

Time commenced - 6.00pm
Time finished - 8.17pm

CLIMATE CHANGE COMMISSION 19 AUGUST 2009

Present: Councillor Ingall (Chair)
Councillors Chera, Keane, Shanker, Tuplin and Webb
Jeremy Fisk, Peter Robinson and Bob Hewins (Co-opted
Members)

40/09 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Banwait and Hird..

41/09 Late Items to be introduced by the Chair

There were no late items.

42/09 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

43/09 Call-In and Councillor Call for Action

There were no items.

Items for Discussion

44/09 Waste Treatment Plant

The Commission considered the Environmental Statement for the proposed waste treatment plant. Members asked a number of detailed questions about the environmental impact of the plant. These questions included:

- Paragraph 16.2.7 – are the figures quoted for 7 days per week or for 5 days per week?
 - What is the tolerance on those figures?
- The report quotes a predicted increase in traffic of 2.2%. Is this a 2.2% increase in total vehicles? If so, would it not be more useful to quote the increase in the number of heavy goods vehicles?

- How has it been ascertained that traffic increase will not have any perceptible environment effect?
- The statement explains that the site is accessible by sustainable modes of transport. What incentives will there be for staff and visitors to use sustainable modes of transport?
- What is the percentage change in the number of HGV vehicles?
- What degree of certainty is there that emissions of NO₂ will be as quoted?
- The statement says that the waste treatment facility will have a negligible effect on air quality. How will this be quantified?
- The waste delivered to the site will contain many different materials in variable quantities. How certain can we be certain of the contents of the stack emissions?
- Which herbicide will be used to kill the knotweed and how will it be guaranteed not to damage other surrounding vegetation?
- When new housing is built this will further increase traffic and pollution. Has this been taken into account in the plans for the plants own emissions and traffic impact?
- Can anybody give a guarantee that this plant will not worsen the health of local people and it will not bring on early deaths?
- The traffic figures quoted are approx 60% capacity. How can this be a worst case assessment?
- Which chemicals will be stored on site?
- Has a comparison been made of the pollution from the Waste Treatment Facility with the pollution caused by the same waste being deposited in land fill?
- What is the preferred access route to the site?

The Commission received detailed responses to these questions, and any supplementary questions, from representatives from United Utilities, ENERGOS and RPS. After a lengthy discussion, the majority of the Commission were satisfied with the contents of the Environmental Statement and the clarifications received from the representatives.

Resolved to recommend the Cabinet Member for Direct and Internal Services note that the Commission was in general agreement with the Environmental Statement, subject to the following provisos:

- 1. That the traffic modelling was given further consideration and the possibility of obtaining an independent assessment was considered;**
- 2. That any decision should take account of the additional air quality management data requested by Environmental Health;**
- 3. That the Commission were consulted again should the waste collection area of the facility be expanded.**

45/09 Forward Plan Item 13/09 – Refuse Collection Rounds Review

The Commission received a report from Andrew Hopkin, Assistant Director for Local environment and Malcolm Price, Policy Strategy Manager for Waste Management on the refuse collection rounds review. It was reported that by April 2009 there were still 10,000 properties in Derby who were not able to participate in the kerbside recycling scheme Recycle Derby. To be able to expand the number of households able to participate, a review of the current collection rounds was required. This would maximise efficiency of the current rounds and enable further properties to be incorporated. It was expected that the changes would occur in October or November 2009, and it would mean that around 110,000 households would have a change of day or time for their waste collection.

Members asked if there was a communications strategy to support residents through the changes, as there had been some problems with a previous campaign to notify residents of the changes. It was noted that the team had learnt from their previous experiences and that there would be discussions with Ward Members, and a literature campaign. Malcolm Price's team would also be available to support residents as required.

The Commission asked if there were plans to increase the range of recyclables that would be collected. It was reported that the team were always looking for ways to improve the range of what could be recycled, but this did depend on the available processing facilities.

Resolved to note the report.

46/09 Forward Plan Item 101/08 – Generating Energy on Council Owned Land

The Commission received a report from Chris Edwards – Assistant Director, Property Services on the potential for generating energy on council Owned land. It was reported that Partnership for Renewables (PfR), a commercial arm of the Carbon Trust, had been specifically set up to work with public sector bodies in the development of renewable energy sources. PfR had been working with the Council for 12-18 months to assess the possibilities for generating wind energy from Council owned land. The first two phases (screening of sites + feasibility studies) had been completed but there were still a number of outstanding issues surrounding the lease which would need to be resolved, and some more detailed feasibility work that would need to be undertaken.

It was reported that Derby was on the edge of viability for renewable energy through wind as there were few spaces in the city with the required wind speeds.

Members raised concerns about the potential revenue from the scheme although it was noted that there was a consultation that considered

possibilities for allowances for renewable energy generation which would provide an income stream.

It was noted that there may be other market choices for production of energy, and these would be investigated as appropriate.

Resolved to note the report.

**47/09 Response of the Council and Council Cabinet to
recommendations of the Commission**

There were no items.

**48/09 Matters referred to the Commission by Council
Cabinet**

There were no items.

**49/09 Matters referred to the Commission by the
Scrutiny Management Commission**

There were no items.

MINUTES END