Having clarified that those present understand what district energy is, AM referred to MVV's planning application which referenced the possibility of supplying heat as well as electricity from the Facility. The primary heat customer is the MoD, with an additional heat potential of around 2.8 MW _{th} however, the right location and circumstances are necessary for this to work. Unfortunately the scoping report for Barne	

Barton and Weston Mill doesn't look promising.

JU questioned why this decision had been reached without consulting residents.

AM confirmed that feasibility studies were continuing but District Heating (DH) requires sufficient heat demand in one location. PCC are looking at various locations over the long-term (ie. decades), including Derriford, City Centre, Weston Mill and Barne Barton. He also explained the need for everyone to buy into such a scheme if it is to be successful.

MU had some information from other DH schemes and successes in Europe.

AM explained that European successes have used nodes of heat and expanded out from there. A scheme in Barne Barton for example, based on 240 properties, would cost between £15 and 19, 000 per property. This is not feasible at the moment, although Sanctuary Housing are looking at the possibility of a biomass plan for Talbot Gardens (awaiting input from Sanctuary). The council are therefore reaching the conclusion that it would be better to make properties energy efficient in other ways.

JU pointed out that none of this is actually helping residents, especially as the Green deal is just a loan.

AM clarified that the Plymouth Energy Co-operative was part funded by the MVV S106 low carbon infrastructure payment and has been involved in door knocking exercises and installing solar panels on schools.

It was noted that S106 funds are public money and the council are accountable for them. The council were obliged to thoroughly consider DH but are now able to look at other ways of using the money to enable access to other existing schemes.

MU described the case in Oslo, where a modern DH scheme on a larger scale serves a residential heat area of similar size and population to Plymouth. There is less heat available from the EfW Facility but we are talking about heating a smaller area. Would it not be possible for the local council and central government to provide funding for the required infrastructure if this is a long-term aspiration for the city?

MC offered to arrange a meeting for residents but JF pointed out that Alison Cooke (AC) and Sally Godber (SG) are still working on this with residents and invited GC to provide an update.

GC: the council leader (TE) has visited Weston Mill residents as a result of meeting with Alison and Sally. He expressed a concern to residents that as the Facility was granted planning permission under a Conservative administration, Weston Mill had been overlooked.

GW expressed some surprise at TE's words and suggested that residents drum up enough support and buy-in to apply for a feasibility study.

GC pointed out that a lot of properties are let out and it is difficult to get buy-in.

GW explained that if residents wanted to challenge what the council are spending the S106 funds on they would need their own experts (which they appear to have in AC / SG).

JU and MU wished to acknowledge that, as homeowners, they have a responsibility for their properties but are desperately in need of help.

DA pointed out that elderly residents could well have passed away

before anything happens and suggested a reduction in council tax as compensation.

GW explained that residents can apply for re-banding or to the valuation office.

MC reiterated GW's advice that the next step is to gather enough support amongst neighbours.

JU commented that she had visited the EfW site and been impressed with what it can do, she feels frustrated knowing it could do so much more. How can residents access funding? AC / SG are still working on this and GC feels much more positive after meeting TE, although he questioned the absence of Ham Ward councillors on this ILC.

GW explained that there are an extremely large number of committees across the City, all requesting Councillor membership. The ILC has one councillor member (GW), who represents Plymouth City Council.

GW pointed out (on behalf of all residents close to MVV's site) that residents would like to know how they can benefit from the S106.

AM clarified that AC has applied for North Yard Trust funding but was not successful in securing money for assessments of properties and is now looking into free assessments and capital grants. He also confirmed that the DH process is coming to an end so other possibilities will be investigated.

It was suggested that the NYCT could be used as a vehicle for conversations about these matters but JF advised residents would be far better to stick to the one route that is already in motion. This should help to reduce the confusion that still exists regarding the functions of various groups (ILC, NYCT, PCC).

Air Quality Management Plan

JF updated those present with the locations of the diffusion tubes which have now been installed.

GW asked for a map of locations to be sent around with these minutes (attached).

The particulate monitor at Camels Head junction is due to be installed in a couple of weeks' time and the data will be presented in a user-friendly format.

JF added that MVV will purchase a second particulate monitor, which will be installed and maintained by PCC.

GW asked where this would be sited and JF offered to find out.

Commissioning

JF explained that the construction phase will be coming to an end over the last months of this year and the project will enter a phase known as commissioning. This will be monitored by the Environment Agency and carried out in line with a Commissioning Management Plan.

It is MVV's intention to warn residents of any unusual or noisy activities which might be associated with commissioning, in particular steam blowing of the boiler and pipework.

There was some discussion around experiences when Langage gas-

JF

JF

	fired turbine fired up and also the extremely loud steam blowing at Exeter EfW. DM pointed out that Exeter had had no silencers in place, whereas MVV have fitted silencers to steam blowing vents ahead of this activity taking place. He stressed the importance of this and the noise modelling which has been carried out by independent consultants. It was agreed that the next ILC meeting should focus just on Commissioning and resident concerns relating to this.	
6.	Any other business	
	There was a request that the NYCT issue regular public statements. JF	JF
	will send a link to their new website around with these minutes.	01
7.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	01