FLAGG PUBLIC MEETING

**Minutes of the Public Meeting held Monday 24th May 2017**

Present: Derbyshire Dales Environmental Health officers; Karen Carpenter , Laura Salmon

Parish Cllrs , Jean Dicken (Chair). Mavis Mycock, Sue Naylor, Sue Waldron

Members of the Public, Brenda Murray, Gordon Murray, Ron Beresford, Alan Westwood, Barbara Westwood, Jim Harris, Debbie Oliver, Mick Oliver, Brent Barber, Caroline Boam, Caroline Morgan

Anna Mycock (detained at work, arrived on meeting closing)

Apologies for absence from Sarah Mycock

S Mansfield (Clerk of Flagg Parish Council);

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Agenda item 1 | Chair Opens the meeting and clarifies purpose and tone of discussion. |
| Minute 24/05/17/01 | Councillor Jean Dicken took the Chair and opened the meeting at 6:00 pm. The Chair hoped thast the meeting would be useful and productive. |
| Agenda item 2 | To consider any requests for Variations of Order of Business. |
| Minute 24/05/17/02 | Item 6 had already been deleted by the Clerk to the Parish Council.  DDDC EHO requested that Item 7 be passed over but in the event gave very helpful responses the the questions raised in that item.  Items 12 &13 were deleted at the request of DDDC EHO. |
| Agenda item 3 | DDDC given opportunity to address the meeting. |
| Minute 24/05/17/03 | The DDDC EHO's addresed the meeting and explained their role in the process of issuing and monitoring an operational permit for the Plant |
| Agenda item 4 | Redferns/EFGE given opportunity to address the meeting |
| Minute 24/05/17/04 | **The following email originating with Redferns, the operators of the Knackery and the proposed Plant ,was forwarded from DDDC EHO and received by the Clerk to Flagg Parish Council shortly before the meeting**  Dear Karen,  Further to your email yesterday about the meeting this evening.  I have read the email and proposed agenda and consider it is confrontational and aggressive in style. I do not believe that this meeting will be productive and constructive. Therefore I will not be attending the meeting.  Despite this, I am (and always have been) happy that there should be a dialogue with representatives of the Parish council and you to discuss the ongoing operations of the business.  Best regards  Michael |
| Agenda item 5 | Residents table the following items as questions followed by a  discussion of each item after questions are answered |
| Minute 24/05/17/05 |  |
| Agenda item 6 | Item deleted prior to issuing the agenda. |
| Minute 24/05/17/06 | Not applicable – no item. |
| Agenda item 7 | Could Karen Carpenter give a brief resume of her career to date,  qualifications, and current job content. A brief outline of the  structure and staffing of her department and her management reporting line would also be appreciated.  - Are there any similar companies to Redferns and ECGE currently  under her supervision?  - Current scope of working relationship with Redferns  - What input will Karen have to the installation of the  Environmental Plan and Monitoring Systems with ECGE, e.g.  Controls and their implementation, staffing etc.  - What will be the scope of her supervision in terms of Regulatory  checks, Surprise visits, Regulatory advice etc. Enforcement  Followed by a discussion of these Qs and As. |
| Minute 24/05/17/07 | Karen Carpenter gave a full explanation of her experience and qualifications. The parts of the existing and future plant inFlagg that were under Karen's supervision and how that supervision worked in practice were clearly expalined. |
| Agenda item 8 | Attendee's will be given an opportunity to seek further clarification  on Karen Carpenter's responses (17.5.17) to specific questions  raised by Debbie Oliver (20.4.17) on the odour Management Plan  Odour Management Plan  OMP 1.1  How does the "so called " innovative process control odours ?  The system is sealed for the separation process, building under negative pressure,  fugitive and dryer emissions passed through incinerator.  OMP 1.3  During the maceration "softening process " drying and storage what controls are in  place for fugitive emissions ? Maceration within the process building. As above  answer.  What temperature is odorous air from heating and drying etc. subjected to through  boilers and combustion from electricity to ensure no nasty odours escape the  operation via emission points ? This is a time and temperature combination. The  process will be operating a high temp short retention combination. Temperatures of  800-1100 o C. In addition a condition preventing odours beyond process boundary  will be put in the permit.  OMP 2.1  What certainty can be applied to a process that is "almost wholly enclosed " in  ensuring that odours cannot be emitted ? It is not anticipated that odours will occur.  Creating liaison arrangements should allow for a reporting process to investigate if  problems occur  OMP 2.2  What odour controls are in place for transferral between knackery and process ?Flagg Parish Council serving The Residents of Flagg  Material will be moved directly over and an interlock will work on the doors to  ensure extract ventilation is on whilst doors open.  OMP 2.4  Are there likely to be any odorous escapes when trailers are entering or leaving the  building ? MBM will be in sheeted vehicles and otherwise as above.  OMP2.5  What level of seal will the external doors to the building provide to prevent odours  escaping ? External door rubber flat seals to maintain negative pressure in building  OMP 3.1  Where will the "Washings " storage tank be located and what controls are in place  to control emissions ? How often will the waste storage tanks be emptied ?  Underground storage tank, pumped out and removed from site when necessary.  OMP 4.1  At what temperature is waste oxidised to control odours ? Temperatures of 800-  1100 o C.  OMP 4.2  What systems are in place to control odours in the event of plant failure ? Plant will  shut down and procedures will revert to existing until back up and running.  (Materials sent to current rendering plant)  Appendix 1  Operating hours  None applied to site in planning process  OMP 1.3  What noise levels will be emitted from the site during the planned operating hours  of 7am to 8pm ?  Noise consultant predicts 14dB below background in daytime and 5dB below  background for evening/night. This is also well below World Health Organisation  guidelines.  Odour Management  OMP 2  Will good working practices and containment be sufficient on their own to manage  odours without abatement systems ? What levels of odours will plant operatives be  subjected to ? Abatement is by way of incineration. The second question is not aFlagg Parish Council serving The Residents of Flagg  matter for permit.  Routine Cleaning  OMP 2.2  Chlorine bleach in itself gives off very strong odours , how will these be managed ?  This will be diluted to an appropriate strength.  Will vehicles leaving the site and travelling through the village give off odours ?  Vehicles will be sheeted and would not ordinarily travel through the village centre.  Containment  OMP. 2.4  Point A) makes reference to doors being kept closed during processing whenever  possible , when is it not possible to keep the doors closed and for what reasons ?  Movement of materials and personnel, linked to extract system as discussed above.  General Questions  Inclusive of materials to and from site and waste removal what level of additional  heavy goods traffic will the narrow country lanes be subjected to ? It is expected  that there will be less HGV’s leaving the site.  Is it envisaged that expansion of the existing site will downgrade the village and  have negative financial impacts on local properties . Not a consideration of the  permit. |
| Minute 24/05/17/08 | to avoid unnecessary duplication the questions raised by Debbie Oliver and answers thereto by Karen Carpenter were all itemised in the agenda sent to you prior to the meeting.  Some points in the answers were explained in the meeting but no alterations to the answers were necessary.  K.C. confirmed she is responsible in regulatory terms for stipulating the standards to which all the new Plant is to be constructed.  She explained these could be additional requirements she could insist upon should the implementation and testing phase fail to meet those standards.  K.C. confirmed that the new Rendering Plant will be classified as a A2 category and will be controlled by DDDC.   The Knackery is classified as Part B and will be governed by the terms of the Environmental Protection Act.  Any breaches of regulations concerning noise, odour, vibrations, treatment of waste observed(this is EA for existing) , the complaint should currently be registered with DDDC.   (K.C. confirmed if she, or in her absence another member of staff are available they will come out as soon as possible to confirm the breach).   Any breach for the Knackers yard part of the process must be detectable at the complainants residence (outside the Knackery gates is not permissible as a complaint;  it must offend a complainants right to amenity at their property.   K.C. confirmed she would send her mobile contact no. and the envhealth e-mail link to Stephen to circulate in Flagg.  K.C. confirmed that all doors at the Knackery and the new Plant should be closed at all times (except when in use for access) as they are conditions of Planning Permission and should be reported if the condition is not observed.  It was suggested photographs bearing date and time should be taken to avoid issues of doubt.  Any resident registering a complaint should also keep a record of the offence, date and time reported and name of person taking the complaint.  With regard to the disposal of waste water at the new Plant, K.C. reported that Mr. Redfern had confirmed to her that no waste water or chemical waste from this facility would be spread to land.    It would be transported off site to an authorised disposal facility.   Mr. Redfern has not yet chosen the authorised contractor.   The existing processes are dealt with by the Environmental Agency.  Traffic issues should be lodged as complaints with Derbyshire CC Highways and not DDDC.  K.C.  explained that the 'discharge' of conditions imposed on granting of planning permission does not mean the item is complete and finished.   It merely means that a plan has been lodged with the Peak Park Planning specifying what needs to be done to comply with the condition.   It is then up to K.C. and the Peak Planners to ensure that plan has been implemented and is working.  A considerable discussion arose when the issue of smoke emissions was being discussed and it transpired that the emission pipe from the larger incinerator (i.e. horse/cow etc) may not have an afterburner unit on it and therefore it is possible that this may be a source of some of the current odours as the temperature achieved is not sufficient to kill odours.   K.C.  to investigate. |
| Agenda item 9 | The Parish Council and Residents feel we need to set up proper  communication links with DDDC Environmental Health e.g.  structure charts, contacts, telephone numbers, email addresses  with Parish Council and residents contact points.  We also need to explore and agree similar contact points of  communication with Redferns/ECGE. |
| Minute 24/05/17/09 | K.C., Parish Council and Residents will form a small working party to make a plan to improve communication paths not only between themselves but also with representatives of Redferns. These to be lines of communication only to advise each other of breaches, or issues. Be assured the residents have no wish to be involved in any business activities whatsoever and will only be involved in matters which may affect their loss of amenities. ADW and SM to form a small working party to progress this item. |
| Agenda item 10 | Concerns were raised in Parish Council.'s and residents' response  dated 12.4.17 re the Application by EGCE for a permit;  - Suggest issue of a temporary permit only as the whole plant is  experimental and not yet built and tested  - Where will DDDC find the staff resources - do they have the  appropriate powers/resources for enforcement of compliance?  - Steve Mansfield (Clerk of Flagg Parish Council) to speak on the  siting of monitoring stations using appropriate devices for noise,  vibration, odours, airborne gaseous and particulate materials, also  on the access to data by Parish Council, Residents, Operators andFlagg Parish Council serving The Residents of Flagg  Monitoring Authorities in real time and historically. What budget  has been allocated by the operators and by DDDC for the  environmental monitoring systems?  - How much working detail of the plant will be available to  residents and monitoring agencies, such as plant alarm levels (Hi,  HiHi, Lo, LoLo), PLC ladder logic, process parameters etc.?  - Hours of Operation appear to have been extended since  Planning application – should there be any restrictions written in  the operating permit for weekends, mornings and evenings, public  holidays etc.?  - Specific concerns stated re Bolton Planning (items 1-4)  - In the application for Planning Permission and at the Planning  Committee meeting, it was stated that the rendering process was  not a separate entity but a continuation of the Knackering Process,  so it seems logical that the Knackery operations should be covered  by the same Regulatory Regime. |
| Minute 24/05/17/10 | Steve Mansfield spoke on the subject of positive results from close liason between residents in the area adjacent to Petrochemical plant and operators of those plant where he had worked. These good relations had depended much on accurate monitoring of the emmisions from the plant, which helped the operators as musch as the residents to understand what was really happening.  Karen Carpenter stated that no budgets had been allocated either by the Environmental Health Authorites of the Plant Operator for the provision of Environmental Monitoring Systems, however the principle of “The Polluter Pays” would apply.  There were no plans to make plant operating parameters available to the residents.  There was not likely to be any restriction in the permit on hours or days when the plant could be in operation.  The specific concerns re Bolton Planning Application items 1 - 4 are an Environmental Health Officer issue and have been addressed in the Minutes relating to 24/05/17/08.  The Knackery operations could not be covered by the same regulatory regime as the new plant. |
| Agenda item 11 | Disposal of waste and waste water and cleaning chemicals -  nothing should be spread to land - Does a current permit exist?  If so which organisation issued it and where is it recorded? |
| Minute 24/05/17/11 | This is a decision for the Environment Agency |
| Agenda item 12 | Item deleted at the request of Derbyshire Dales Environmental Health Officer |
| Minute 24/05/17/12 | No discussion on Stone extraction and removal |
| Agenda item 13 | [Item deleted at the request of Derbyshire Dales Environmental Health Officer](http://www.flagg-pc.org/) |
| Minute 24/05/17/13 | No discussion on Insurance |
| Agenda item 14 | Agree next steps. Close meeting |
| Minute 24/05/17/14 | Next steps include making a delgation to discuss matters with Plant Operators. The residents of th evillage will draw up a plan of action.  The Environmental Health Officers, who had carefully and fully answered all the questions put to them in as open and frank a manner as they were able, were thanked and applauded by the whole meeting.  The meeting was closed. |