

Jon Brier

From: Christopher Lecointe
Sent: 16 November 2021 15:37
To: Claire Tomalin - Principal Planning Officer
Cc: Jon Brier
Subject: RE: Rivenhall IWMF Condition 66

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I was chasing this at a meeting this morning – almost there.

Are you around tomorrow for a quick catch up call?

Christopher Lecointe

Director of Environmental Planning
RPS | Consulting UK & Ireland
T +44 1235 821 888
E lecointec@rpsgroup.com

From: Claire Tomalin - Principal Planning Officer <Claire.Tomalin@essex.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 November 2021 14:28
To: Christopher Lecointe <LecointeC@rpsgroup.com>
Cc: Jon Brier <Jon.Brier@rpsgroup.com>
Subject: Rivenhall IWMF Condition 66

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of RPS.

Chris

I saw John Ahern last night at the Woodhouse Farm Exhibition, he explained you were putting a leaflet together for general circulation

However, with respect to condition 66 I was really only looking for a letter/email, that confirmed a couple of things that have already been stated at liaison meetings and in previous email exchanges between ourselves (see below). I'd just prefer not to put on our web the email exchange/minutes as they also include matters not relevant to condition 66.

You were also going to provide some clarification as to why the building works were likely to take till 2024/25, as previously within application documents 24 months has been stated.

I am still hoping to take condition 66 to November Committee, but our deadline is this Thursday for reports, so a prompt response would be appreciated.

Extract from our exchange of 19 October 2021

ESS/34/15/BTE/66/01

Information was provided yesterday at the liaison meeting which would be useful to be able to refer to as part of consideration of the current application with respect to condition 66. However, in order to enable this I would appreciate if an additional supporting/statement letter could be submitted with respect to the application, covering the following points.

The options being considered for the use and steam, I believe at the meeting both district heating and cooling systems were mentioned. It would need to be made clear these are subject to further planning permissions.

What options are being considered for the space that would be available within the IWMMF if the MRF, MBT, AD facilities were not developed. My understanding from the meeting (subject to planning permission) were the following:

- Facility to recycle 120,000tpa of bottom ash into aggregate
- Facility to deal with bulky waste, such as mattresses etc

The current application refers to the possibility of applying for a DCO to allow power generation in excess of 50MW. Queries have been raised as part of the consultation that the need for the DCO arises from the possibility that the EfW facility might be increased in size to use the maximum amount of waste permitted to be imported by the planning permission i.e. 853,000tpa. My understanding from the liaison meeting and it would be good if this could be clarified, that the DCO arises not from increasing the input into the incinerator above 595,000tpa, but the incinerator would be more efficient and thus able to generate more electricity than was quoted in the 2015 application. In the 2015 application the combined power to be generated by the CHP and AD was approximately 50MW with 22MW used on site to power the various elements, leaving 28 MW for export to the grid. An explanation as to how it is now anticipated that there could be potential to produce in excess of 50MW for export to the grid would be beneficial.

Not mentioned at the meeting, but what would be the alternative for use of the heat and steam if no facility directly utilising the heat and steam could be found by the time the incinerator was operational? Subject to appropriate permission is there potential to generate more electricity from the heat and steam?

As you will have heard at the meeting there is concern that the facility will not be integrated, particularly with respect to the use of the heat and steam. However, on a slightly different point without the MRF & MBT, how would it be ensured that the all the waste to put input to the incinerator had had all recyclables recovered e.g. paper and plastics, such that it is only residual waste. There has always been concern raised that the incinerator would discourage recycling.

As stated it would be helpful if the above points could be clarified in a statement to support the "plan of action".

Response: We would be happy to submit a further document in connection with the above to elaborate and clarify the points you raise. In brief though please note the following:

1. Any change to the authorised scheme, if it involves development and cannot be dealt with via the discharge of existing planning conditions, will be the subject of one or more further applications. Depending on the consenting regime (TCPA 1990 or Planning Act 2008, DCO regime), ECC will either be the determining authority or be consultee in the decision making process;
2. The district heating scheme we spoke of is currently an aspiration by Indaver and they wish to engage with you and your authority to explore the possibilities of devising and delivering such a scheme locally;
3. The plans for the IWMMF building that are currently being explored, in addition to the EfW component, are an IBA treatment facility (the scale is presently assumed to be about 120,000tpa); a waste pre-processing facility for selected waste streams, most notably bulky items; and a heat off-take area designed to serve a presently undefined heat/steam user;

4. We do not intend to alter the tonnages the plant is authorised to treat but the increase in power output i.e. greater than 50MWe, is achieved through better, more efficient plant not more fuel.
5. The power output will be above 50MWe but may vary depending upon the balance of heat and electricity produced;
6. Household waste arriving on the site will already have been subjected to some form of pre-treatment. Waste separation at source is now the norm so that only residual waste streams should arrive at the IWFMF site. There may be occasions where wastes arriving on site might be subjected to further pre-treatment e.g. bulky waste items, in which case these will be sent for pre-processing site within the IWFMF to extract recyclates.

Thanks & Regards

Claire Tomalin BSc (Hons), MA, MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer – Minerals & Waste
Planning Service
Place and Public Health

Mobile 07887 662163
Telephone: 03330 136821
Email: claire.tomalin@essex.gov.uk www.essex.gov.uk
Essex County Council, County Hall, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 1QH

ECC Planning Service is working remotely, away from the office. This means staff are working flexibly throughout the day around caring responsibilities.