

Lostock Sustainable Energy Plant (LSEP) Local Liaison Committee:  
Minutes of Meeting  
Meeting No: 6 held on 23 Sep 2021

**Record of Attendance**

Present:

Phil Davies, Tata Chemicals Europe **(PD)**  
Sam Deacon, Coast Communications **(SD)**  
Tim Forrest, Copenhagen Infrastructure Partners **(TF)**  
Jeremy Gibbs, Cheshire West & Chester Council **(JG)**  
Sian Guest, Coast Communications (Scribe) **(SG)**  
Hazel Honeysett, Cheshire West and Chester Council **(HH)**  
Xavier Jacquemont, CNIM **(XJ)**  
Steve James, local resident **(SJ)**  
John Jensen, Lostock Sustainable Energy Plant **(JJ)**  
Cllr Sam Naylor, Cheshire West & Chester Council and Northwich Town Council **(SN)**  
Olivier Rio, CNIM **(OR)**  
Lyndsey Sandison, Lostock Gralam Parish Council **(LS)**  
Liz Waugh, Coast Communications (Chair) **(LW)**  
Kathryn Williams, Coast Communications **(KW)**

Apologies:

Gillian Sinclair, FCC Environment **(GS)**  
Cllr Helen Treeby, Cheshire West & Chester Council and Rudheath Parish Council **(HT)**

**Welcome & introductions**

LW, as chair of the Local Liaison Committee, welcomed attendees to the meeting and asked members if they wished to raise any further items of AOB.

**2. Minutes of previous meeting**

The committee reviewed the minutes and actions from the previous meeting. LW then addressed the three actions that were raised during the May LLC meeting:

1. Add local recruitment, including Jobs Fair to the agenda for the September LLC meeting. This had been actioned by Coast and was present as agenda item 5 of the September meeting.
2. Invite member of CWaCC Highways team to the September meeting to discuss roadworks. Principle Engineer, Jerry Gibbs, was present at the meeting. LW departed from the agenda to allow committee members to introduce themselves for JG's benefit.
3. Updates on the heat network and rail delivery options

TF provided an update on the rail feasibility study and highlighted that he had met with SN to go through the findings of the study and didn't have anything further to add.

SN had relayed the details of their meeting to relevant members of CWaCC, including regeneration and climate crisis portfolio holders, as well as the deputy leader of the council and the people responsible for waste management. SN added that representatives of CWaCC and LSEP should work together to identify a suitably sized authority that had the appropriate rail infrastructure to supply waste to site, then the rail delivery option could be taken forward. SN reaffirmed the importance of this approach, in light of the upcoming COP26 conference, and said that it would be remiss of a responsible organisation not to make use of the available railhead on site.

TF agreed with SN in principle and highlighted the conclusion of the rail feasibility study. TF said that, although the necessary infrastructure does exist on the Lostock site, most local authorities don't have the facilities to source and transport the waste to rail links, in order to transport it to site.

TF went on to state that three or four suitable authorities had been identified and LSEP would be enthusiastic to engage with those authorities in such an arrangement.

TF then went on to address the heat network study, which will be included in the variation application. The conclusion of the study found that, based on the current legislation in place for heat supply, it is not a commercial possibility to supply local areas. However, of the five areas that were looked at, two or three were more promising than others. This will be under continued review as legislation changes.

In relation to Tata, the plant is being designed to include an off flow to Tata and LSEP has a contract with Tata to supply steam on their request.

LW asked if both studies would be included in the application. TF confirmed that they will.

All actions were completed and could be signed off.

### **3. Road works update**

JJ presented an update on the traffic management works at the Middlewich Road / Kings Street & Penny's Lane – Broken Cross junction

See pdf copy of presentation: *LSEP LLC Sep 2021 – construction update.pdf*

SJ offered his congratulations to the project team, following JJ's update, for how well managed the road works had been. SJ mentioned that there were currently delays in the area due to temporary traffic signals. However, SJ

accepted that this was a short-term issue and that traffic flow would improve once the signals became operational. The contractors are keeping the work area tidy, aside from the issue concerning the broken water main.

The other three projects had been completed and were working well and the final project should be completed very soon. SJ mentioned that, in general, the works had been undertaken in a very considerate manner.

JG then provided an update on the current works programme. The original completion date was due in October, but due to additional work to put a new rising main in the carriageway, works had been extended to 12<sup>th</sup> November.

JG provided an update regarding how the new traffic light systems would operate:

- The Kings Street / Griffiths Road junction represents "stage 1" and operates at green, as a priority, for traffic travelling north up Kings Street and south, down Griffiths Road
- If there is demand for a right turning on to Middlewich Road, "stage 2" will be activated, which will allow vehicles to turn on to Middlewich Road
- If there is then demand for traffic to turn onto Penny's Ln or Middlewich Road, "stage 3" will activate, or if there is demand for pedestrians to cross on Middlewich Road, or Kings Street, "stage 4" will activate.
- If those demands don't arise, the signals will revert to "stage 1".
- The crossings will be puffin crossings, which will allow the crossing signals to be cancelled if the user has already crossed the road
- These crossings don't have any audible sound on them but do include a rotating tactile cone that visibility impaired people can use to signal when it is safe to cross.

SJ asked if the signals would be activated by induction loops or infrared as the pedestrian crossing, installed by the garage, is installed on induction loops.

JG wasn't clear on the answer but said he would respond to SJ with more information.

**ACTION:** *JG to clarify details regarding crossing systems for SJ (CWaCC)*

SN requested clarification regarding what road and pedestrian users would find if travelling from Middlewich Road, with the Broken Cross junction on the right. Would they be normal traffic lights?

JG confirmed that it would be normal traffic lights, at stage 2

SJ complimented the contractor for restoring the old cast iron finger post, which was welcomed.

SN raised the implications of HS2 to the area and asked JG if he had liaised with the project team delivering HS2, to establish what impact those works will have on Griffith Road.

JG confirmed that a meeting with the HS2 project team had taken place, during which, they reviewed the local junctions and how traffic modelling, which will include junction and pedestrian improvements, where necessary.

SD raised the query from Cllr Treeby – during the May LLC meeting – regarding the impact on pedestrians that the current road works at the Middlewich Road / Kings Street & Penny's Lane – Broken Cross junction, might have.

JG said that the signals will help the pedestrian phases on Middlewich Road and Kings Street, which is an improvement on the current pedestrian provisions.

JG is available to answer further queries, should the committee members have any.

SJ asked if the LSEP local liaison committee would be involved in the HS2 development and its impact on the local traffic infrastructure.

LW stated that HS2 was not part of the committee's remit.

#### **4. Construction update**

JJ presented an update regarding the ongoing enabling works and the completion of the demolition works. JJ also confirmed that the remediation works would be completed by Christmas 2021 and provided an update regarding the piling works. JJ also gave a brief update on Covid-19 measures being implemented on site.

See pdf copy of presentation: *LSEP LLC Sep 2021 – construction update*

SJ asked when the plant was due to be operational. JJ responded that the current plan is for the plant to be operational by the second half of 2024, although the construction schedule is still under adjustment.

SJ asked if this delay was due to Covid-19. JJ highlighted that the enabling packages of works was more complicated than initially anticipated, as is often the case when working with existing installations. There have been a number of factors causing delays.

HH has asked if there had been any issues raised regarding the piling from the local community. JJ confirmed that there had been issues regarding the P4 car park initially, but not regarding the piling works. JJ stated that the piling technology used does not involve an impact hammer, therefore, very little noise is generated.

PD said that Tata hadn't received any complaints regarding the piling and have had no issues with noise.

HH commented that it was helpful to have an insight into the piling technology that was being used.

SJ wanted to compliment the project team regarding the piling works. The local residents did have an issue regarding noise coming from the Tata site, which wasn't insignificant, especially downwind. The noise continued through Saturday and Sunday night. Tata had been in touch with SJ to apologise for the noise and it would be highlighted as an environmental issue that would be addressed.

PD added his apologies for the noise disturbance. He wasn't aware of the specific issues but mentioned that it could be as a result of steam venting on site.

**ACTION:** *PD will investigate the steam venting issue on site and follow up with SJ to provide further information (Tata).*

LS highlighted that she had previously received notification of planned venting by Tata and it did make a difference, as LS was able to circulate those details on local community forums. If Tata are aware of potential noise in future, LS requested that the committee are kept in the loop.

SN thanked JJ for his construction presentation and queried what Tata's future involvement in LSEP would be. SN asked if the project was on schedule and on budget, and whether the current completion date had changed?

PD said that Tata is the landlord for LSEP and that the footprint for the EfW plant has been long leased to LSEP. He said that Tata won't be running the plant; it will be run by FCC as the O&M Contractor although Tata will have regular interface with the plant. There is a steam offtake option on the plant and Tata will provide sodium bicarbonate to LSEP, which is the agent that is used to clean the flue gases. This represents a closed loop solution that keeps traffic off the road. If LSEP and Tata are successful in securing the use of rail to deliver waste to site, it would be Tata's railhead that is used.

SN replied to say that Tata has a big presence in the town. SN has flagged to CWaCC that they need to find customers for the rail aspect and asked if Tata could be involved to help utilise the rail link to bring in waste.

PD stated that the railhead had been discussed with TF and the LSEP team in the past. It was an area of focus in 2012 to bid for a West London waste contract that did have a rail delivery system. PD agreed that using the rail link would be preferable, if possible.

SN said that CWaCC are in the process of developing a 10-year waste strategy. SN had been informed that in order to make the use of rail economical, the waste would need to be sourced 50 miles away. Community members have asked SN whether the LSEP facility represents old technology that isn't being used in the UK anymore.

TF responded to say that there are more innovative technologies that have delivered to a greater or lesser extent. The LSEP project will be one of the more efficient incineration plants in the UK, given its size. LSEP isn't the last facility of its kind being developed, others are currently in the planning phase. TF highlighted that the Ørsted facility does use different technology, which has had a varying commercial performance. TF wasn't aware of other technologies that had a reasonable commercial application.

LW highlighted that there were approximately 50 similar facilities under development in the UK, and that other technologies such as pyrolysis or gasification had an equally chequered past.

TF highlighted significant commercial failures that new technologies had experienced. TF wasn't aware of a single gasification plant that had met its business plan.

SN said that this information was useful but that the technology being used at LSEP was not in keeping with the current climate agenda. However, he did accept that the facility is under construction.

**ACTION:** *Invite a consultant to the next meeting to discuss the variety of different technologies that are currently available to provide more context regarding the facility (Coast).*

## **5. Jobs Fair**

XJ provided an introduction regarding the current civil erection works that are taking place and the planned process erection works that are due to take place in the second half of 2022. XJ said that now is the appropriate time for CNIM to host a Jobs Fair and Meet the Buyer event. The event will take place before the end of 2021, CNIM has given Coast the mandate to coordinate the events.

SD stated that the Jobs Fair and Meet the Buyer events represent an opportunity to bring the procurement teams, local job seekers and suppliers together. Now that various different work packages on the process and civils

side are due to come on stream, it is the best time to engage with the local job market. Coast is in the planning stage currently and is in the process of sourcing an appropriate venue in the area. He said that the events will be promoted and publicised as comprehensively as possible, to ensure maximum level of attendance.

SD finished by saying that Coast will share all the relevant information with the committee as soon as it is available and requested that the committee members supported the project team's efforts to promote the events.

SN welcomed the update and highlighted that he was opening a jobs fair in Northwich on 24<sup>th</sup> September – organised by CWaCC, Northwich Town Council and the Northwich BiD organisation – at the new Open Space in the town. SN offered to put Coast in touch with anyone that can help the project team liaise with the local jobs market.

LW said that Coast are in touch with CWaCC's economic development team.

HH highlighted that the events sit with the legal obligation that CNIM are tied to, outlined in the planning permission, which talks about local employment. The Jobs Fair and Meet the Buyer events would fit with those obligations.

LW highlighted that the obligation is a shared one, and did not just sit with CNIM. LW also asked if Northwich Leisure Centre was still in abeyance.

SN confirmed it was back in operation and would be big enough to hold the event. SN offered his support in any way to help facilitate the events.

SD queried whether the Open Space venue is a permanent or temporary structure. SN confirmed that it was a temporary marquee but that Memorial Court would be a suitable venue for the events. SN stated that, wherever the events are held, CWaCC, Northwich Town Council and Northwich BiD will be available to support.

## **6. Variation application**

TF provided an update regarding the variation application. The Environmental Statement was submitted to BEIS on 17<sup>th</sup> March. BEIS responded on 12<sup>th</sup> May confirming the scoping document that LSEP had suggested. Since then, LSEP has been focussed on collating the documentation for the application's submission and LSEP hoped to submit the application within the next two months.

SJ asked when LSEP would be publishing the community's responses to the details of the variation application.

TF thought that those responses had been relayed to the committee at a previous meeting, although that may have just been the preliminary findings, but TF was happy to share the full analysis with the committee members. The analysis will also form part of the final submission, which will be in the public domain.

**ACTION:** *LSEP to provide an update on consultation responses and invite the organisation that ran the consultation to present at the next LLC meeting (LSEP).*

SJ highlighted that he had been in touch with BEIS for an update but hasn't received a response. SJ also hasn't received a response from either of the local MPs.

TF replied that BEIS has responded to LSEP's scoping application and has agreed with the outline plans they have presented so far. BEIS hasn't received the final application yet.

## **7. Future agenda requests**

No future agenda requests were made

## **8. AOB**

SJ raised the lack of local representation on the committee and suggested a recruitment drive to increase local involvement, which could include an advert in the Northwich Guardian.

HH highlighted the committee's constitution and the legal agreement that was originally outlined. From a local point of view, the local representatives on the committee are the council members and it is down to them to feed back details from the committee meetings to local residents. HH suggested recruiting members of the Parish Council, as well as Mark Stocks (Cllr for Shakerley) to attend more regularly. HH suggested this would be the direction to take, rather than increasing local resident membership.

Jame Kelly has applied to become of a member of the Local Liaison Committee and LW will follow up with him regarding his application. Ultimately, the application would be referred to the committee for a decision.

SN stated that SJ was doing a great job on the committee and thought that once the formal variation application had been submitted, people were more likely to get a response from the Parish and Town Councils. SN mentioned that the main opposition group – CHAIN – was run by one person, who was currently unwell. He said that extension of hours and increase in HGV traffic, included in the variation application, would prompt robust objections from the local community.



LW raised Extinction Rebellion's Day of Action, scheduled for the 24<sup>th</sup> / 25<sup>th</sup> September, against incineration. Most of the action will be focused on plants in London and Dorset. However, the necessary arrangements have been made on site should a local protest be held. LW highlighted that the action will include a photo shoot in Griffiths Park.

SJ mentioned that it would be good to get together on site for the next meeting.

LW suggested potentially holding a hybrid meeting for those that did not feel comfortable attending in person.

## **9. Date and time of next meeting**

Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> January 2022

### **ACTIONS**

- JG to clarify details regarding crossing systems for SJ (CWaCC)
- PD will investigate the steam venting issue on site and follow up with SJ to provide further information (Tata)
- Invite a consultant to the next meeting to discuss the variety of different technologies that are currently available and provide more context regarding the facility (Coast)
- LSEP to provide an update on consultation responses from those that ran the consultation (LSEP)