



# Residual Waste Working Group

10am-1pm Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> April 2014

Meeting Room 6

## AGENDA

1. **Apologies**
2. **Minutes**
3. **Matters arising**
4. **Out of county capacity**  
Tony Childs
5. **Presentation on risk**  
Ian Mawdsley
6. **Revisit consideration framework**  
Tony Childs
7. **Reflections on site visit to Advanced Plasma Power & arrangements for site visit to Veolia**
8. **To consider members' suggestions for agenda items and arrangements for future meetings**
9. **Future meeting dates:**
  - Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> June, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1
  - Tuesday 1<sup>st</sup> July, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1
  - Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> Aug, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1
  - Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> Sept, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1
  - Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> Oct, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 2
  - Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> November, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1
  - Monday 1<sup>st</sup> December, 10am-1pm (all day if required): MR 1

### Site Visits:

- Veolia Environmental Services, Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> May 8.30am-4.15pm

**Membership:** Chairman David Jenkins, Cllr Tim Harman, Cllr Sarah Lunnon, Cllr Tracy Millard, Cllr Patrick Molyneux, Cllr Brian Oosthuysen, Cllr Alan Preest, Cllr Simon Wheeler, Cllr Bill Whelan

**Officers:** Rachel Ferris, Christine Wray, Tony Childs, Joanne Bolton, Ian Mawdsley

If you have any queries in regards to this agenda please contact Sidgorée Nelson on 01452 425075 or [Sidgorée.Nelson@gloucestershire.gov.uk](mailto:Sidgorée.Nelson@gloucestershire.gov.uk)

## Notes: Residual Waste Working Group 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014

### 1. Apologies

#### Attendance

Cllr Tim Harman*	P	Cllr Sarah Lunnon	P
Cllr Tracy Millard	P	Cllr Patrick Molyneux	A
Cllr Brian Oosthuysen*	P	Cllr Alan Preest*	P
Cllr Simon Wheeler	P	Cllr Bill Whelan	A
Ind Chair David Jenkins	P	Sidgorée Nelson (officer)	P
Rachel Ferris (officer)	P	Christine Wray (officer)	P
Tony Childs (officer)	P	Steve Read (officer)	A

P = present \* = present for part of meeting A = apologies/absent

### 2. Minutes – these were approved at the meeting.

### 3. Matters arising

#### 3.1 A number of actions were noted to have been completed by the Chair:

- Meeting dates through to December 2014 had been organised
- The dvd *Trashed* was now available to members through Democratic Services
- A visit to New Earth Solutions Ltd had been organised (and actually taken place)
- Information on two MBT plants had been sourced
- The factual resource members had requested had been completed, however it was noted that it would need to be continually updated as the group continued to learn

A number of actions were noted as in progress including the arrangement of site visits and work on establishing an understanding of the current potential available out of county capacity, though members would receive a fuller update on that later on in the meeting.

### 4. Reflections on site visit to New Earth Solutions Ltd

- 4.1 Members were invited to share their thoughts on the site visit to New Earth Solutions in Avonmouth that had taken place on 3<sup>rd</sup> March.
- 4.2 Those that had attended commented on how useful they had found the visit, which gave them an opportunity to see Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) and energy recovery facilities (pyrolysis and gasification (also known as advanced thermal technologies)) in action.
- 4.3 Members did however express surprise that the amount of recyclables recovered from the MBT process was just 2%. They wondered if this reflected good sorting practices at kerbside or if there are more recyclable materials within the waste stream not currently retrievable. It was the view of some members that the amount of biological material making its way through to the energy

## Item 2

recovery facility (about 60%), might indicate that there was an economic drive to keep biologicals in the waste stream.

- 4.4 Members also sought clarification on whether the compost like product produced at the facility counted as recycling. Having checked with DEFRA, officers were clear that while it counts as waste diverted from landfill, it is not considered recycled for the purposes of counting towards the County's recycling target because the material does not meet the required quality standard. The material is a contaminated product and has limited use, mainly as restoration soil for contaminated land or landfill cover.
- 4.4 There was a consensus amongst members that the energy recovery facility was interesting and impressive in its use of advanced thermal technologies (pyrolysis and gasification) to produce char and syngas. A member wondered if it would be possible to landfill this char as a way of capturing carbon. It was also commented that the modular nature of the technology is a key benefit as the NES facility had 16 pyrolysis and gasification units that could be run independently, with further units being added as required.
- 4.5 Though it was acknowledged that MBT technology could develop further in the coming years, hopefully improving the recovery of recyclables, there was a view amongst members that an emphasis on sorting at source is preferable to relying on waste treatment technologies to recover recyclables. They recognised how difficult it is to extract high quality material out of 'black bag' waste.

### **5. To receive representations from Sue Oppenheimer etc on behalf of the campaigning group GlosVain**

- 5.1 Representatives from GlosVain were welcomed to the meeting. They introduced themselves as: Sue Oppenheimer – Chair and Parish Cllr; Ian Richens – PR; Chris Harmer – technical researcher; Gerald Hartley – Parish Cllr; and Diana Shirley. Cllr Lunnon wanted it to be noted that she knows Sue Oppenheimer, Chris Harmer and Gerald Hartley well.
- 5.2 Sue Oppenheimer presented to the group, highlighting a number of issues as key to GlosVain's view that there are better alternatives available to deal with residual waste than an incinerator at Javelin Park. These were:
- That it is DEFRA's view that waste is reducing
  - This view then calls into question the council's predictions that waste will grow
  - Overcapacity locally and nationally is predicted by Eunomia by 2016/17
  - Technology is developing rapidly and will provide better alternatives to incineration
  - And that the UK will need to abide by national and European policy changes regarding the management and treatment of waste in the future
- 5.3 In their view the importance of thinking of waste treatment as part of a 'circular waste economy' in Gloucestershire is also key, as this recognises that 'there is no such thing as waste' in today's economy. Rather, waste is a resource consisting of materials that can be used to make other useful products.

## Item 2

- 5.4 A number of principles thought important to the working group's deliberations were also outlined for consideration. These were to:
- Have environmental sustainability at the heart of deliberations
  - Keep good value for tax payers in mind
  - Choose a technology that is flexible and future proof
  - Help waste become a resource
  - Base their decisions on sound data and realistic predictions
  - And deal with waste as far up the waste hierarchy as possible
- 5.5 GlosVain were keen to share examples of good practice such as the Transition Repair Café scheme in Stroud, which aims to repair and therefore reuse otherwise disposed of electronic devices. They suggested that the council has money set aside from the landfill allowances trading scheme that was never used and could be used now to support such initiatives.
- 5.6 The council's 'aspirational' 70% recycling target by 2030 was challenged by GlosVain as not being ambitious enough. Members were told that 2 Oxfordshire district councils already achieve about a 65% recycling rate for what GlosVain regard as affordable prices. In their view, the council should be aiming for 70% by 2020 instead, which they supported by references to a Welsh study that indicates that about 74% of waste is currently recyclable.
- 5.7 The following were suggested to improve Gloucestershire's recycling rates:
- Look to best practice elsewhere
  - Address low compliance through an increased emphasis on educating the public
  - Expand the range of recycling
  - Fund community initiatives
  - And better joint working between Gloucestershire's county and district councils
- 5.8 Lastly, GlosVain suggested that Anaerobic Digestion and MBT technologies are low cost and more environmentally friendly alternatives to incineration at Javelin Park. In particular, they highlighted Urbaser Balfour Beatty's (UBB) proposed MBT plant in Essex as evidence that MBT is seen as a viable treatment for residual waste by both the company itself and local authorities more generally. The possibility of an MBT plant at Javelin Park specifically, was also explored, as Biocentre has suggested that they could provide such a facility. Gasification and pyrolysis as used at NES were also mentioned.
- 5.9 Members and the Chair thanked GlosVain for delivering an interesting presentation. Members then asked a number of questions.
- 5.10 One focus for members was GlosVain's view on why UBB proposed an energy from waste facility for Gloucestershire in contrast to MBT in Essex. GlosVain suggested that while the council had committed to a technology neutral procurement, the use of the example of an incinerator on the Javelin Park site as a reference project indicated to bidders that this was something the council was thinking about specifically. In response, officers told members that in order to get private Finance Initiative (PFI) credits from Government,

the council had needed to produce a robust reference project (which had to be based on a specific technology). Energy from waste was selected as the reference technology as it was an established technology with readily available information that the reference project could be based upon. The reference project was purely a mechanism to achieve funding from Government. The Council's Cabinet approved a range of technologies as being able to provide a potential solution for the County and this technology neutral approach was clear throughout the procurement process. Illustrating this, bids for all but one of the technologies identified in the Cabinet report (autoclave) were received as part of the procurement process. Officers thought it was also important to note that in Essex's case, the council had specifically requested an MBT solution.

5.11 One member asked GlosVain about their view of out of county capacity as this is something that the group is interested in. Sue Oppenheimer and the other members of GlosVain shared their view that there is available capacity to be had in the immediate vicinity as indicated in the Eunomia 'Residual Waste Infrastructure Review'. They were also keen to get members to recognise that environmentally there is a case for transporting waste out of county (even taking the use of fossil fuels into account) if it can be shown that the material is being used more efficiently than would otherwise be the case. Responding to this view, officers pointed out that the Eunomia Review includes facilities with planning permission in its calculations of available capacity, and there is no guarantee that such facilities will be built. GlosVain acknowledged this as a potential risk, but stressed that overcapacity was also a risk. In their view there is a need to balance both.

5.12 The group recognised and agreed with GlosVain's message that encouraging recycling is a key priority, and asked them for their ideas on how to do this. Increasing efforts to educate the public on the importance of recycling was highlighted as an important area of focus for the council. An idea of funding recycling champions to work on a neighbourhood basis was suggested.

5.13 Sue Oppenheimer offered to share GlosVain's non-restricted information and information sources on out of county capacity with the council.

**ACTION –Tony Childs**

5.14 GlosVain wished to share a pdf on the Hernania region of Spain to show how their waste collection strategy works to reduce waste disposal. Chris Harmer is to share this information with the council.

**ACTION –Tony Childs**

## **6. Out of county capacity**

6.1 In response to a request made at a previous meeting, Tony Childs showed members a map with out of county waste treatment facilities (existing or with planning permission) plotted onto it. This was accompanied by a table showing the name, location, capacity and operator of each facility.

## Item 2

6.2 Each operator had been contacted regarding what capacity might be available at their site(s), though as members learned, only New Earth Solutions had replied at this point to say that they had no capacity available at present.

6.3 It was agreed that once the operators had provided this information an item would be added to the next meeting's agenda to fully cover available capacity.

**ACTION – Tony Childs**

### **7. Revisit consideration framework**

7.1 At the group's previous meeting members had agreed a number of positions:

- They had ruled out autoclave
- Agreed 60% and 70% recycling targets
- Accepted the tonnage ranges in the Waste Core Strategy
- And amongst other conclusions, stressed the need not to enter any contract that could act as a perverse incentive against the achievement of our recycling targets

7.2 Revisiting the consideration framework discussed in February, officers posed a number of questions to members to help them respond on the framework. Members were asked to give further thought to these questions, responses to which would be crucial to the direction of any fallback strategy.

7.3 Members recognised the importance of agreeing a framework, but felt that the interconnectedness of many of the questions needing to be considered meant that they needed more information in a number of areas. They requested:

- Information on cost consequences
- And further information on out of county capacity as previously agreed

7.4 It was agreed that this information would be provided to members at the group's next meeting, and that in the meantime the slides shown at this meeting would be circulated to prompt questions at the next.

**ACTION – Tony Childs/Sidgorée Nelson**

### **8. To consider members' suggestions for agenda items and arrangements for future meetings**

8.1 Reflecting discussion during the meeting, members thought it was time to give some real consideration to the financial implications of different technologies, as this is regarded as key to their deliberations. In particular it was recognised that the attitude of banks would need to be explored.

8.2 It was agreed with members that a presentation on finance would be organised for the group's next meeting

**ACTION – Tony Childs/Rachel Ferris**

**END**

**Residual Waste Working Group  
Matters arising - action sheet  
1<sup>st</sup> April 2014**

	REFERENCE IN MINUTES	ACTION REQUIRED	RESPONSIBILITY	OUTCOME
1	4.8 (7 <sup>th</sup> Jan) 3.4 (18 <sup>th</sup> Feb) 7.4 (1 <sup>st</sup> April)	<b>Out of county capacity</b> Members asked for a map to be draw up of facilities in adjacent counties that showed residual waste capacities.	<b>Tony Childs</b>	<b>In progress.</b> At April's meeting officers shared a map of treatment facilities that are already operational/have planning permission in the immediate vicinity. Each facility operator had been contacted for details of available capacity but we have yet to hear back.
2	6.5 (7 <sup>th</sup> Jan)	<b>Visits</b> For the group's next meeting the Chair asked officers to put together a provisional list of waste treatment plants that could be visited.	<b>Tony Childs</b>	<b>Complete.</b> Officers have now scheduled all of the site visits members had requested. Dates have been circulated.
3	4.8 (18 <sup>th</sup> Feb)	<b>Request for information</b> Members requested 'closed loop' diagram for each of their chosen technology showing what goes in, what comes out, and what happens to those outputs	<b>Tony Childs</b>	<b>Complete</b> as of the group's last meeting on 1 <sup>st</sup> April.
4	4.9 (18 <sup>th</sup> Feb)	<b>Exploring scenarios</b> Officers were asked to explore MBT, EFW and ATT solutions for Gloucestershire using the assumptions of waste growth and targets for recycling performance at 60 -70% made within the Waste Core Strategy and Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy	<b>Tony Childs</b>	<b>In progress.</b>
5	5.13 (1 <sup>st</sup> April)	<b>Contact GlosVain for information they have on out of county capacity as well as any contacts they have</b>	<b>Tony Childs</b>	<b>Complete</b>
6	5.14 (1 <sup>st</sup> April)	<b>Get pdf on Hernania from GlosVain</b>	<b>Tony Childs</b>	<b>Compete.</b> A copy of this pdf had already been circulated to members.
7	7.4 (1 <sup>st</sup> April)	<b>Circulate slides on the consideration framework to members</b>	<b>Tony Childs/Sidgorée Nelson</b>	<b>Complete.</b>
8	8.2 (1 <sup>st</sup> April)	<b>Presentation on finance</b> Specifically to cover the financial implications of different technologies and the attitudes of banks to each.	<b>Tony Childs/Rachel Ferris</b>	<b>In progress.</b>