

Green Lane Eco Park Community Meeting 25 January 2010

The meeting offered an excellent opportunity for local residents to engage with the proposals and to find out more about the developer, the history behind the site, the current plans and the technology proposed, and also to be able to address questions to those involved in the scheme. The attendance of over 130 people was far greater than expected and we apologise to any late-comers that were unable to enter due to Health and Safety regulations enforced by the Monton House Hotel.

Due the large turnout, the initial intention of holding a Community Liaison Group (CLG) was unfortunately not possible and therefore, after initial presentations, the proposed agenda was quickly modified to enable attendees to put forward as many questions as possible during the time available, which was greatly extended from the planned 8pm finish. The meeting of 25 January 2010 therefore covered the following points:

1. Introductions

- Welcome by John Twitchen
- Introduction by Hazel Blears

2. Presentation by Anthony Hirsch of Sky Properties

- What other uses have been considered for the site and why these have been refused/deemed unsuitable
- Why a waste management facility
- The current proposal for Green Lane Eco Park
- The companies involved in the proposal (Sky Properties, Entec and Energos)
- The technologies proposed

3. Presentation from Energos

(NB: Energos were not able to complete their presentation without interruption and so this was halted to allow for questions.)

4. Q&A

- Time was prioritised for the Q&A session to allow as many questions to be asked as possible within the limited time frame

5. Discussion regarding future steps including formation of CLG group

- Hazel Blears agreed to coordinate a meeting with the Council planners to discuss the plans and if there is any possibility of redesignation of the site
- Purpose and Terms of Reference of CLG explained by John Twitchen
- Hazel Blears undertook responsibility of coordinating individuals who wish to participate and represent the local community

During the course of the evening, every question asked from the floor was carefully noted and has since been compiled into the following document. If a question was unable to be answered at the time, work has now been done to provide an answer.

Work is now being carried out to form the CLG and we thank those who have expressed an interest in participating. At these meetings we have the intention of discussing the wider issues surrounding the use of the site and the practicalities (such as traffic) related to any scheme proposed for the site. The proposed CLG members will be contacted directly in due course with further details.

Once again, thank you for attending and for all your questions. Please do not hesitate to contact Sky Properties if you have any further questions by emailing info@greenlaneecopark.com or leaving a message on the dedicated answer phone service on 0800 107 1020.

Questions from Green Lane community meeting 25th January 2010

| Question | Response |
|---|--|
| Who were Chester Developments and what is their relationship to Sky Properties? Why did Chester Developments go under? | Chester Developments was a management company owned by Sky Properties. A decision was made to liquidate the company in June 2009 as Chester Developments had group issues with HMRC which were unresolvable. This coincided with the original funding facility expiration, therefore after detailed negotiations with the bank it was decided to continue in the name of Sky Properties. The ownership of the triangle piece of land situated adjacent to the site on the Bridgewater Canal was already owned by Sky Properties and under a restructuring facility with our bank it was decided that this was the best way forward. |
| Can Salford Council reconsider designating the land as residential? | The land is identified in the City's current plan as employment land and part of the site is allocated for employment development. Given the site's planning history and its location adjacent to the M602 and other industrial land, it is very unlikely that, through the replacement to the current plan (the emerging Core Strategy and subsequent Site Allocations Documents) the City Council will consider a redesignation. |
| What is meant by 'other materials' being taken by the Gasification plant? | The waste stream that is targetted is commercial and industrial waste and it is commercial waste that is increasing as the nature of employment moves away from traditional manufacturing. Commercial waste will come from offices, retail units, restaurants and other businesses. This will include paper, cardboard, packaging, plastics, cans and food waste. The waste types will be identified in the Environmental Permit issued by the Environment Agency. More information on commercial and industrial waste can be found at http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/topics/documents/commercial-industrial-waste-aims-actions-091013.pdf |
| What are the more toxic materials that may be brought to the site for processing? | No hazardous wastes will be permitted to be managed at the site. This will be set out in any planning permission and any permit application submitted to the Environment Agency. |
| Is there infrastructure in place for district heating and how easy/difficult would this be to install? | Retrofitting heating systems in older residential areas can be difficult and costly. Supplying industry and particularly high energy users is normally a more feasible option. As energy prices increase however it will become increasingly important to secure alternative energy supplies and so these alternatives including heat from energy-from-waste facilities will become increasingly feasible. |
| In Norway, there is a very sparse population density. What about here, isn't this the most densely populated area where an ENERGOS plant has been proposed? | Green Lane would be the most densely populated area in which an Energos plant has been built. One reason that the location is attractive is that it is close to the areas where waste is produced and to where the energy produced at the plant could be utilised. This is known as the proximity principle. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>What happened with the Energos plant in the Isle of Wight? Weren't there a number of problems?</p> | <p>The Isle of Wight was a Defra part-funded project in which Energos retro-fitted a small conventional incinerator with the Energos gasification technology rather than build a new plant. The budget was limited so an old incinerator was adapted. However no short cuts were taken in the Gasification process. There have been some problems with the operational reliability but these issues were related to the old incinerator and not the ENERGOS technology.</p> |
| <p>Weren't there repeated emissions failures?</p> | <p>No. This is not true.</p> |
| <p>Are there any long term health studies relating to emissions from Gasification that can be looked at through CLG group?</p> | <p>There have not been any long-term studies relating to existing gasification plants. The Health Protection Agency published a report in September 2009 which looked at the health impacts from incinerators and this is available at http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAwebFile/HPAweb_C/1251473372218</p> |
| <p>Is it true that there are no waste incineration plants this close to residential areas anywhere in the UK?</p> | <p>No this is not correct. There are residential areas near a number of UK energy from waste plants and incinerators. For example, within 50m to the west of the Coventry Incinerator is housing development and there is housing near to both the Runcorn and Kirklees plants.</p> |
| <p>Have the HPA done any studies in the immediate vicinity of an ENERGOS plant?</p> | <p>No studies have yet been carried out.</p> |
| <p>How is ENERGOS technology renewable energy?</p> | <p>Renewable energy is produced from the biodegradable portion of the waste treated at the plant. Municipal and commercial waste streams contain approximately 60% biodegradable material. This material degrades and produces methane if left to decompose in a landfill site. This is a potent greenhouse gas and is harmful to our environment. By producing energy from waste at an Energos plant we are reducing our dependency on fossil fuels for energy production. Under a Government scheme designed to support the construction of new facilities, Renewable Obligation Certificates (ROCs) are awarded for the generation of renewable energy from Gasification Plants.</p> |
| <p>Exactly how much traffic will be going in and out of the plant, taking into consideration deliveries and collections?</p> | <p>If all of the facilities are constructed and the site is fully integrated then there will be approximately 160 HGV movements a day. These will be between the working hours of 7.30am and 6.00pm but we would seek to avoid movements during peak morning and evening periods. If we assume movements would in the main be over an 8 hour period, this would be 10 vehicles per hour or 1 every 6 minutes.</p> |
| <p>When will the peak period of lorry movements be? Will this increase?</p> | <p>Because of the nature of the facilities proposed lorry movements will tend to spread evenly over the day. However, the Transport Assessment has to assume a very worst-case and so will assume higher movements to and from the site to provide extra sensitivity in the assessment.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>What level of emissions are we talking about from the lorries?</p> | <p>The emissions from the lorries will comply fully with the legislation on emissions imposed by the Government and will be no different to any other lorries of similar types using the road network. It should be remembered that because the overall change in total traffic on local roads will be less than 1%, then emissions impact will also be small. We have looked at the contribution to small dust particles (called PM10 and PM2.5) as well as nitrogen dioxides. In all cases the increase on background levels is extremely small.</p> |
| <p>What is the capacity of the plant? Is this the maximum or the optimum and will it increase?</p> | <p>Any planning permission will be based upon the capacities provided in the application. The capacity of the gasification plant is 10 tonnes per hour or 78,000 tonnes per annum. This is not the maximum size of plant but no future expansion would be possible in the area of interest to ENERGOS because there is insufficient land available for any future expansion. The Energos plant size will not increase.</p> |
| <p>When did the ENERGOS plant open on the Isle of Wight?</p> | <p>The Isle of Wight plant was commissioned in spring 2009.</p> |
| <p>If ENERGOS technology is so good, why are there not more sites?</p> | <p>It is only recently that the cost of landfill and government targets imposed on local authorities has made the technology commercially viable. In the past 2 years planning consent has been granted for 6 new plants in the UK.</p> |
| <p>Won't the increase in traffic cause harm to the ecology in the area (trees/canal/wildlife etc)?</p> | <p>No. The overall increase in total traffic in the local area is very small – less than 1%. There would be no wider environmental or ecological impacts as a result of this change.</p> |
| <p>Have you considered the problems in traffic flow when there is an accident on the motorway? Monton is in gridlock.</p> | <p>Because the overall increase in total traffic will not be significant, then the proposals will not add materially to any short-term problems associated with closures of the M60 / M602 or any other strategic route. The routing agreement that would be set out in any planning permission would exclude the use of Monton High Street.</p> |
| <p>What will the noise impact be?</p> | <p>The Council will impose strict limits on noise from the plant. The limits that the Environment Health Officer have imposed are below background levels and so the facility will not cause significant impacts for residential areas over the M602 motorway which in itself will be a major contributor to the local noise environment.</p> |
| <p>Why was a resident told that it was the Council who were monitoring for noise in her garden?</p> | <p>We would normally tell residents that we are undertaking monitoring at locations identified by the Council but not on behalf of the Council. If residents are unhappy with the locations chosen then Sky Properties have indicated that they would be happy to include other locations.</p> |
| <p>Can residents see the Entec reports (EIA)?</p> | <p>Yes. Once the application is submitted then all of the documents will be available online, at the Council Offices and at other locations to be agreed.</p> |
| <p>Q to Hazel Blears: Is this scheme to generate revenue/income for Salford Council?</p> | <p>Hazel Blears stated Salford Council will not benefit financially from the scheme.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| How far are the granted ENERGOS plants from residential areas? | At Knowsley, there are houses within 200m and the main village is 600m from the plant. |
| Is ENERGOS technology unique to the company? Why aren't there more in existence? | Yes the technology is unique to ENERGOS and is patented. No other company has achieved a similar long track record of successful operations and environmental performance. Cost and a lack of legislation have so far limited the number of plants in operation. |
| Would you want to live next door to this plant? | In making any decision about buying a home I would take into consideration many factors including local schools, hospitals, local services, amenities as well as negative implications such as motorways, industrial estates, pylons, crime. If I was currently living in the area and I was given the opportunity by the developers to have an input into their proposed plans, I would want to ensure that I was in possession of all of the facts before I made a decision. |
| What leisure plans were turned down previously? | Residential, warehousing, office space and leisure use have all been deemed unsuitable as the land is designated for employment use by the Council and also because it did not fit with their UDP as it was feared a leisure or commercial park would take business away from the main high street. |
| Is the way forward to lobby Salford Council to redesignate land? | There is an opportunity to lobby the City Council for a redesignation but the current and emerging policy context indicates that the site will be used for employment / waste related development. |
| Could we look at plans that provide something for young people in Monton? | Sky Properties are happy to discuss alternative schemes with local residents and the Council. However, previously other uses such as leisure have been deemed unsuitable for the site. |
| Have you considered the effect your plans are having on house prices already? | This is not a material planning consideration but the environmental context for residents north of the M602 will continue to be affected more by the M602 than developments south of the motorway. |
| Would Sky Properties appeal if this plan is turned down by the Council? | If this planning proposal was turned down for technical reasons, having adhered to the UDP and planning guidelines and Counsel's opinion advised us that an appeal to the Secretary of State had a more than average chance of success, then it is likely we would proceed with an appeal. |
| How close is Health and Safety to Sky Properties' heart? From the recent demolition on site, not very it would seem... | Health and Safety is of the highest priority to Sky Properties and the recent work undertaken had all the relevant method statements, notices and certificates lodged with Urban Vision by our contractor. |
| Why were a historic building and a cherry tree ripped down? | I assume you are referring to the former Mitchell & Shackelton office building which was burnt out in an arson attack in 2008. This building was deemed unsafe, was not listed and from a Health and Safety perspective this building had to be demolished. The cherry tree was being used by vandals to climb over the wall and as it was positioned within our boundary this also had to come down in order for the new fencing to be erected around our boundary. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Can we not promote the 3R's instead? | Yes. The development is intended to increase recycling and composting with only residual waste going to thermal treatment from which energy will be recovered. There will also be a training and education centre. |
| Can't this Eco Park be built on top of the local landfill site? | No – Sky Properties don't own that land. Also, you cannot build substantial structures on top of unstable land such as a landfill site. |
| Who identified the land as a potential waste management site? | The site is identified in the emerging Greater Manchester Waste Development Plan Document as suitable for waste development. This is being led by the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA). |
| Is it an option to put this plan on hold and work on other options with the community? | There is no rush to submit an application and other options can certainly be considered. |
| The wind is a prevailing south-westerly which means that the emissions will be blown on to the village. Will they be toxic and can we put figures on these? | The Environmental Statement will include something called a dispersion model which is used to assess the impact of pollutant emissions on local areas. Dispersion modelling uses a range of inputs including the pollutant emission rate, building details, receptor locations and meteorological (including wind) data (in this case from Ringway/Woodford Airports). Using dispersion modelling the contribution of the plant is predicted to be so small that no impacts will result above the existing background air quality. |
| Did Contract Heat & Power (former ENERGOS) dump toxic ash in Newcastle? | Contract Heat & Power (CH&P) did not dump ash but did have a contract with Cityworks, Newcastle City Council's works division for the collection and disposal of mixed bottom ash and fly ash. The Council was prosecuted for the spread of ash at unlicensed sites and was fined by Newcastle Crown Court. The judge fined CH&P a nominal sum relating to "duty of care" for failing to prevent contraventions of the relevant legislation by the council. |
| Hasn't other land been redesignated from industrial to residential? Can't we use this as a precedent? | Other smaller sites in the past have been converted from industrial to residential use which is why we felt in our original application we would have the same success. The application was refused permission by Salford Council in December 2006, as it would have led to a loss of employment land. We were advised that if we appealed we would have a high chance of success. At the appeal it was argued that if we were to achieve residential consent, it would have set a national precedent for changing the use of land reserved for employment to residential. The appeal was refused by the Secretary of State (then Hazel Blears) in 2007. |
| How do these plans fit in with the Bridgewater Canal Corridor proposals? | On the draft plans for the Bridgewater Canal Corridor the land is shown as part of a redevelopment area and as having the potential for waste management use subject to review through the Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document. |
| Why is it called an 'Eco Park'? | The term Eco Park is widely used around the world to describe industrial and mixed developments, normally incorporating an energy generation component and/or material recovery or manufacturing using recovered materials. There are at least three existing waste facilities in the UK called Eco Parks. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Can't Energos find another site in Salford? Is it true they cannot be on Trafford Park as Kelloggs have stated they would withdraw?</p> | <p>Energos has assessed the suitability of several sites in the Greater Manchester area during the past 4 years, including sites on Trafford Park. In the late 1980s Kelloggs did express concerns about the impact of a conventional incinerator proposal at Trafford Park. Energos does not know whether or not their concerns were addressed at the time of that proposal. They had similar concerns about chemical plants on the industrial park.</p> |
| <p>When will everyone in Monton be canvassed/ consulted on this proposal?</p> | <p>The next step is setting up a Community Liaison Group which directly engages with a number of local people. We hope that by offering these meetings we can take on board concerns of local residents who have expressed an interest, and have the opportunity to provide any further information that may be requested, establishing a dialogue with local residents. We hope to address issues raised by residents through this process, and deliver an improved planning application. As a developer, we intend to be a good neighbour and are carrying out the consultation process as we genuinely want to hear what you think about the proposals for the site, be it positive or negative. The consultation process ensures that everyone is given access to accurate information about the proposal, thus being able making an informed decision about it based on fact not myth. Once the planning application is put in, the Council will then run a formal period of consultation on the proposals.</p> |
| <p>Can Sky Properties, the Council and local MP work together to improve traffic?</p> | <p>Sky Properties are committed to developing a proposal that not only has a minimal impact on traffic but actually improves the current traffic situation in Monton.</p> |
| <p>Why are the planners not at this meeting?</p> | <p>This is a Community Liaison meeting and Sky Properties has met with planners and will meet them again as part of the normal pre-application process. No planning application has been submitted yet.</p> |
| <p>What were the traffic plans for the other proposals?</p> | <p>With all the other schemes that were considered, the traffic impact was greater than with the current Green Lane Eco Park proposal. A residential use along the lines previously proposed would generate around 122 vehicle movements in the morning peak, whilst a commercial use would generate around 147 movements at the same time. Movements to and from the Eco Park would generally try to avoid peak times but, for the purposes of comparison, assuming that this is not the case and that lorry movements were in fact double the expected number during the morning peak time then worst case total vehicle movements in the morning peak time would be around 68.</p> |