

Boston Alternative Energy Facility



Statement of Common Ground between Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited and Boston Borough Council

Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: EN010095

Date: April 2022

Revision: Final

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of the Statement of Common Ground.....	1
1.2	Description of the Proposed Development.....	1
1.3	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	2
1.4	Terminology	3
2	Overview of Previous Engagement	3
3	Issues	6
3.1	Introduction and General Matters	6
4	Agreement of this Statement of Common Ground.....	36
4.1	Statement of Common Ground.....	36

Table of Tables

Table 2-1	Engagement activities between AUBP and Boston Borough Council	3
Table 3-1	Issues	8

Appendices

Appendix A	Engagement and Correspondence.....	37
Appendix B	Glossary	38

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Statement of Common Ground

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in respect of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the proposed Boston Alternative Energy Facility (the Facility) made by Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited (AUBP) to the Planning Inspectorate under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (Planning Act).
- 1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application Documents. All documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate website.
- 1.1.3 The SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority where agreement has been reached between the parties named in **Section 1.3**, and where agreement has not been reached. SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and so focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination.

1.2 Description of the Proposed Development

- 1.2.1 The Facility covers 26.8 hectares (ha) and is split in to two components: the area containing operational infrastructure for the Facility (the 'Principal Application Site'); and an area containing habitat mitigation works for wading birds (the 'Habitat Mitigation Area'). The Facility will generate power from Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) with the 'thermal treatment' process for generating power converting the solid fuel into steam, which is then used to generate power using steam turbine generators. It will have a total gross generating capacity of 102 megawatts electric (MWe) and it will deliver approximately 80 MWe to the National Grid. The Facility will be designed to operate for at least 25 years, after which it may be decommissioned.
- 1.2.2 The Principal Application Site covers 25.3 ha and is located at the Riverside Industrial Estate, Boston, Lincolnshire. This site is next to the tidal River Witham (known as The Haven) and down-river from the Port of Boston. The Habitat Mitigation Area covers 1.5 ha and is located approximately 170 m to the south east of the Principal Application Site, encompassing an area of saltmarsh and small creeks at the margins of The Haven.

1.2.3 The main elements of the Facility will be:

- Wharf and associated infrastructure (including re-baling facility, workshop, transformer pen and welfare facilities);
- RDF bale storage area, including sealed drainage with automated crane system for transferring bales;
- Conveyor system between the RDF storage area and the RDF bale shredding plant, part of which is open and part of which is under cover;
- Bale shredding plant;
- RDF bunker building;
- Thermal Treatment Plant comprising three separate 34 MWe combustion lines and three stacks;
- Turbine plant comprising three steam turbine generators and make-up water facility;
- Air-cooled condenser structure, transformer pen and associated piping and ductwork;
- Lightweight aggregate (LWA) manufacturing plant comprising four kiln lines, two filter banks with stacks, storage silos, a dedicated berthing point at the wharf, and storage (and drainage) facilities for silt and clay;
- Electrical export infrastructure;
- Two carbon dioxide (CO₂) recovery plants and associated infrastructure;
- Associated site infrastructure, including site roads and car parking, site workshop and storage, security gate, and control room with visitor centre; and
- Habitat mitigation works for Redshank and other bird species comprising of improvements to the existing habitat through the creation of small features such as pools/scrapes and introduction of small boulders within the Habitat Mitigation Area.

1.3 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.3.1 This SoCG has been prepared in respect of the Facility by (1) AUBP, and (2) Boston Borough Council, together the Parties.

1.3.2 **AUBP** is a privately-owned company, established for the purpose of securing development consent for the Facility and then developing and operating the Facility. The company team has been involved in industrial development at the site in Boston, Lincolnshire since 2004.

1.3.3 As a prescribed consultee under the Planning Act, 2008 (the “2008 Act”), **Boston Borough Council** is responsible for services such as rubbish collection, recycling, housing and planning applications.

1.4 Terminology

1.4.1 In **Table 3-1** in the Issues section of this SoCG:

- a) “Agreed” indicates area(s) of agreement; and
- b) “Not agreed” indicates a final position for area(s) of disagreement where the resolution of divergent positions will not be possible, and parties agree on this point.

1.4.2 It can be assumed that any matters not specifically referred to in the Issues section of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to the Boston Borough Council and therefore have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters can be read as agreed, only to the extent that they are either not of material interest or relevance to Boston Borough Council.

2 Overview of Previous Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of the meetings and correspondence undertaken between the Parties in relation to the Facility is outlined in **Table 2-1** below, this is also shown in **Appendix A**.

2.1.2 It is agreed that this is an accurate record of the key meetings and consultation undertaken between the Parties in relation to the issues addressed in this SoCG.

Table 2-1 Engagement activities between AUBP and Boston Borough Council

Date	Form of contact / correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
3 April 2018	Meeting	Meeting to present the scheme, discuss details and the involvement of Boston Borough Council.
5 September and 7 September 2018	Meetings	Meetings explaining the project and consultation process, time for questions, answers and discussions.
6 September 2018	Meeting	Meeting explaining the project and consultation process, time for questions, answers and discussions.
5 February 2019	Meeting	Project update meeting with Ward Councillor and Economic Development Manager for Boston Borough Council to show project developments and next steps. Update on forthcoming public information days. No meeting minutes available.
14 March 2019	Meeting	Meeting to discuss potential cumulative schemes to be considered. No meeting minutes available.

Date	Form of contact / correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
19 June 2019	Meeting	Round table meeting with Boston Borough Council (portfolio holder for environment; Economic Development Manager; Head of Environmental Operations; Ex-Forward Planning Officer) to discuss Phase Three statutory consultation and the publication of the PEIR.
19 June 2019	Meeting	Round table meeting with Boston Borough Council (Councillors for Wyberton Ward, Coastal Ward, Kirton and Frampton Ward, St Thomas' Ward) to discuss Phase Three statutory consultation and the publication of the PEIR.
6 August 2019	Letter	S42 response received from Boston Borough Council.
24 September 2019	Meeting	Meeting with Boston Borough Council Environment and Performance Scrutiny committee to show presentation of the proposed scheme followed by a general discussion and question and answer session.
25 September 2019	Meeting	Round table meeting with Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council to discuss traffic and transport for the proposed scheme including consideration of mitigation measures.
3 October 2019	Meeting	Round table meeting with Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council to discuss environmental health concerns focussing on emissions e.g. noise and air quality.
9 October 2019	Meeting	Discussion of the socio-economic assessment of the Facility and opportunities for liaison with local businesses with Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council.
19 May 2020	Meeting	Project update meeting with Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council about proposed changes to the project and information on upcoming consultation proposals.
31 July 2020	Meeting	Project update meeting with Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council, with the opportunity to ask questions.
5 August 2020	Meeting	Presentation to Boston Borough Councillors about the project and provide information on upcoming consultation proposals. No meeting minutes available.
8 September 2020	Meeting	Presentation to Boston Borough Council Environment and Performance Scrutiny Committee about the proposed changes to the scheme and an update about the proposed changes.
18 November 2020	Meeting	Meeting with Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council to provide a discussion on the three key topic areas for Boston Borough Council: noise, air quality and transport prior to submission; and to identify the way forward for engagement post-submission.

Date	Form of contact / correspondence	Key topics discussed and key outcomes
4 June 2021	Meeting	Meeting with Boston Borough Council to provide a project update. Waste and Lincolnshire County Council, use of the river and other matters including lighting, noise and heritage impacts were discussed.
9 August 2021	Meeting	To discuss cultural heritage and archaeology.
12 August 2021	Meeting	General project update discussion
7 September 2021	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the Section 106 agreement and its contents.
7 September 2021	Meeting	Meeting to discuss air quality / dust.
27 September 2021	Meeting	Meeting with Boston Borough Council, Natural England and Lincolnshire County Council to discuss the Outline PRoW Strategy.
25 November 2021	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the draft DCO.
08 December 2021	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the Statement of Common Ground.
10 December 2021	Meetings	Meeting to discuss the Section 106 agreement. Meeting with LCC and BBC to discuss discharge of requirements.
20 January 2022	Meeting	Heritage meeting to discuss the outcomes of the intrusive site works.
31 January 2022	Meeting	Meeting to discuss the Section 106 agreement and its contents.
22 February 2022	Email	Email from BBC providing comments on the s.106
11 March 2022	Email	Email to BBC providing revised s.106 for comments
17 March 2022	Email	Email from BBC providing comments on the s.106
21 March 2022	Email	Email to BBC providing revised s.106 for comments
29 March 2022	Meeting	Meeting between AUBP and BBC's legal representatives to discuss the s.106
29 March 2022	Email	Email from BBC providing comments on the s.106
4 April 2022	Email	Email to BBC providing comments on the s.106

- 2.1.3 As can be seen from the above, there has been a degree of collaborative and proactive working between the parties, and the parties have agreed to continue in this general manner in an attempt to reach a commonly agreed position and resolve any issues arising. In particular, AUBP is committed, to attempting to resolve all of the concerns raised by Boston Borough Council.

3 Issues

3.1 Introduction and General Matters

3.1.1 This document sets out the matters which are agreed or not agreed between Boston Borough Council and AUBP. It is noted that Boston Borough Council have provided an extensive Relevant Representation which attempts to raise the most significant issues at an early stage, those matters have been used to inform ongoing dialogue and also the scope of this document.

3.1.2 On 17 August 2021, the Examining Authority issued a letter under Section 88 of the Planning Act and Rules 4 and 6 of The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (known as the 'Rule 6 Letter'). Annex E of the Rule 6 Letter set out a request for SoCGs between AUBP and various parties, including Boston Borough Council. For Boston Borough Council the Rule 6 Letter advises that the following issues should be in the SoCG:

- A. Archaeology and Heritage
- B. Environmental considerations including landscape, dust, climate change and biodiversity
- C. Highways and sustainable transport
- D. Public Rights of Way (PRoW), recreation and tourism
- E. Futureproofing – including management of waste and use of bi-products
- F. Community impact and maximising opportunities to create a positive legacy for the town
- G. Socio-economic benefits
- H. Draft DCO

3.1.3 The Rule 6 Letter also advises that all of the SoCGs should cover the Articles and Requirements in the draft Development Consent Order and that any Interested Party seeking that an Article or Requirement is reworded should provide the form of words which are being sought in the SoCG.

3.1.4 **Table 3-1** details the matters which are agreed or not agreed between the Parties, including a reference number for each matter.

Table 3-1 Issues

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
1. Archaeology and Heritage					
BBC 1.1	Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 8 (<i>Cultural Heritage</i>) (doc ref 6.28, APP-046) and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (doc ref 7.3, APP-122)	Approach to Investigation and Mitigation	BBC is in agreement with the phased approach set out for the investigations, the specific methodology for which is to be developed in consultation with heritage stakeholders including the archaeological adviser to BBC.	<p>The EIA has been informed by a desk-based assessment (including full settings assessment) and a programme of geophysical survey. The Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI) proposes a phased approach to further investigation and mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1: a programme of geoarchaeological monitoring and assessment (boreholes) to be undertaken alongside planned ground investigations for the project; Phase 2: a phase of targeted trial trenching to 'ground-truth' the results from the geophysical and geoarchaeological assessments; and Phase 3: a programme of pre-construction set-piece excavation and/or archaeological monitoring/watching briefs during construction would be agreed in consultation with stakeholders. 	Agreed
BBC 1.2	ES Chapter 8 (<i>Cultural Heritage</i>) (doc ref 6.28, APP-046) and Outline Written Scheme of	Suitability of Assessment for EIA and Timing of Further Investigation	BBC does not consider that the work undertaken to date sufficiently characterises the site for the purposes of the EIA and DCO application. A specific area of concern raised by BBC is that field evaluation has not	Given the results of the desk based assessment and geophysical survey (which do not suggest the presence of significant or extensive archaeological features) the proposed strategy for further investigation, as set out in the OWSI is	Not agreed but understanding of respective positions reached.

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
	Investigation (doc ref 7.3, APP-122)		<p>yet been undertaken and that this would be considered essential to inform their advice on the application. We note the further works planned and will work with AUBP to agree the specification of this.</p> <p>BBC understands that further submissions on this will be made. We are pleased to note the initial results will be shared with the Councils consultants (Heritage Lincolnshire), LCC and Historic England.</p> <p>We understand that there is still some distance between the specialists on behalf of BBC and LCC and the AUBP team in terms of the correct approach to trial trenching and investigation. We appreciate that AUBP may be seeking to proceed 'at risk' and this is a matter for them and the Inspectors consideration.</p> <p>Therefore, in respect of this matter, the position reached may be one of 'agree to disagree' on technical interpretations of policy and guidance, and that the matter will rest with the Inspector to determine.</p>	<p>planned to take place post-consent. This is in line with AUBP's view on risk. AUBP has undertaken further intrusive site works (boreholes) and has agreed this work with Boston Borough Council (and others) through the issuing of a Written Scheme of investigation (WSI). The results of these intrusive site works were submitted at Deadline 4, and updated at Deadline 8 Geoarchaeological Borehole Survey (document reference 9.52(1), REP8-009).</p> <p>Given the significant depths of alluvium across the site which overlie identified deposits with archaeological potential, as confirmed by the targeted geoarchaeological investigation in October 2021, archaeological evaluation by trial trenching or test pitting is unlikely to be practical at this time, serving limited value and informing the Applicant's view on risk. The Applicant stands by a targeted strategy for further evaluation following, and informed by, planned, post-consent geotechnical investigations (to include geoarchaeological and archaeological objectives) which will allow for a fuller understanding of the potential for sub-surface archaeological deposits. The Applicant considers this approach is in line</p>	

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>We would however maintain that in the event of the above, sufficient mitigation measures should be put in place to enable any unforeseen issues to be addressed once detailed investigation and design work has been undertaken.</p>	<p>with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>	
BBC 1.3	N/A	<p>Mitigation in the form of interpretation, education and promotion of understanding of the historic importance of the area.</p>	<p>BBC considers that it is important to secure a comprehensive form of interpretation, promotion and education measures to offset and mitigate the residual impacts of the development in respect of cultural heritage. Presently there is limited detail on this and its scope. This has been raised with AUBP.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We note the steps taken by AUBP to address and that there are proposals for mitigation being presented. It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter</p>	<p>A draft Section 106 agreement is being negotiated between AUBP and Boston Borough Council, which is in advanced stages. The s.106 covers the inclusion of historical interpretation. This has been incorporated into the Outline PRoW Design Guide, a revised version was submitted to the Examination at Deadline 8 (document reference 9.41(1), REP8-007).</p>	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			can be treated as being agreed between the parties.		
BBC 1.4	ES Chapter 8 (<i>Cultural Heritage</i>) (doc ref 6.28, APP-046) and Chapter 9 (<i>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</i>) (doc ref 6.9.2, APP-047)	Views of St Botolph's (the Stump)	<p>There are some residual concerns regarding the prominence of the facility (in particular the stacks) within views of St Botolphs. Limited analysis has also been undertaken on views from the Stump and its viewing areas. We believe more can and should be done to mitigate any impacts arising on this important local asset.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We note the steps taken by AUBP to address and that there are proposals for mitigation being presented. It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>We also welcome discussions with AUBP about other ways to ensure any residual impacts of the scheme are managed/mitigated, albeit accepting that this may fall outside of the planning process. We remain committed to discussion and dialogue with AUBP on this.</p>	<p>The ES includes an assessment of views/landscape and setting of St Botolph's. This receptor is determined to be of high heritage significance. Operational impacts on the setting of St Botolph's are set out in Section 8.9 of Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage (document reference 6.2.8, APP-046) with the conclusion that no significant effects will occur once embedded mitigation is applied (see Table 8-11). Given the massing of the Facility and its location no further mitigation is considered practical. At the meeting with the Council on 7 September 2021 this issue was discussed. The Council raised the issue of what it considers to be residual effects and that the Council thinks these should be addressed in the form of a Community Fund. The Council has provided a draft proposal on what that Community Fund would relate to. AUBP has provided its response to that proposal and the parties agree this is a matter to be discussed in greater detail at a later point.</p>	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
2. Environmental considerations including landscape, dust, climate change and biodiversity					
BBC 2.1	ES Chapter 14 (<i>Air Quality</i>) (doc ref 6.2.14, APP-052)	Dust	<p>To assist in protecting the high sensitivity business nearby it is considered as part of the DCO Schedule 2 'Code of Construction Practice 10(3)(d)' dust monitoring should take place at boundary locations to ensure the dust management controls are being effective and to provide quantifiable evidence in the event of complaints, along with a suite of measures to address any concerns.</p> <p>The Councils Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the information to date, and we are satisfied with the steps proposed. This matter can be treated as agreed, subject to the mitigation measures being secured.</p>	<p>Dust is assessed within the ES in line with the Institute of Air Quality Management's guidance (para 14.7.3) with mitigation set out (para 14.8.1). No significant effects are predicted. AUBP does recognise a nearby high sensitivity receptor and will confirm any additional mitigation or monitoring in relation to this location. Particular provision will be included in the final version of the Air Quality and Dust Management Plan, in consultation with specific sensitive receptors, for the targeting of control, monitoring and management measures. An outline version of this plan (document reference 9.39, REP3-015) has been submitted to the examination at Deadline 3.</p>	Agreed
BBC 2.2	ES Chapter 9 (<i>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</i>) (doc ref 6.9.2, APP-047)	Landscape	<p>This development, as a result of its scale and form, will result in significant landscape and visual change. We note the embedded mitigation measures, but there is limited scope for other measures to reduce the impact of the structures themselves which are led by the technology proposed. We request consideration</p>	<p>AUBP agrees with Boston Borough Council that due to the scale of the development further mitigation is not possible. However, AUBP has committed to providing interpretation of the facility (exact measures to be agreed) as part of the draft Section 106 agreement which is being discussed with Boston Borough Council and is in an advanced stage. This</p>	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>given to other forms of mitigation in the form of interpretation, education and promotion of understanding of the historic importance of the area and use of the river. This could link to other themes such as tourism and PRoW.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We note the steps taken by AUBP to address and that there are proposals for mitigation being presented. It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties.</p>	links to the Outline PRoW Design Guide and Stopping Up Plan, a revised version was submitted to the Examination at Deadline 8 (document reference 9.41(1), REP8-007) .	
BBC 2.3	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Doc ref 7.4, APP-123)	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)	Further BNG opportunities should be explored at other local sites such as Woodland sites, nearby Local Wildlife Sites, Wildlife Trust sites Borough Council operated sites such as Witham Way Country Park, or in collaboration with the Eastern IFCA.	Terrestrial BNG is included within the Application where on-site planting is proposed. The focus on BNG is otherwise directed towards intertidal habitat loss. Therefore, the Applicant is considering BNG at Havenside Local Nature Reserve (LNR) as discussed in the updated Outline Landscape and Ecological Mitigation	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We note the steps taken by AUBP to address and that there are proposals for mitigation being presented. It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties.</p>	<p>Strategy (OLEMS) the latest version was submitted at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.4(2), REP7-037). AUBP continues to explore opportunities for BNG on terrestrial sites with Boston Borough Council on land within the borough and has provided a detailed commitment in the draft s.106 agreement to provide BNG.</p>	
BBC 2.4	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Doc ref 7.4, APP-123)	Planting	<p>Planting should be moved forward in the programme and inspections should be carried out more frequently than annually. The planting proposed is described in the OLEMS could be adjusted to provide enhanced carbon and particulate removal.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We note the steps taken by AUBP to address and that there are proposals for mitigation being presented. In general terms these are acceptable. There are some inconsistencies in the document –</p>	<p>The updated OLEMS was submitted to the Examination at Deadline 7 (document reference 7.4(2), REP7-037), includes a monthly inspection of vandalism and fly tipping. Any inconsistencies in the OLEMS will be checked and included within the Schedule of Errata (document reference 9.96) to be submitted at Deadline 9. The Applicant will agree the final planting within the final LEMS.</p>	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>Para 10.7.2 does say monthly inspections. There are instances in paras 10.8.2, 10.10.2 10.11.2 that refer to annual removal of rubbish and repair of vandalism so my be inconsistencies that need reviewing.</p> <p>It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, requirements finalised, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties.</p>		
BBC 2.5	N/A	Climate Change	<p>BBC seeks to work collaboratively to support the wider Borough in taking action to address the climate and environment emergency and work with local businesses to support the development of a low carbon economy. We consider that Carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions should be monetised and a Community Benefit Fund established.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We</p>	Please see responses to SoCG Reference BBC 7.3 and BBC 7.4.	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>note the steps taken by AUBP to address and the responses received and respect that position.</p> <p>We also welcome discussions with AUBP about other ways to ensure any residual impacts of the scheme are managed/mitigated, albeit accepting that this may fall outside of the planning process. We remain committed to discussion and dialogue with AUBP on this.</p>		
3. Highways and Sustainable Transport					
BBC 3.1	ES Chapter 19 (<i>Traffic and Transport</i>) (Doc ref 6.2.19, APP-057)	Avoidance of traffic by using vessels	BBC note and recognise the change within the scheme to reduce highway impacts by bringing material in by river. This is a positive change and does address one of our previous concerns.	The incorporation of a wharf into the project reduces both construction and operational road traffic and no significant adverse effects on road users are predicted.	Agreed
BBC 3.2	ES Chapter 19 (<i>Traffic and Transport</i>) (Doc ref 6.2.19, APP-057)	Improved access to Marsh Lane Industrial Estate	<p>It remains an ambition of BBC to secure improved access arrangements to the Marsh Lane industrial estate and immediate area surrounding.</p> <p>We note that AUBP have acknowledged and reviewed the Councils request in respect of this wider ambition. There is mutual</p>	AUBP does not consider such improvements necessary or proportionate to the Facility's impacts. There is a mutual agreement of decisions regarding this matter.	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			agreement, that whilst it is not a deliverable output from this scheme, it may be something which this development contributes towards the achievement of in future.		
BBC 3.3	ES Chapter 19 (<i>Traffic and Transport</i>) (Doc ref 6.2.19, APP-057) and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc ref 7.2, APP-121)	Construction Phase traffic impacts – including indirect effects and monitoring of the Spirit of Endeavour Roundabout	<p>BBC would request that consideration be given to whether measures are required to ensure that in-direct impacts do not arise, particularly through the construction phase. We also consider that monitoring of the impact upon the Spirit of Endeavour Roundabout is required along with surrounding minor routes as described in our Relevant Representation.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We note the steps taken by AUBP to address and that there are proposals for mitigation being presented including through the requirements.</p> <p>We also welcome discussions with AUBP about other ways to ensure any residual impacts of the scheme are managed/mitigated, albeit accepting that this may fall outside of the planning process. We remain</p>	Chapter 19 of the ES includes detailed assessment of impacts of the Facility's construction traffic including driver delay. As residual delays are assessed to not be significant, the Facility's construction traffic would not induce motorists to reassign to other "lesser/minor roads". The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan is secured as Requirement 13 of the draft DCO (document reference 2.1(4), REP8-004) includes a commitment to monitoring of HGV and personnel vehicle movements.	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>committed to discussion and dialogue with AUBP on this.</p> <p>The Council would also highlight the recent successful grant of a Levelling Up award relating to improvements at the roundabouts in question. This is to be facilitated by LCC.</p>		
BBC 3.4	ES Chapter 19 (<i>Traffic and Transport</i>) (Doc ref 6.2.19, APP-057)	Road adoption	<p>BBC questions whether there is scope to rectify historic issues relating to the private road(s) included within the scheme area, to bring them up to an adoptable standard.</p> <p>The Council thanks AUBP for reviewing this matter and understands that there are a number of technical and legal complexities which preclude this.</p>	AUBP does not propose to bring private roads on March Land Industrial Estate to adoptable standards.	Agreed
BBC 3.5	ES Chapter 19 (<i>Traffic and Transport</i>) (Doc ref 6.2.19, APP-057)	Provision of Busses	BBC noted there should be consideration of a bus route through the industrial estate and would encourage the Applicants to work with the Highway Authority and local operators to discuss what can be achieved, and the Borough Council would be happy to facilitate such discussions.	AUBP does not consider that it would be proportionate for it to fund a bus service and operators may be unwilling to divert buses on to a private road network. AUBP is happy to have a further conversation on this matter.	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>We note that AUBP have acknowledged and reviewed the Councils request in respect of this wider ambition. There is mutual agreement, that whilst it is not a deliverable output from this scheme, it may be something which this development contributes towards the achievement of in future.</p> <p>We also welcome discussions with AUBP about other ways to ensure any residual impacts of the scheme are managed/mitigated, albeit accepting that this may fall outside of the planning process. We remain committed to discussion and dialogue with AUBP on this.</p>		
BBC 3.6	N/A	Electric vehicles	<p>BBC request consideration is given to the promotion of renewable energy use within the town and improvements to EV car charging within the town.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We note the steps taken by AUBP to address and that there are proposals for mitigation being presented including through the requirements. It is likely that this matter will be agreed</p>	<p>EV charging points will be provided at the Facility itself, and this is included within the draft s.106 agreement. However, it is not proposed that AUBP will provide EV charging points within the town as there is no direct connection between such provision and the development.</p>	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>We also welcome discussions with AUBP about other ways to ensure any residual impacts of the scheme are managed/mitigated, albeit accepting that this may fall outside of the planning process. We remain committed to discussion and dialogue with AUBP on this.</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties.</p>		
4. Public Rights of Way (PRoW), recreation and tourism					
BBC 4.1	ES Chapter 19 (<i>Traffic and Transport</i>) (Doc ref 6.2.19, APP-057)	PRoW Stopping Up	<p>We would query why the loss of PRoW is considered minor and suggest this should be upgraded. Concerns that this element has been under assessed and not properly understood. We question whether the PRoW permanent closures have been underplayed and whether sufficient mitigation has been presented.</p>	<p>Approximately 1.1 km of footpath will be permanently stopped up alongside The Haven. An Outline PRoW Design Guide and Stopping up Plan for the alternative route (which is an existing PRoW) was submitted to the Examination at Deadline 3 and a revised version was submitted at Deadline 8 (document reference 9.41(1), REP8-007). The work sets proposed improvements to the PRoW including</p>	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>BBC requests a detailed scheme for works to improve the PRoW including measures such as boundaries, detailed design for the footbridge, footpath width, planting, surfacing, signage, vegetation management, interpretation, management for a set period.</p> <p>The Council notes that the submitted Outline PRoW Design Guide and Stopping up plan at Deadline 3 is a step forward. Clearly there is a level of dialogue ongoing to finalise the details, particularly around the funding and management objectives. LCC will have input in to this also.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We note the steps taken by AUBP to address and that there are proposals for mitigation being presented including through the requirements. It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this</p>	<p>factors such as safety, materials, planting / biodiversity and interpretation and seating. Boston Borough Council have been consulted as part of this work. The outline guide is intended to inform a final detailed design for improvement works to the retained public rights of way and approach and mitigation in relation to the public rights of way due to be permanently stopped up. The draft s.106 provides that AUBP will undertake a number of commitments in relation to improving the existing public rights of way including measures to enhance the surfaces, widen the paths where possible, provide seating and additional signage.</p>	

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties.		
BBC 4.2	ES Chapter 20 (Socio-Economics) (Doc ref 6.2.20, APP-058)	Tourism	<p>BBC queries the extent of tourism impact assessment and the limited scope (0.5 miles). We feel this may have been underplayed. We also consider that measures should be put in place to establish and monitor the exact implications on the tourism sector during construction.</p> <p>The Council has revisited this and acknowledges the wider search area. We note AUBPs position on this matter and have no further comment to make on it.</p>	<p>The tourism assessment set out in the ES covers a radius on 10 miles from the site. It is considered that the scope and assessment is appropriate. Given the assessments presented within the ES, AUBP does not consider it is necessary to propose any tourism monitoring. At the meeting with the Council on 7 September 2021 this issue was discussed. AUBP maintains it is unnecessary to undertake tourism monitoring.</p>	Agreed
5. Futureproofing – including management of waste and use of bi-products					
BBC 5.1	ES Chapter 5 (Project Description) (Doc ref 6.2.5, APP-0543) and Chapter 23 (Waste) (Doc ref 6.2.23, APP-061)	Household Waste	BBC request the DCO contains measures to require reasonable consideration and use of reasonable endeavours to facilitate the use of localised residual waste as part of the feedstock.	AUBP is happy to discuss the potential for future use of local waste as part of the Facility's feedstock if it meets the required specification and the requirements of the DCO subjects to contracts and timing. Such a commitment is included in the draft s.106 agreement.	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>We note that AUBP have acknowledged and reviewed the Councils request in respect of this wider ambition. There is mutual agreement, that whilst it is not a deliverable output from this scheme, it may be something which this development contributes towards the achievement of in future. We welcome the inclusion of this within the S106</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties. In addition, the Applicants have committed to ongoing dialogue should the DCO be approved and the scheme move in to the delivery phase. This is acceptable to the Council.</p>		
6. Community impact and maximising opportunities to create a positive legacy for the town					
BBC 6.1	N/A	Establishment of a 'hub' within the core of the town during construction.	Whilst BBC recognise there are proposals for on-site education facilities, we would encourage the establishment of a 'hub' within the town centre during the construction.	AUBP will appoint an Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) contractor following the granting of the DCO. The EPC contractor may utilise space within Boston town centre which could be used as a community hub for those interested in the Facility. Included in the draft s.106 agreement is a provision	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We note the steps taken by AUBP to address and that there are proposals for mitigation being presented including through the requirements. It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>We also welcome discussions with AUBP about other ways to ensure any residual impacts of the scheme are managed/mitigated, albeit accepting that this may fall outside of the planning process. We remain committed to discussion and dialogue with AUBP on this.</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties. In addition, the Applicants have committed to ongoing dialogue should the DCO be approved and the scheme move in to the delivery phase. This is acceptable to the Council.</p>	<p>that AUBP will use reasonable endeavours to discuss the use of a town centre location with the EPC contractor.</p>	

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
7. Socio-economic benefits					
BBC 7.1	Environmental Statement Chapter 20 (<i>Socio-Economics</i>) (Doc ref 6.2.20, APP-058)	Economic benefits	<p>The investment in the development and operational aspects of the BAEF will undoubtedly contribute to the economic success of the borough. We support the development on this basis as it has potential to bring a significant number of jobs, of a range of skill-levels to the town. We do however request that there is a need for clear, and unequivocal commitments to upskilling, education, and commitments to local labour and supply chains.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We note the steps taken by AUBP to address and that there are proposals for mitigation being presented including through the requirements. It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>We also welcome discussions with AUBP about other ways to ensure any residual impacts of the scheme are</p>	<p>A range of indirect employment opportunities will be created during the construction and operational stages and these are estimated in the ES Socio-Economics chapter. Opportunities will be across a variety of roles/occupations, including higher skilled roles. Discussions with Boston College are ongoing regarding the potential to support apprenticeship positions and discussions with Boston Borough Council are also ongoing regarding the ability to attract business to the area due to the provision of the Facility.</p> <p>The draft s. 106 agreement provides a number of commitments from AUBP to provide apprenticeships and local labour and local business opportunities to support the local economy.</p>	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>managed/mitigated, albeit accepting that this may fall outside of the planning process. We remain committed to discussion and dialogue with AUBP on this.</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties. In addition, the Applicants have committed to ongoing dialogue should the DCO be approved and the scheme move in to the delivery phase. This is acceptable to the Council.</p>		
BBC 7.2	N/A	Social / Community Benefit Fund	<p>BBC requests that a "Community Fund" to be set up, which shall be for the purpose of mitigating the intangible and residual impacts of the Project on the communities in the Borough of Boston through schemes, measures, projects and provision of infrastructure, which will enhance, promote or advance, the economic, social, well-being or environmental conditions of the Borough or those communities contained within.</p>	<p>AUBP has considered the Council's request for a Community Fund. AUBP has provided its response to that proposal and the parties agree this is a matter to be discussed in greater detail at a later point.</p> <p>At present, AUBP is confident that the mitigation measures as set out in the Environmental Statement are adequate to reduce the adverse environmental effects to acceptable levels. In respect of certain other matters which the Council considers could be included within the remit of the Community Fund, AUBP is confident that most, if not all, of such matters can be</p>	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We recognise and appreciate the position taken by AUBP and understand that there is mutual appreciation and respect on the positions taken by both AUBP and BBC on this.</p> <p>It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>We also welcome discussions with AUBP about other ways to ensure any residual impacts of the scheme are managed/mitigated, albeit accepting that this may fall outside of the planning process. We remain committed to discussion and dialogue with AUBP on this.</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties. In addition, the Applicants have committed to ongoing dialogue should the DCO be approved</p>	<p>responded to by the provision of specific Section 106 planning obligations or DCO requirements. Discussions in relation to the draft s.106 agreement are in an advanced stage..</p>	

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			and the scheme move in to the delivery phase. This is acceptable to the Council.		
BBC 7.3	N/A	Supporting Local Business	<p>BBC questions if the Applicants can give commitments in respect of preferential procurement approaches to support local businesses.</p> <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We recognise and appreciate the position taken by AUBP and understand that there is mutual appreciation and respect on the positions taken by both AUBP and BBC on this.</p> <p>It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>We also welcome discussions with AUBP about other ways to ensure that the maximum local social and economic benefits are achieved. We remain committed to discussion and dialogue with AUBP on this.</p>	<p>AUBP would ensure that local businesses are made aware of contract opportunities. The mechanism for this is yet to be agreed but could involve a commitment to local advertising and a supplier event. Any details would have to be agreed with the EPC contractor. AUBP have also committed to use reasonable endeavours to promote local business opportunities subject to such not resulting in a breach of any domestic or international law.</p>	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties. In addition, the Applicants have committed to ongoing dialogue should the DCO be approved and the scheme move in to the delivery phase. This is acceptable to the Council.		
BBC 7.4	N/A	Synergies for other business	<p>The commitment to ongoing study in relation to Combined Heat and Power study is welcomed, BBC believes similar commitments pertaining to the following areas would be of benefit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for battery storage • Provision of wider network connections /capacity to facilitate other forms of renewable energy production • CO₂ use maximisation – this must be food grade as a minimum <p>The Council has reviewed the responses to date on this point. We recognise and appreciate the position taken by AUBP and understand that there is mutual appreciation and respect on the positions taken by both AUBP and BBC on this.</p>	<p>AUBP will continue to explore opportunities with Boston Borough Council to maximise the economic potential of the Facility within Boston to businesses who have synergies with the Project and the draft s.106 agreement will require AUBP to use reasonable endeavours to consider opportunities to support local businesses and the local labour force.</p> <p>Unfortunately, opportunities for connecting into the substation to be constructed will not be available to third parties.</p> <p>The draft s.106 agreement will also require AUBP to use reasonable endeavours to consider opportunities to incorporate or facilitate Battery Storage Infrastructure within or alongside the Project, subject to certain conditions; and to use reasonable endeavours to consider</p>	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>It is likely that this matter will be agreed by a subsequent deadline once further submissions have been lodged formally, and a S106 concluded.</p> <p>We also welcome discussions with AUBP about other ways to ensure that the maximum local social and economic benefits are achieved. We remain committed to discussion and dialogue with AUBP on this.</p> <p>A final version of the S106 agreement has been prepared, subject to this being formally executed, this matter can be treated as being agreed between the parties. In addition, the Applicants have committed to ongoing dialogue should the DCO be approved and the scheme move in to the delivery phase. This is acceptable to the Council.</p>	opportunities regarding the maximisation of CO ₂ export from the Facility to companies within Lincolnshire, subject to conditions.	
8. Draft DCO					
8.1	Draft DCO (document reference 2.1, APP-005)	Draft DCO	BBC advise that subject to those measures raised in our Relevant Representation relating to the draft DCO being dealt with, BBC raises no	BBC's position is noted and welcomed.	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			concerns to the current general scope and content of the DCO.		
8.2	Draft DCO (document reference 2.1, APP-005)	Draft DCO	BBC seeks Article 23 (Tree Work) to be amended to add wording to ensure all necessary works are undertaken in accordance with BS5837 standards, and that in the event trees are required to be felled or removed, appropriate mitigation planting should be provided.	AUBP considers these matters are better addressed as part of the Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy required under Requirement 6 of the draft DCO (document reference 2.1(4), REP8-004). An updated version of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy (document reference 7.4(2), REP7-037) was submitted at Deadline 7, which details the proposed procedures in relation to site clearance and proposed planting. The Illustrative Landscape Plans (document reference 4.4, APP-014) show the locations of proposed planting.	Agreed
8.3	Draft DCO (document reference 2.1, APP-005)	Requirements	BBC advise that subject to those measures raised in our Relevant Representation relating to the draft DCO being dealt with, BBC raises no concerns to the current general scope and content of the DCO. With the exception of the ones set out below the requirements set out in Part 1 of Schedule 2 provide a suitable framework for securing the necessary and relevant environmental mitigation measures and other environmental control measures.	The Applicant notes and welcomes BBC's response on this matter.	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
8.4	Draft DCO (document reference 2.1, APP-005)	Requirements – Requirement 2	BBC requests that Requirement 2 be amended to include notification to the Council of the intention to commence works on site.	Requirement 2 of the draft DCO has been amended to give the relevant planning authority 1 month's notice in advance of the commencement of works.	Agreed
8.5	Draft DCO (document reference 2.1, APP-005)	Requirements – Requirement 16	BBC requests a number of amendments to Requirement 16: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could this be more specific, i.e. min 14% of local labour/sourcing where possible? - Could more detail be provided on training opportunities –not just construction, but post operation and management, include linked disciplines not just engineering, for example climate change and ecology - Commitments to work with bodies such as Lincoln University post commissioning to ensure benefits are realized and quantified? 	AUBP considers these matters would be more appropriately addressed as part of the s.106 agreement currently under negotiation with the Council. Please also see SoCG Reference BBC 7.1 above.	Agreed
8.6	Draft DCO (document reference 2.1, APP-005)	Requirements – Requirement 18	BBC queried whether details on source(s) of material be included should be included in Requirement 18.	Paragraph (2)(a) of Requirement 18 of the draft DCO (document reference 2.1(4), REP8-004) already provides that the waste hierarchy scheme must provide details of "the type of information that must be collected and retained on the sources of the residual waste after recyclable and reusable waste has been removed".	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
8.7	Draft DCO (document reference 2.1, APP-005)	Requirement – new	<p>BBC seeks an additional requirement to be included in the DCO relating to materials to be included within detailed design of all building.</p> <p>BBC would request detailed design information including materials and finishes for all buildings and external features, structures and boundary treatments to be submitted to the Council for agreement in writing.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the discussions at the recent sessions and the ongoing dialogue in respect of requirements. We note the proposed change here and are agreeable to it.</p> <p>There remains the wider discussion about 'relevant planning authority' which is subject of ongoing discussion. However, this is likely to be resolved by a future deadline.</p>	The Applicant has agreed to add a requirement on approving the details of external appearance of new permanent buildings and structures. This included in Requirement 4(1), the latest version of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 8 (document reference 2.1(4), REP8-004).	Agreed
8.8	Draft DCO (document reference 2.1, APP-005)	Discharge of requirements	BBC is concerned about the procedure for the discharge of requirements and the deemed consent element. As a minimum the time periods should be extended to 12 weeks, and that requests for information can be made at any time. Also can only specify that consultation	AUBP notes that Lincolnshire County Council has requested that the definition of relevant planning authority be amended to "relevant planning authority' means the planning authority for the area in which the land to which the provisions of this Order apply is situated". AUBP has agreed to make this amendment. As LCC is the	Agreed

SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>is undertaken within a set period (10 days), as BBC cannot force a consultee to respond. BBC would prefer this to be agreed through a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) approach and allowing the ability for the Council to recover its reasonable costs associated with the processing and discharge of the requirements; including establishment of the timetable and process for the discharge.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the discussions at the recent sessions and the ongoing dialogue in respect of requirements. We note the addition of the fees paragraph and are agreeable to it.</p> <p>There remains the wider discussion about 'relevant planning authority' which is subject of ongoing discussion. However, this is likely to be resolved by a future deadline.</p> <p>We recognise and appreciate the position taken by AUBP in respect of the Planning Performance Agreement and understand that there is mutual appreciation and respect on the</p>	<p>Local Planning Authority (for waste) under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, LCC is the relevant planning authority for the purposes of the Requirements in Schedule 2 to the DCO. It is noted that Boston Borough Council consider they are the appropriate authority to discharge some of the requirements under Schedule 2 of the draft DCO. AUBP has agreed with both Councils which is the appropriate authority to discharge each of the requirements as set out in section 2 of the draft DCO (document 2.1(4), REP8-.004)</p> <p>However to address BBCs points, the eight week timeframe and processes for requesting further information in Part 2 of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO is consistent with the procedure in a number of recently made DCOs including the Wheelabrator Kemsley K3 Generating Station Order 2021, the Lake Lothing (Lowestoft) Third Crossing Order 2020 and the Immingham Open Cycle Gas Turbine Order 2020. The deeming of approval in paragraph 27(2) of Part 2 of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO is also consistent with the wording included in a number of recently made DCOs including the Lake Lothing (Lowestoft) Third Crossing Order 2020, the</p>	


SoCG Reference	Document Reference	Topic	BBC's Position	AUBP's Position	Status
			<p>positions taken by both AUBP and BBC on this. This being likely to be resolved outside of the planning process and could be resolved at a later date, post conclusion of the DCO.</p>	<p>Immingham Open Cycle Gas Turbine Order 2020, the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing Development Consent Order 2020 and the Riverside Energy Park Order 2020. The procedure is also generally consistent with that provided for in Appendix 1 to the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Fifteen: Drafting Development Consent Orders. The procedure in Part 2 of Schedule 2 is necessary to ensure that requirements are discharged in a timely manner and the use of a PPA is not consistent with the well precedented approach as outlined above.</p> <p>For clarity AUBP has amended Part 2 of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO to include a requirement on the payment of the prescribed fees under regulation 16(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed Applications, Requests and Site Visits) (England) Regulations 2012.</p>	

4 Agreement of this Statement of Common Ground

4.1 Statement of Common Ground

- 4.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by the Parties.

Signe




Name: Paul Salmon

Position: Project Manager on behalf of Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited

Date: 07/04/2022

Signed.



Mike Gildersleeves

Assistant Director – Planning & Strategic Infrastructure
on behalf of Boston Borough Council

Date: 6/4/22

Appendix A Engagement and Correspondence

Meeting with BBC

3/4/18

Present

Phil Drury

Simon Rowberry

Gary Bower

Jonathan Standen

Kelly Linay

PD – is it a well-kept secret – yes

PD – is the intention that an application goes in and then consultation begins – no scoping goes in then formal consultation begins

Compliant with IED standards (industrial emissions directive)

Wharf anticipated to be 300m long

Building height around 25-30m high

Stack height won't be higher than the St Botolph's

Stack for gasification facility and light weight aggregate plant

3 x 32mw facilities side by side

Anticipating a seal conveyer to move waste from reception to facility

SR - Is it stopping waste going to landfill

PR – what cannot be recycled – what it is that will go to the facility

EA – meeting them on Friday 6/4

SR - How high will the grab cranes be – similar scales to the port facility

SR – how will the recycle be taken off site

8,000 hours operating a year

80mw net – 16mw to run the facility

Submission prior to Q1 2019 (calendar year)

SR – PINS timescales are slipping. Let's hope they give priority to NSIPS

PD – what capacity have you spoken to LCC

East Lindsey, South Holland – key stakeholders

Would we have an input to any justifiable wish list in respect of S106 – yes

Negotiating with applicant and putting agreed opinion to PINS

2024 for operation (34-month build)

200-300 jobs and 80 construction jobs

Timescales work with other projects to move workforce – dovetailing rather than being in competition

Difficult to get hotel accommodation – squeeze on accommodation

Working with local education providers to fill jobs in lead up to 2024 – skills development – working with schools/colleges

Apprenticeship development – working with college to provide throughput to employees

SR -Workforce development issue – potentially one of the biggest breaks – matching workforce development with a wider housing offer – attracting people who are a different socio-economic class – almost in a chicken and egg situation – we have some of the biggest major projects coming on stream in the east of England

Housing – dependant on a small/medium house builders – not the national developers

Currently have 5,000 – 6,000 housing in line for being built

S106 – possible apprenticeship agreements

The sooner the wider membership the better – keen to engage with leading members not from planning – detailed information sharing, knowledge of the application, Boston Area Town Committee – not necessarily formal – those that sit on the committee – those that represent the Ward

Big, exciting application, significant – sits on a site that comprising that has a large number of food production businesses – the new waste recycling facility created some difficulty for some of the larger employers

What can we say to whom and when

Get the right message out there in a controlled way

PD – the EfW plant locally is running at capacity – how can we get the local waste in somewhere else – because of the housing numbers our numbers are modest – local EfW plant does not meet requirements – so we are looking at alternative recycling facilities in Lincs. IF we do get to that stage South Lincs would be sensible – bizaree that you are importing waste when we produce more than we can cope with – conversation with waste disposal – could it be a solution to our problems - Should be a conversation about how it could help/be to difficult so that it can be eliminated if necessary

Is the product one that can be used?

Lincs Waste Authority – could they have a view to respond? – Make sure added to non-stat list

PD liaising with the Leader

BAEF Stakeholder Meeting

Meeting Date: Wednesday 5 September at 4.20pm

Attendees: Kelly Linay (Athene Communications) Gary Bower (RHDHV), Cllr Richard Austin and Cllr Alison Austin

Points of Discussion	Notes
Overview	<p>Are we linked to Boston 1? – GB explained the previous link.</p> <p>Who is BAUP? What is the driving force behind this – is there a lot of feedstock that needs a home? Will the feedstock come from the UK? Likely to be Leith, Grimsby and Tilbury. GB explained what the feedstock is made up of – baled material. Decreasing transport as detracting transport from Slippery Gout.</p>
Questions and Comments	<p>With a site plan GB explained the layout and boundary. We are working with the port to identify the appropriate times for deliveries based on tides.</p> <p>1 or 2 ships a day. What size ships? – maximum is currently 118m - ours are anticipated to be about 100m long and 12/13m wide. They will be loaded with bales and crane lifted off. Still in concept design – we want to take views to help meet the needs of the project as well as the local community. Future proofing the bank for flood defence – meeting the long-term requirements.</p> <p>RA – level with the arrangements of the barrier.</p> <p>GB - Bales stored in stock piles which have to be a certain size to meet fire regs (450 cubic metres) 200+ bales. It is classed as combustible material but it's not spontaneously combustible in this format. The ground water won't be contaminated with anything. This will be part of the work carried out pre-consent. How robust is the packaging for the bales – very robust – double wrapped – is combusted as part of the process. Nothing is coming from abroad, nothing from the UK. The facility needs to be constantly running – 3 lines. We are trying to keep a week's capacity on site to ensure it keeps running. We will carry out a risk capacity and accident management plan.</p> <p>AA - Has no issue with the principle – it is an area designated for waste and recycling.</p> <p>GB - Residents will ask why they are having everyone's rubbish dumped on them. DCO process we need to demonstrate everyone has been able to have their say on the process.</p> <p>RA - Biggest group will be those on the other side of the river. Surprised how Boston 1 dominated the scene. This will dominate even more.</p> <p>GB – It will be fractionally taller.</p>

<p>Questions & Comments (Continued)</p>	<p>Does the Metsar plant and Fogarty shield the view as well?</p> <p>GB - Aggregate plant will also have a chimney. We won't be able to get a permit to operate if we can't demonstrate that we meet the emissions standard. Emissions will be much less than those coming out of the hospital and crematorium. They will be very tightly controlled.</p> <p>AA - Four companies who will be very concerned: DCI, Fresh Time, Pilgrim Foods and Green Yard (formerly Penguin). They want to know what the comparison in emission is with something local or something they use.</p> <p>Alan Thompson is a loveable rogue and he contributes to the community.</p> <p>Will it pay business rates as an NSIP? – can we get an answer to this?</p> <p>RA - Mentioned the s106 monies – and the contribution this will make to the local community.</p> <p>GB - Walked through the process. Stock control – FEFO principle for bales. If the bales sat there for too long they would start to biodegrade. Things can be rebound. The field at the top is planned to be a construction laydown area – no plan in the immediate future to develop that area. We'll need to talk to DCI about this area. John Studholme at DCI is a tough cookie, worth going to speak to him. Shredder will be in negative pressure, so if a door is opened, air flows in or air out.</p> <p><u>Can we promise that the odour will be nil?</u> RA</p> <p>GB - The shredder will be sealed, and any odour will be put into the air feed of the gasifier.</p> <p><u>Is the odour likely to be a bit of methane?</u> RA</p> <p>GB - If you are inside it is likely to be unpleasant.</p> <p>RA - Dangerous objects won't get this far – e.g. unexploded shell.</p> <p><u>What is the worst-case scenario?</u> AA</p> <p>GB - The worst-case scenario is that it stops.</p> <p><u>Is there another plant that is like this?</u> RA</p> <p>GB - Yes – explained about Outotec – the one that is most equivalent is built in Hull (we are essentially 3 Hull's). Our MW is 102 with 80 going into the grid for export Substation connection to the pylon. Facility will be kick started by an oil starter.</p> <p>What pressure will there be from central gov to see this through?</p> <p>GB - There is a demand in EN3 policy statement – we don't have to demonstrate the need because of this.</p>
--	---

<p>Questions & Comments (Continued)</p>	<p><u>Were any other sites considered?</u> AA - The current site has a lack of infrastructure.</p> <p>GB - Three key issues normally for a site like this is transport, noise and air quality. Silos feed the shredded material into the gasifier at a fixed rate. This is the area where there could be a combustion problem, so there are very tight fire regs here <u>Will the feedstock always power the unit?</u> Do you need a reserve such as oil if you can't use feedstock. It takes a day to cool down the facility. <u>What fuel do you need?</u> Oil. <u>Where are you getting your silt from?</u> The river. Port of Boston will provide the silt. We'll need a marine licence. We are trying to make sure we are doing a more positive option for the silt rather than depositing offshore <u>What materials are going to be brought on site by road?</u> People, process chemicals e.g. slate lime and urea and ammonia - we have not yet identified the number of vehicles <u>Where will the vehicles be coming from?</u> Sources likely to be very similar to Boston 1 Worried about bring tanker loads from the Humber – we have to come up with a transport plan.</p> <p>AA -Vital that they are approaching as you did from Peterborough up the A16 – don't let them come up the A52 from the SW as they will get as far as Chainbridge? and they won't like the queue of traffic so will take the residential route – they must come up the A16 – insist with Highways.</p> <p>GB - We can put in recommendations in way of routing.</p> <p>AA - Working on the principle that the process involved is very highly regulated that you must keep to it – she is not concerned about that – she is going to have to fight her ward.</p> <p>GB - We have to consider each part of the site and the impact on each of the receptors.</p> <p>AA - Affordable housing (guesstimate 40 homes possibly more) being built of Wyberton road that it may have an impact on the industrial site. AA did not want the impact of the housing to restrict the industrial estate.</p> <p>GB - We will assess the cumulative impact – this is one of the developments that we'll need to consider.</p> <p><u>Can the grid stand having that much energy fed back into it?</u> AA GB - We are arranging with Weston Power and the line can take it and we have consent at the moment for up to 85MW into the grid. The facility is built to operate at around 8,000 hours per year, providing power to 186,000 homes (equivalent to 60% of homes in Lincolnshire).</p> <p>RA - Possible that we'd fine a cog in the river.</p>
--	---

<p>Questions & Comments (Continued)</p>	<p>GB - Book – from the Romans to B&Q – A history of Wyberton – good river map dating back to the 1800s. Future proofing – carbon capture – as we are less than 300MW legally we don't have to, however, we would like to use that captured from the stack - food grade CO2 – that is likely to be tankered out by road.</p> <p>AA - That will get near the business units.</p> <p>RA - Would there be any worries of a plant like this being next to a banana ripening plant?</p> <p>AA - I don't understand the process but am thinking about it in practical terms. The fishing fleet will object.</p> <p>GB - Explained the Rochdale envelope.</p> <p><u>Impact on the river and the flow?</u> AA</p> <p>GB - The hard edge that we're going to put in is currently a soft edge. We have to model of sediment transport on the river.</p> <p>AA - The fishing fleet will object.</p> <p>GB - Port have said they won't object as we've involved them at an early stage. They are looking from a statutory perspective as well as a revenue generation perspective.</p> <p><u>What is the value of the project?</u> – approx. £480 million. Increasing port employment due to the additional work. 80 vehicle movements a week.</p>
<p>General Comments</p>	<p>Nothing received by Royal Mail – Grace to follow up with Royal Mail.</p> <p>GB – We'll send them a video about the shredder post their holiday</p> <p>We checked that all questions raised by AA had been covered.</p> <p>Rare plant locally the Horsetail.</p> <p>RA – showed an image of the final cut to the cut end of the river</p> <p>Send a copy of the exhibition boards – via email</p> <p>RA - Important to have a good common statement on emissions that people can understand e.g. like 60% of homes being lit via the facility.</p> <p>AA - Get the message across that this is not an incinerator. That's going to be 300 jobs that going to be 300 more houses required – potential comment.</p>



General Comments (Continued)	RA is going to be looking for sponsorship 7/9/19 for a heritage conference – hire of Black Friars theatre.
--	--

BAEF Stakeholder Meeting

Meeting Date: Thursday 6th September 2018

Attendees: Kelly Linay (Athene Communications) Gary Bower (RHDHV), Michael Cooper (Leader of BBC) and Clive Gibbon (Economic Development Manager, BBC).

Points of Discussion	Notes
Overview	GB explained about the informal and formal consultation. Project determined by the SoS – pulling together a DCO – everything is front loaded
Questions	<p><u>Will the shredding be done on site?</u> CG GB - Yes.</p> <p><u>Has there been any thought to use the waste heat to heat housing?</u> MC GB - Not for housing but potentially for other uses.</p> <p><u>Are the bales vermin proof?</u> MC GB - Yes – similar to agriculture bale wrap, double wrapped, currently being exported abroad, so robust. We don't anticipate a lot of ripped bales.</p> <p><u>Is the role manual?</u> CG GB - No it is all automated.</p> <p><u>What is going to be your main market for the aggregate? (UK or abroad)</u> MC GB - Potentially a lot of east coast market but we won't preclude it being exported.</p> <p><u>Is there any mileage in a railway line?</u> MC GB – we're changing the drainage capability, so we need to factor that in. Future aspiration for the construction laydown site is for an algae generation facility.</p> <p><u>What is the height of the stack at the hospital?</u> MC GB – don't know, we'll find that out – Wikipedia says 50m. MC – it is a fair distance from the other side of the river for the residents that will be affected.</p> <p><u>What types of roles are there [in terms of jobs available through the construction of the site]?</u> CG GB - Construction staff, operation of facility – wharf handling side – fork lift drivers, highly skilled roles – a team will be brought in and then beneath them there will be a local level to learn and then take over. Apprentice opportunities. MC - Boston College is building an engineering block. CG - Keen to involve the schools. GB - The idea of having a visitor centre on site MC -A visitor centre would be amazing CG - A viewing platform would be good. People are interested MC - Show a bit coming back to the community it will go a long way, people will like that. CG - Can provide details of the right people to speak to within the college.</p>

Questions (Continued)	<u>What is the relationship with Boston 1?</u> CG GB - None. We are not in competition with each other.
Comments	<p>MC- Nearby planning has been granted for housing for 90 homes – there is potential for linking up for brownie points and good from an environmental perspective. GB - It is something we can consider but is not currently part of the scheme. One thing that is missing from the list of providers is the carbon capture. This is a relatively new development. 3 units that will do the carbon capture and turn it in to food grade carbon dioxide.</p> <p>GB – One thing we want to do is diversify in the economy. This will bring a different skill set to the area and will be a positive contribution to the area. Bringing in a million tonnes by ship so we need to create a new wharf. Doubling the number of ships that currently use the river. MC – Will be busy and a wakeup call for them. GB - We want to make sure we’re not affecting the navigable channel.</p> <p>GB - For air pollution consenting residues we have to plan for the worst-case scenario. Boston 1 stack is 40m, they had consent for 60m – we don’t know how tall ours will be we are still working on that. The CAA are only more concerned if it is more than 90m tall. MC - Residents are concerned about views of the stump from further afield. GB - Will have less of a dominance than the power station from say Pinchbeck. There is no cable connection from this to Bicker MC - You’re not going to Bicker to connect to the grid – potentially more energy at Bicker. GB - This is not an incinerator.</p> <p>GB – September is all consultation for us. We’ll then compile our PEIR. Anticipating submission late Spring, end of Q2.</p> <p>MC – None of the plan should be a problem but the biggest problem will be construction traffic. It is notoriously bottlenecked. Access to the site is going to have to be addresses and how you achieve that I don’t know but you’re really going to have to think about it. There is no way you can get construction traffic, workers etc. through that bottleneck. It’s bad now. GB – The earlier we can construct the wharf the more can come in by ship. There are 8 shredders and they are 72 tonnes each. They normally come on a flat loader from Finland.</p> <p>MC – It is things like the aggregate and concrete getting them to the area is going to be a problem. You may need to look at bringing your own road in.</p> <p>MC - There is other infrastructure to consider e.g. B&Bs. GB – We have to do a socio-economic assessment.</p>



GB Closing Remarks	White Hart will be quiet. Skirbeck most likely quiet. Frampton – residents are very vocal in that area. Black Sluice - lucky to see someone there. Fishtoft – will be busy.
---------------------------	---

BAEF Stakeholder Meeting

Meeting Date: Friday 7th September 2018

Attendees: Kelly Linay (Athene Communications) Gary Bower (RHDHV), Cllr Peter Bedford (former BBC leader and ward councillor for Coastal)

Points of Discussion	Notes
Overview of project	<p>PB stated that he assumes the project is like the Energy from Waste (EfW) facility at North Hykeham; GB confirmed it is similar, but the technology is different.</p> <p>GB explained the DCO process.</p> <p>PB -Trident knoll went down the same route can see the lights of Boston 1 from his home on the other side of the river. He also mentioned that he is personal friends with Colin from HH Atkins.</p>
Questions from PB:	<p><u>Weston Power can take the 80 MW?</u> (185,000 homes is a fair amount of homes)</p> <p>GB confirmed yes and explained that everything will come in by ship bar one small exception, aggregate exported by ship. Road transport will be minimal apart from during the build.</p> <p><u>Carbon dioxide – is that using a scrubber?</u> The emissions need to be low because of the amount of veg grown around there.</p> <p>GB - no it is a different process that will create food grade CO2.</p> <p><u>Turning point - down where Mick Georges yard is?</u> Turning point at the port.</p> <p>GB - Yes.</p> <p>Will conditions discharge be done locally?</p> <p>GB - LCC and BCC will decide who will take the lead. It is a neater solution to work with one party.</p> <p>PB - I think you're on the right route. The local councillors get het up about things when their parishioners go to them.</p> <p>GB - It won't have the same dominance as the Spalding plant. Visitor centre has been done successfully at the Boston Barrier. This was mentioned at the technical meeting this week. 300 jobs for construction and around 80 for operation.</p>

<p>Contractor Info</p>	<p>PB – HH Atkins will be the main contractor.</p> <p><u>GB Comments:</u></p> <p>Variance in types of labour. Bringing some diversification to the economy. Looking to bring apprenticeships and working with Boston College. The transfer station next to Slippery Gout – both BCC and LCC have asked if this facility can take this material – GB – we’re receptive to this idea. They could install a baling plant, or we could – we have the capability to do it and it may have to be part of a separate application. Why are we taking Scotland’s rubbish – lack of renewable energy facilities.</p>
<p>Details of project explained by GB</p>	<p>Skirbeck and Fishtoft will have potential views but they already have views of the industrial area. Wharf bank will be 350-400m and will be cut back from the river but keeping the flood bank. It will be a hard edge.</p> <p>PB expressed that there should be no seepage in to the river.</p> <p>We are likely to be asked to make it 7m high. Room for three ships. Shredder will remove aluminium, steel, glass or stone. Silos will be 30m high (100ft). The shredder will operate under negative pressure so if a door opens no odour will be omitted and no rubbish will fly out. Gasification is different to incineration. It does not burn anything it converts it into a gas which turns into steam which turns the turbine creating energy. The onsite pylon is the connection to the grid. Will look very similar to Boston 1 but will be on a bigger footprint. Total of seven days storage over the entire site. 50,000 tonnes of hazardous ash will have to leave by road if the EA won’t let us turn it into aggregate. We don’t know the height of our stack yet. The stack will have to have a flashing red light on top of it for CAA regs. We know there is a precedent for 60m. We don’t want to higher than the stump (83m). We will compare it to the Frontier building. Likely to be submitted May/June 2019. Consent summer 2020 and then a period for JR. Have we consulted with Black Sluice – meeting with IDB on Tuesday (11th Sept). 3-year build. Finished in 2024.</p>
<p>Closing Remarks</p>	<p>PB - It sounds very positive. I hope it comes to fruition. Business rates will be very good off of it.</p>

Boston Borough Council stakeholder meeting 1pm

19/06/19

Yvonne Stevens - Trinity Ward; Portfolio holder for environment (newly elected)

Clive Gibbon - Economic Development Manager

Christian Allen - Head of Environmental Operations

Peter Udy - Ex-Forward Planning Officer

Gary Bower (RHDHV)

Helen Scarr (Athene)

GB presented his PP on the site.

YS - can you take plastic that is currently going to Malaysia?

GB - no, we are taking household waste only.

GB - the minerals and waste plan and the new local plan don't align on the land use of the site.

CA - is there any issue with the conflict between the local plan and waste and minerals plan?

PU - it's not in the plan because it wasn't thought we needed all of it for employment land. It's not quite the same allocation but it's near.

YS - what comes out the chimney is clear, is it?

GB - we have to stay within government levels. Our levels will be within the guidelines.

YS - birds won't sit on the top and drop dead?

GB - what comes out will not harm people or the environment. No one can say there are no emissions but they will be at a level which is safe.

CA - that's regulated by the Environment Agency?

GB - yes, they regulate the environmental permit for the Facility (separate to the DCO)

YS - are the emissions smelly?

GB - no, there won't be an odour from the stack. Odour is more likely to come from waste and we have measures in place to prevent this from happening during transport and storage.

YS - the old landfill site didn't cause too many problems - and this should be better than that.

GB - no it shouldn't, and the prevailing wind is going in the same direction towards Skirbeck.

PU - this will need a habitats regulation assessment as well due to its proximity to the Wash which is highly protected.

GB - this will look at species and ship movements and whether anything will have a detrimental effect. There are a large amount of vessels in the Wash (22,000 per year) so our cumulative impact won't be great there. It will be greater with movements on The Haven, however. We will double the number of commercial boats on The Haven with our Facility.

GB - we also look at the sediment profile of the impact of our site.

CA - do you also look at the emissions from the boats themselves?

GB - yes all of this is cumulatively assessed.

CA - is it based on the exact ships you will be using?

GB - we use models. There are two different types of ship which will come in. Everything is done on a 'worst case' basis.

CG - I am excited about the idea of the carbon capture from an economic point of view, as well as the aggregate.

YS - why can't we use the aggregate in Boston? Could we produce something to stop it being taken away?

GB - you can, although it is market driven. The aggregate doesn't have to put onto a ship, it's a marketable product. If there is a need in Boston it can be used in Boston.

CA - does the aggregate plant create any emissions?

GB - it is under the same restrictions as the gasification facility. It will be continually monitored under operation.

PU - is the air cooling system like the first Spalding power plant?

GB - yes, it is similar.

YS - what about the dredging of the wharf, as the mud will come back?

GB - we will use some of the mud in building the facility. We also do maintenance dredges every year and use the material within the Facility. Port of Boston don't dredge this area currently as the power of the river clears the sediment. We are using something which otherwise would have been deposited offshore in the Wash.

CG - do you have any plans for a haul road?

GB - there are no plans for new roads, we will use existing roads.

CA - I think we were thinking of the pressure on certain roads.

GB - the transport chapter looks at 16 links - where the key constraints are. We have modelled our impacts on all of these.

YS - was Boston your first choice for this Facility?

GB - this site was selected because it had the allocation in the plan, onsite grid connection and navigable river. The developer has also been involved previously with Boston 1.

CA - the traffic assessments have been undertaken - so is there going to be any impact by the site?

GB - construction will have an impact as we are bringing everything in by road. One two-week period of the construction will have an impact on the road network, when we are making the silos. Over the whole period it is non-significant but this period will be.

YS - can't you cut through by Costa? Put a road in? You should consider this.

GB - this will be looked at when we agree the statements of common ground with you. This may lead to us having to amend the road. We also haven't assessed the impact on this proposed road.

YS - I think this should be seriously looked at.

GB - you need to formally raise this with us. A voice of BBC needs to recommend that we build a link road. We would then look at this in terms of merits of the scheme.

CA - if we raise it formally you are obliged to consider it?

GB - yes, we will be.

YS - your concrete may set because of the congestion in Boston.

GB - we have considered this with our concrete supplier. We are looking at putting a concrete plant in the Facility which takes away the risk and reduces lorry movements by a fifth. Our models don't represent this, they represent the worst case. A concrete plant would be one way we mitigate traffic impacts.

YS - will the facility have an impact on Boston 1? Particularly their chimney?

GB - we have to factor them in to our plans and look at the cumulative impact with our emissions and theirs.

CA - what's the potential for linking up the facility with the waste transfer station - local waste?

GB - the developer wants it to happen, and you want it. We need to follow procurement rules to make this happen. The waste needs to be baled etc. Someone already has the contract for the

waste. This would come by road, but it's better than taking it to North Hykeham. We haven't included this in our current traffic assessments, however. Because it's not going to definitely take place, we don't know how many vehicle movements it would reduce from North Hykeham.

PU - could you have a conveyor belt to take the material to the site?

GB - maybe, or an electric trailer. Even if it is driven, it's still beneficial compared to journeys to North Hykeham.

CA - we have modelled the future EfW versus the amount of waste Lincolnshire is producing - we can share this data with you.

CG - we are interested in tangible benefits and added value e.g. Diversifying our business base. We are interested in the CO₂ extraction and heat extraction. How can we work with you to use these benefits to gain investment/attract businesses? How far can the heat travel before it's of no use?

GB - at the moment the Facility is using its own heat. Our modelling is currently around this. We could use the heat offsite, it's something we need to look into.

CG - the key interest is in the CO₂ - we didn't have enough last year.

GB - at the end of the examination phase we will have determined exactly what the project will be. This is when we need to ensure that everything has been considered/requirements met. Latter part of 2020 would be when we need to make plans for the heat/CO₂ business.

GB - it will produce 120 tonnes of CO₂ a day.

CA - if you take our waste and recycle the parts that can't be used in the facility, we need to make sure the recycled materials go into our figures if possible.

Boston Borough Council meeting 3pm 19/06/19

Richard Austin - Wyberton Ward
Alison Austin - St Thomas' Ward
Peter Watson - Kirton and Frampton Ward
Peter Bedford - Coastal Ward

Gary Bower - RHDHV
Helen Scarr - Athene Communications

GB - the PEIR has now been published and is on the website.
AA - I looked at the NTS on the PINS website.

RA - does the PEIR put the emissions in a layman friendly way?
GB - not at the moment. The NTS is quite long as it is summarising such a lot of information. We take your feedback on board that we need to produce materials the local people can find.
AA - the consultation days should help the local people.

RA - can you take the materials that are being sent to Malaysia?
GB - no, our facility is specifically taking household waste. That material can't be recycled due to the way it has been manufactured. We aren't limited by volume we can take, it is how much energy we can put into the National Grid at this point.
RA - could you negotiate an increase?
GB - potentially in the future.

PW - were you planning to have an event in Kirton?
HS - we are having one in Frampton, Kirton will not really be affected but Frampton will be visually.
PW - fair enough.

GB presented his PP on the facility.

RA - does the crown have jurisdiction even over The Haven?
GB - yes, up to the high water point.

AA - the map in the NTS doesn't show Bittern Way connecting to Nursery Way.
GB - we are using Ordnance Survey maps, which are out of date.

GB - one of the emissions trigger points has been met in our assessments - we need to do more work to look into how we can address this.

PW - are the bale storage times affected by temperature?
GB - yes, we will adjust this based on the temperature.
PW - you could spray it with water too.
GB - we may do.
PW - would the bales expand if they get hot?
GB - there will be gaps in the materials which will allow expansion.
AA - will they be in black wrapping?
GB - most likely white or blue - we will consider this.
PW - do you liaise with the local fire service?

GB - we will have a fire plan and will agree this with the fire authority - we have already met with them. The biggest fire risk is in the silos when the material has been shredded. We have a plan in place for these. We have a fire advisor on our project team.

RA - Fishoft are very sensitive to smell. You need to be careful when loading/unloading.

GB - we have plans in place to control odour eg. Not going to unload any damaged bales in case of odour and pollution.

RA - in the silos your material won't flow freely - how do you get this to happen?

GB - we have a screw inside which feeds the material in and allows it to flow through, so there is no build up of moisture. It is constantly flowing.

AA - why are you only capturing carbon from one unit?

GB - the developer only has an intended market for one at the moment. We could expand this in the future. We don't have to capture any carbon as we are below the threshold.

AA - how is it taken offsite?

GB - by tanker - there will be 6 tankers a day. We are looking at local opportunities for the carbon dioxide.

AA - metal recycling off site - does this mean just outside the red line boundary?

GB - yes.

PW - what sort of aggregate is it?

GB - lightweight, 0.75 density. You can use it in road manufacturing or building.

AA - you can't read the site diagram on the online NTS.

GB - this is because it has to be a stand-alone document.

AA - how long does it take to unload one vessel?

GB - 6-8 hours. I can't remember the exact durations. They must arrive on one tide, then leave on the next high tide.

AA - how do they get taken into the facility?

GB - they'll be taken out by a crane and onto a trailer which takes them to the storage area. Trailers will take 100 tonnes each.

PW - what is the height of the cranes?

GB - they aren't currently modelled in the PEIR, they won't be any taller than our largest building though.

PW - so the cranes don't have a huge visual impact then.

GB - the cranes will be on caterpillar tracks so we have a bit more freedom.

RA - are the fishermen happy now?

GB - we are engaging with them regularly which they are pleased about. They didn't want to be lumped in with the Port so we are liaising with them individually.

RA - what is happening to the footpath?

GB - I will show you the proposed new route which follows an existing path.

RA - does the scheme impact the Haven countryside park in any way?

GB - there will be an impact from emissions which needs to be mitigated. Our models show an absolute worst case impact - to the closest point of the park.

RA - footfall to the park might increase so people can come and see the construction.

GB - we are also putting a visitor centre in the facility.

PW - where will the vessels turn around?

GB - either in the knuckle point or the port itself.

RA - we need to ensure the vessels don't try to turn in The Haven and get stuck as has historically happens.

PW - do the vessels need to be piloted?

GB - yes they do. All vessels will be piloted up the Haven.

GB explained the relocation of the footpath along Roman Bank and how that has been agreed.

GB - the air condensed cooler is the noisiest thing on site as it contains fans.

PW - the water inside can't cause legionella, for example?

GB - no, it's a closed system. We are aware of the bungalows nearby which could be affected. This is the only noise issue related to the site we have identified.

RA - the wind usually blows away from Heron Way.

GB - we can't use the wind in our assessments, we have to assume worst case scenario.

RA - did you assess Boston 1's noise?

GB - we have used some proposed figures but we have used a baseline of no noise because we are doing worst case scenario.

PW - how do you control the ash from the aggregate plant?

GB - the ash goes through a pipe and is blown to the plant. It is never outside.

RA - do you need lights on the stacks?

GB - we aren't above the aviation threshold but we probably will anyway.

RA - Boston Heritage Forum is holding a heritage event in September which is looking for sponsorship.

GB - I have passed this on to the client to consider.

AA - will piling take 24 months? Concerned about the vibration impact of piling.

GB - we aren't close to residential areas. The construction of the silos will take 10 weeks and that will need piling down to about 20m.

AA - traffic movements in construction seem high.

GB - the construction of the silos means a lot of vehicle movements due to the volume of concrete required.

AA - and they will be coming down the A16?

GB - yes and we have assessed this on the worst case, a significant impact in a small period of time.

RA - it's about 5000 lorry movements. They don't want to be held up in a traffic jam.

GB - we haven't modelled it, but we may create a concrete batching plant on the site which mitigates this problem.

AA - the peak time for getting into the industrial estate is 7.30am.

GB - our transport assessments take this into account.

AA - they can't use the A52 because people will cut through the rural areas which is not safe.

GB - there will be a construction traffic management plan which will govern which routes can be used.



B O S T O N

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Municipal Buildings, West Street, Boston, Lincolnshire, PE21 8QR

6 August 2019

Our ref: MS/LS

Boston Alternative Energy Facility
25 Priestgate
Peterborough
PE1 1JL

Tel No: 01205 314292

Dear Sirs

BOSTON BOROUGH COUNCIL CONSULTATION IN RESPECT OF PHASE 3 FOR BOSTON ALTERNATIVE ENERGY FACILITY

We are pleased to set out below our detailed response to the proposals in respect of the above.

We are mindful there are several strands within the Borough Council who will have a professional view and in addition, both the Cabinet and the Environmental and Performance Scrutiny Committee have reviewed the draft proposals and have made comments.

We have set out below a summary of our departmental comments, which include elected member comments, with a concluding paragraph of outstanding questions, in addition to a summary of issues that have been sent directly to elected members. We believe many of the issues we have raised, such as impact of traffic on the wider area, require greater clarification before any application is submitted to the Secretary of State. We welcome ongoing dialogue to enable such issues to have this clarity and suggest that noting the size and scale of the proposed development there is an extension of time to the deadline of the 6 August 2019 consultation period. We propose an extension of up to six weeks to enable round table discussions comprising officers of both Lincolnshire County Council, Boston Borough and members of the BAEF project team. We are willing to host the meetings and propose that a single-issue topic be discussed in detail each week, commencing with highways and traffic impact. We believe this will ensure that we are better able to consider Joint Statements of Common Ground in readiness for any Inquiry.

The Borough Council is keen to work with the applicant to contribute at this early stage to ensure that in the event the Secretary of State determines to approve the application, all aspects have been robustly considered to ensure maximum economic benefit to the wider community whilst protecting the environment from traffic, noise and harm to the ecosystems surrounding the proposed site.

Waste Strategy

The Waste Strategy for Lincolnshire was adopted by the Lincolnshire Waste Partnership (LWP) in January 2019. This followed a period of extensive public consultation during the summer of 2018 and adoption by each *individual partner member of the LWP through their democratic process. The Waste Strategy for Lincolnshire was adopted by Boston Borough Council on 28 November 2018.



LWP is made up of the Lincolnshire County Council, as waste disposal authority and the 7 district/borough councils as waste collection authorities}.

On the basis that the BAEF could process residual household waste from Lincolnshire, this proposal could support delivery of 4 out of 10 strategic objectives in the Waste Strategy for Lincolnshire:

Objective 4: To explore new opportunities of promoting waste minimisation and of using all waste as a resource in accordance with the waste hierarchy.

Objective 7: To seek to reduce our carbon footprint.

Objective 8: To make an objective assessment of what further waste processing/disposal capacity is required and, as necessary, secure appropriate capacity.

Objective 10: To consider appropriate innovative solution to the delivery of our waste management services.

The current disposal facility for residual municipal waste in Lincolnshire, an Energy from Waste (EFW) plant located in North Hykeham, Lincoln, is forecast to reach its operational capacity in the next 5 years. Lincolnshire County Council, who are responsible for the disposal/treatment of the county's municipal waste, have yet to publish a coherent strategy for dealing with the treatment of the county's residual waste once this capacity shortfall is met. Landfill is not an option within the geography of Lincolnshire and no longer presents a financially viable or environmentally acceptable method for disposal of municipal waste in the long term.

Whilst the Waste Strategy for Lincolnshire is driving action across the LWP to mitigate the impact of increasing residual waste volumes, population and household growth in the county, these actions are unlikely to be sufficient in themselves or delivered quickly enough to mitigate the forecast capacity short fall at the EfW in the longer term.

If the proposed BAEF could process residual household waste from the south east of the county (Boston, East Lindsey, South Holland and North Kesteven District Councils), it would offer a new disposal and treatment option for the county and would future proof the capacity of the EfW facility in Lincolnshire for many years to come. By diverting waste in the south of the county away from the EfW, development of additional waste processing infrastructure in the county can be substantially delayed or even eliminated.

BAEF could also meet several other strategic objectives by providing an innovative solution to municipal waste processing and treatment, using waste as a resource by converting it to energy and valuable commodities such as carbon dioxide and aggregate and could substantially reduce the carbon footprint of our current countywide waste management arrangements by eliminating road haulage of waste from the south of the county to Lincoln. There will also be a significant and positive impact on the county's recycling rate as recyclable material will be removed from the residual waste stream by screening, prior to being processed in the gasification facility. The recyclable content of the residual waste stream is forecast to be in the region of 20% hence its removal for recovery prior to processing will provide a significant boost to the countywide recycling objective as well as the national recycling targets contained in the HM Government: Our Waste, Our Resources: Strategy for England published in 2018.

Finally, the location of the Lincolnshire County Council owned and operated waste transfer station, on Nursery Road, Riverside Industrial Estate, Boston, Lincolnshire, PE21 7TN, is ideally situated adjacent to the proposed development site of the BAEF to offer the opportunity for the bulking, baling and direct transfer of municipal waste, collected from households in Boston, East Lindsey and South Holland districts, into the proposed BAEF site for treatment. This will serve to divert waste away from the EfW facility in Lincoln and will substantially reduce residual waste haulage costs and the countywide waste management carbon footprint. With regard to this proposal, please note comments under Traffic Management.

Development Management

The proposed Alternative Energy Facility by processing waste by a gasification process as described above would appear to be an acceptable and appropriate use for the site selected. Whether it is classed as B2 or Sui Generis use would be decision that is made later in the process. However, currently the proposal is considered acceptable in context with the Lincolnshire County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

In terms of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan a B2 use is appropriate given it is an allocated employment site. A Sui Generis use and the development in the Countryside would need to be justified on the basis “of other material consideration”.

The benefits that could accrue from the gasification process would mean less waste is directed to land fill sites or elsewhere. It does not need to burn coal or gas to help create the energy to produce the electricity. The residue from the combustion process is recycled into products that have an economic value at the end of the process.

The whole process from construction to end use would provide a facility that provided employment opportunities across the whole spectrum, including construction jobs and end user jobs, some of which may be specialised.

There appears to be a case for the need of such a facility and based on the planning history locally around this site this may be a suitable location given the delivery of material to the site would be by water and not by vehicles.

The energy produced would not only be a benefit across Boston but the whole East Midlands Region and nationally, given the electricity produce will be added to the National Grid.


However, given the stage we are currently at, it is not possible to assess the project against the policies of the adopted Local Plan. There are no plans of the proposed structures to view and assess only simple written descriptions.

Planning Policy

Policy 7: “Improving South East Lincolnshire’s Employment Land Portfolio” of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan allocates the Riverside industrial estate, shown below in purple or crosshatched, as B1, B2 and B8. The Boston Alternative Energy Facility site is shown with a black line and extends over land shown allocated for employment land and countryside.

The policy also allows new employment development outside the allocated employment site provided:

- a. the development does not conflict with neighbouring land uses;
- b. there is no significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area;
- c. the design is responsive to the local context;
- d. there will be no significant adverse impact on the local highway network;
- e. there will be no significant adverse impact upon the viability of delivering any allocated employment site;
- f. proposals maximising opportunities for modal shift away from the private car are demonstrated;
and
- g. there is an identified need for the business location outside of identified employment areas on the Policies Map.



The Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan - Core Strategy and Development Management Policies contains Policy W3: “Spatial Strategy for New Waste Facilities”. It supports proposals for new waste facilities in Boston, as well as other settlements in Lincolnshire. Policy W4: “Locational Criteria for New Waste Facilities in and around main urban areas” supports new waste facilities as set out in W3 provided that they would be located on:


- Previously developed and/or contaminated land; or
- Existing or planned industrial / employment land and buildings; or

- Land already in waste management use; or
- Sites allocated in the Site Locations Document; or
- In the case of biological treatment the land identified in W5. (This relates to proposals on sites that do not accord with W3)

The Lincolnshire County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan Site Locations document allocates the Riverside Industrial Estate for:

Resource Recovery Park, Treatment Facility, Waste Transfer, Materials Recycling Facility, Household Waste Recycling Centre, Metal Recycling / End of Life Vehicles, Re-Use Facility, C&D Recycling and Energy Recovery.

The allocation extends over a larger area than the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, as it is based on the superseded Boston Borough Local Plan 1999. The proposed plant is located on land within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Riverside Industrial Estate allocation.



The proposal seeks to transport materials to and from the site by boat. The gasification process produces gas which will be used to generate electricity. The impact of boats and emissions from the process on the Wash will have to be assessed to ensure the Wash, which has International, European and National conservation designations, is not harmed and the characteristics for which it is designated are not undermined.

In summary:

- The uses listed in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan are B1, B2 and B8. The uses listed in the Lincolnshire County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan Site Locations document are B2, B8 and Sui Generis.
- The proposal is for an Alternative Energy Facility by processing waste by a gasification process. Energy Recovery in the form of “Gas from biological degradation of waste production, purification or refining place” is B2. A “Power Station” is Sui Generis.

- In the context of the Lincolnshire County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan Site Locations document the proposed Alternative Energy Facility complies with one of the bullet points in W4, in that the land is allocated in the Site Locations document.
- In terms of the South East Lincolnshire Local plan a B2 use is appropriate on the allocated employment site. However, a Sui Generis use would need to be considered against “any other material Considerations”. Development on the Countryside, would need to be justified on the basis of the 7 criteria, a - g of Policy 7.
- The proposal must not undermine the Wash nature conservation designation.

Economic Development

The Council's economic development function is to develop and drive growth and enterprise across the borough to transform the local economy into a sustainable destination of choice for investing, working, living and visiting.

In this context, the Boston Alternative Energy Facility (BAEF) will have a major strategic impact on the local economy, job creation, business and supply chain growth that influence the socio-economic factors on our local communities.

The impact of this development presents a significant economic opportunity for Boston and the wider economy and is much more than just building a power station. The construction and operation of BAEF will provide significant boost and add value to local businesses through the procurement process.

The size and scale of BAEF will also during the build provide a significant increase in local retail and hospitality spend as well as developing strong relationships with local schools, Boston College and University of Lincoln to deliver wide-ranging employment and skills, apprenticeship and traineeship opportunities in the energy sector and especially in Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM).

Aligned to the Local Industrial Strategy, the BAEF is a catalyst for wider economic growth supporting opportunities for businesses of all sizes to supply goods and services throughout the construction and operational phases. The development would create a sustainable opportunity to diversify parts of the business base away from 'low skill - low wage' economy to one that could improve productivity through the contribution of inward investment activity for high grade carbon dioxide (CO₂), aggregates for the construction sector and heat extraction.

Environmental Health

Boston is subject to air quality issues and there are two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in place. Concerns have previously been raised about the proposal and how the impact of the proposed site use must not adversely affect the existing areas, with a request for regular monitoring.

The lack of information relating to the traffic management plan both for the construction period and clarity of site operations means that a detailed assessment cannot yet be assessed.

We have requested that all the options for traffic routes for construction traffic and operational service traffic are examined as part of the process. In addition we note the potential on the AQMA of pollution via shipping vehicles.

There is likely to be an impact on neighbouring communities on both sides of the River Haven in respect of potential noise pollution, light pollution, off loading/on loading of ships at night but until the detailed proposals are received, no detailed comment with regard to mitigation may be made.

Traffic Management

The issue of Traffic Management has been referenced above under two other sections, however, such is our concern about the impact of traffic, we feel this is an issue that must be further explored in some depth. We do not believe this application can progress to consideration by an Inspector on the basis that a Construction Management Plan will be produced at a later date, which will contain specific reference to traffic management. We believe our residents and existing businesses who operate in the locality of Marsh Lane require a much more detailed explanation, particularly noting the length of proposed construction.

As noted above, we feel the economic benefits that can be delivered to the wider area of Boston are significant and we will continue to engage with the BAEF project team to consider how these benefits may be exploited.

However, we are also mindful that the impact of negative publicity/reputation could damage later investment in the supply chain by virtue of not wanting to be associated with a “tainted” project.

By way of example:

- Local Residents - if the mitigation of traffic impact is not properly considered, as soon as construction traffic impacts on residential amenity becomes an issue, there is most likely to be a high profile social media commentary on the impact of the development. This is likely to be vocal and negative.
- Local Existing Business - there are existing businesses that could have a positive impact on the supply chain. Equally there are others that have high profile existing clients that visit the Marsh Lane site regularly. A negative impact from traffic over a four year period will have an impact on existing business and potentially create barriers to those businesses engaging with the potential opportunities the BAEF presents.
- Inward Investment - if there is a negative campaign or general negative news coverage, this will impact on the wider reputation of the Borough as a place in which to invest and also the BAEF as an opportunity to explore further.

Therefore, there is a significant commercial reason to ensure that traffic management, both for construction and for operation of the facility is fully understood and how to mitigate the impact of development is fully explored.

In addition, we noted above the potential to explore further waste import from other areas of the county, as a means of reducing the climate footprint of our current waste haulage arrangements (as above under Waste Strategy).

However, we cannot support these ideas unless there is a clear mitigation of that impact on our residents through a different route into the BAEF site to reduce the impact of traffic movements on residential amenity.

Third Party Representations

There have been several members of the public that have raised questions directly with our elected members. We have explained that all such interaction must be directed to the BAEF website.

However, we feel in the interests of transparency, and noting your approach to consultation and the way you have engaged, it is reasonable to include the issues raised in our consultation response. We have not commented on the specific points raised and remain neutral, we simply request that in your consideration, you do have due regard to these issues and their relevancy on the proposed scheme. The full correspondence received will be sent to the BAEF project team.

- Concern about noise, odour and pollution and how this will be monitored, the impact on air quality on crops with regard to the agricultural industry and will “scrubbers” be utilised for pollutants. In addition, what will happen to the type of waste that cannot be recycled, such as batteries. What consideration has been given to pollution of the river.
- A reliance on estimates and assumptions about the way the plant will operate.
- Concerns about impact on fishing, including; width of modern cargo ships meeting fishing boats in the river; cargo ships have a 3ft bow wave that can, and have, lifted a fishing boat then dumped it onto the mud bank, potentially causing a hazard were the boat to overturn; high mud banks each side of the river all the way to the cut end, a specialist dredging boat is required, Navigation of the river due to there being an S bend in the river; cargo boats turning at the knuckle/ getting stuck across the river.
- Concerns about the ability of the company to deliver the project.
- Concerns about the impact of inclement weather in the Wash impacting on viability of BAEF to operate to full capacity.
- Traffic impact, the extent of machinery and equipment to be transported to the site and whether new roads will be required. Will there be a requirement for night working and how will impact on residents and wildlife be mitigated.
- Local jobs for local people - how will the project use local expertise and technical knowledge; is there a proposed arrangement with Boston College to use apprentices; what consideration has been given to accommodation for workers.
- What vermin control has been considered for the site when operational.

Supplementary Questions and Observations Requiring a Response

There are many additional questions that are unclear from the information in the public domain and the Council as a statutory consultee would appreciate the response to these questions in order to be able to consider what level of support we may provide at a Public Inquiry.

- (i) The construction process is proposed to take up to four years, generate up to 300 construction jobs and give rise to construction work six days a week. However, there is no information as to how this traffic management will impact on local residents and business, in addition to the wider road network impact.

We believe there should be detailed consideration of an access road for the purpose of construction traffic to mitigate the impact of such heavy construction traffic on the community.

We believe that this provides an opportunity to work with our colleagues at the County Council in terms of how this might be upgraded to provide a permanent road to reduce ongoing impact of the use of the site once fully operational.

- (ii) We are mindful that Boston has two AQMAs in operation and we are concerned not to have received the detail in relation to traffic movements for both construction and operation that would enable the Council to fully assess the potential impact, including shipping traffic and how this may be mitigated. We require detailed traffic assessment information before the project progresses further to the next stage.
- (iii) We note the high level of advanced technology proposed within the site, which will likely give rise to noise and pollution impacts on local residents and businesses. However, without detailed proposals, we are unable to fully assess such impact and suggest areas of mitigation. We require further detail to enable such consideration.
- (iv) We are unable to fully assess the project against the policies of the adopted Local Plan as there are no plans of the proposed structures to view and assess only simple written descriptions. At this stage in the consultation process, we are disappointed we cannot provide more clarity and would like to delay the next stage of the process until such time as detailed plans are available for more detailed assessment.
- (v) We note one of the by-products will be aggregate. To lower the carbon footprint, by reducing haulage of this product, and provide additional employment opportunities and to further support the local economy, we suggest provision, at the design stage, to enable local distribution of aggregate products direct to local markets via road.
- (vi) We believe provision of facilities/proposals at the design stage, for the efficient and direct transference of baled waste from the Boston Waste Transfer Station, direct to the RDF receiving facility is worthy of consideration.
- (vii) We note the anticipated by-products and believe that the direct export of Heat / CO₂ / Electricity to encourage local business and residential development is an opportunity. In addition, by encouraging further employment opportunities, this will offset the deficit in the labour allocation designated for the area as falling within BAEF development footprint – by way of example the labour allocation for this area is approximately 800 jobs, but the proposed site will generate only approximately 100 jobs (after the initial construction).
- (viii) We would like to see the materials that are removed from the feedstock during the process as unsuitable for gasification, and recycled; are recorded and contribute to the county and national recycling targets.

- (ix) How will the material (approximately 20%) from bales that is not suitable for gasification, be separated and what impact will this have on noise and pollution.
- (x) We note that ferrous and non-ferrous metals will be removed, collected in separate skips and sent for processing off-site - what traffic movements are these expected to generate and what end use might these have.
- (xi) We note that the existing flood defences are to be replaced - does the new Quay improve existing flood defences and if so, how.
- (xii) What dialogue has there been with the Port as we are interested in the feasibility of boats turning at the knuckle noting the increased traffic proposed to transport the bales to the site and also at this stage, to take away aggregate.
- (xiii) We note the reference to the aggregate leaving by ship and a dedicated berth – how often will this ship leave and arrive in addition to bale shipping movements.
- (xiv) We have not seen sufficient detailed plans within the proposals to be able to fully assess whether there would be an impact on the ecology of the Haven and ecosystem around the application site, however we note you will be completing an Environmental Impact Assessment.
- (xv) We are mindful that renewable energy projects often provide a community fund to provide legacy projects within the community that mitigates the impact of the application site. We believe it would be helpful to the community to see this articulated in the documentation produced by the applicant to support the application.


Conclusion

There are many positive benefits the scheme as proposed will bring to the Borough of Boston and the Council wishes to work closely with the applicant to ensure all issues are fully considered before the final plans are submitted to the Secretary of State to ensure the design of the site can fully capitalise on these options to further enhance job creation and supply chain opportunities. However, the wider economic benefits must be balanced with the impact on the community, both residents and business together with the impact on wildlife and the River Haven ecology. Until such time as the detail surrounding plans and traffic, by way of two examples, are supplied, we cannot comment in any detail.

We would respectfully request that the 6 August 2019 deadline is extended to enable all statutory partners to fully engage and have regard to potential Statements of Common Ground in readiness for the Planning Inquiry. We feel it will cause delay later in the process if the plans are submitted without the applicant having had the opportunity to fully consider detailed observations which will most likely result in amendments to design and enhance the final proposal.

We look forward to hearing from you further with the points we have raised.

Yours sincerely



Michelle Sacks
Deputy Chief Executive

I am sure you are aware of the proposed Boston Alternative Energy Facility ,and have attended the consultation days. As a Boston resident I am still very concerned with regard to noise,odour and air pollution.All the relevant information appears to be best guess,projections,and estimates.

I am sure the residents of Derby were told similar information,but just look at how the plant at Sinfin lane Derby is turning out.

Will the proposed facility become Boston's living nightmare and affect the well being of 50,000 people continuously for the next 25 years.

I look forward to your comments

Regards

K Blanchard


Copies to Councillors,MP,and local press

From: Yvonne Stevens <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 26 July 2019 14:06
To: Janette Collier [REDACTED]
Subject: BAEF concerns for E & P
Importance: High

I am forwarding you the concerns of Mr Ken Bagley for the 26 fishing boats operating out of Boston should the BAEF project become a reality

1. Width of modern cargo ships meeting fishing boats in the river. Because cargo ships have a 3ft bow wave that can and have lifted a fishing boat then dumped it onto the mud bank. The fishing boat was in the process of turning over but thankfully the water came back and re floated it again.
2. High mud banks each side of the river all the way to the cut end, a specialist dredging boat is required.
3. Navigation of the river due to there being an S bend in the river
4. Cargo boats turning at the knuckle/ getting stuck across the river

Yvonne Stevens
Portfolio for Waste



Councillor Mrs. Yvonne Stevens
Trinity Ward
Boston Borough Council
Boston
Lincs

23rd. July 2019

Dear Mrs. Stevens,

Boston Alternative Energy Facility

Thank you for taking time to discuss this project with me. As you know I am 'in principle' in favour of all regions taking responsibility of monitoring and disposing of their own waste streams and hopefully using best technology to achieve the minimum environmental damage whilst doing so. I disclose that I am an environmentalist, have had solar panels on my properties for 20 years and am known as an 'early adopter'.

So naturally I am extremely interested in the project offered as the 'Boston Alternative Energy Project and have attended one of the consultation /information days and discussed the matter in some depth with the staff there.

However exciting this project looks on the impressive documentation, upon reflection I have some reservations I would like to bring to your attention and the attention of the relevant committees with any degree of oversight.

- Is this company requesting planning permission actually capable of delivering such a large and technically demanding project? I was told it was an experienced American company. When I checked with Companies House [registered as company 11013830] the reality seems very different.

The company was set up in 2017. There are 3 directors and I attach a copy of their accounts. The Committee or Council might wish to call in the Directors to present their experience in constructing such high tec. projects and whether they have the financial backing and management capabilities.

I understand that they are linked to Alternative Use Boston Projects Ltd. who already manage a waste wood processing facility in the area. Is this commissioned and satisfactory?

The Committee might consider a tour of a similar project in which they have been involved. Can such a tour be open to those interested at an appropriate cost?

- The whole area around the Wash is flood zone and despite the benefit of the proposed barrier is still very much at risk from rising sea levels and severe weather .I think the risk of inundation of the storage areas during winter storm surges is extremely high as well as the difficulty of uninterrupted transport down the east of the British coast and unloading in foul weather. I note a steady stream of waste material is expected from Scotland via this route... Is this genuinely feasible 12 months /year?
- Very heavy machines will need to access the site over a long period of construction. I doubt whether the current Boston road infrastructure will easily cope with the extra heavy traffic, air pollution and noise etc. Turbines etc. are huge and require special access facilities which cannot be brought in by water. Will extra access roads need

to be built? That alone is a large environmental cost and will have heavy knock on consequences to people living nearby and the local schools. What monitoring procedures are envisioned and how will the company be made to comply?

- You will note that the six RDF silos alone will require 24hr working with slip concrete. Each pair require 35 days to complete which equals 105 days @24 hour working. Who will compensate local residents for the night disruption? This is equally traumatic to wildlife as humans.
- 'Local employment for area'. I have concerns that most technical expertise will be brought in at each construction stage rather than employment for local people. Has suitable accommodation been identified? Is there a requirement that the local college be given access for apprentices or internships?
- Security fencing is always a priority but I plead for hedging to be planted at the same time to become established as part of the environmental protection and not just as a decorative bolt-on at the end of the construction process. The environmental destruction will be considerable and I feel strongly all steps to mitigate the impact should be taken. Otherwise this project will not be an environmental solution to waste disposal and could turn out to be as damaging as landfill.
- Strict vermin control will be essential. Rats and seagulls will target the site. Not only the facility but once attracted will encroach on the whole area.
- What scrubbers are being used to clean the outward pollutants? Plastic produces a lot of very nasty ones.. please note item 5.7.4

We have frequent easterly winds blowing on shore and even westerlies blow pollutants to Scandinavia. The UK has already be taken to international court for causing acid rain killing Scandinavian forests... The idea that there can be no transboundary impacts sounds unrealistic and basically untrue.

Although the publicity material sounds impressive I am not yet convinced the company is yet ready to consider such a big project and there is potential for severe consequences for the whole of the area south of the river. I would like to visit a running site and ask in depth questions about any unintended consequences.

I realise the business will not be run by the council but as a protector of the people and the local environment I hope they will ask sharp questions and expect nothing but the highest of standards and not be bewitched by the idea that we will be 'getting something for nothing'.

There will be large 'costs' to the neighbourhood and the environment. Who will pay compensation to the people living in the area for loss of value to housing, lack of sleep and ongoing disruption during construction? The idea that 'it's only the view that matters' is worrying. I disagree that the overall impact will be minimal and request that hawkish oversight is given throughout.

I hope the council will consider these and other issues as it examines the proposed facility.

Yours sincerely,

Doreen M. Brown [Revd.]

REGISTERED NUMBER: 11013830 (England and Wales)

Unaudited Financial Statements
for the Period 16 October 2017 to 31 October 2018
for
ALTERNATIVE USE BOSTON PROJECTS LIMITED

ALTERNATIVE USE BOSTON PROJECTS LIMITED (REGISTERED NUMBER: 11013830)

**Contents of the Financial Statements
FOR THE PERIOD 16 OCTOBER 2017 TO 31 OCTOBER 2018**

	Page
Company Information	1
Balance Sheet	2
Notes to the Financial Statements	3

ALTERNATIVE USE BOSTON PROJECTS LIMITED

**Company Information
FOR THE PERIOD 16 OCTOBER 2017 TO 31 OCTOBER 2018**

DIRECTORS:	J D Callen J Peakall
REGISTERED OFFICE:	26 Church Street Bishop's Stortford Hertfordshire CM23 2LY
REGISTERED NUMBER:	11013830 (England and Wales)
ACCOUNTANTS:	Morris Wheeler & Co Limited Chartered Accountants 26 Church Street Bishop's Stortford Hertfordshire CM23 2LY

ALTERNATIVE USE BOSTON PROJECTS LIMITED (REGISTERED NUMBER: 11013830)

Balance Sheet
31 OCTOBER 2018

	Notes	£	£
FIXED ASSETS			
Tangible assets	4		8,268
CURRENT ASSETS			
Stocks		532,756	
Debtors	5	336,373	
Cash at bank and in hand		<u>820,101</u>	
		1,689,230	
CREDITORS			
Amounts falling due within one year	6	<u>1,671,691</u>	
NET CURRENT ASSETS			<u>17,539</u>
TOTAL ASSETS LESS CURRENT LIABILITIES			25,807
ACCRUALS AND DEFERRED INCOME			<u>68,344</u>
NET LIABILITIES			<u>(42,537)</u>
CAPITAL AND RESERVES			
Called up share capital			52,951
Retained earnings			<u>(95,488)</u>
SHAREHOLDERS' FUNDS			<u>(42,537)</u>

The company is entitled to exemption from audit under Section 477 of the Companies Act 2006 for the period ended 31 October 2018.

The members have not required the company to obtain an audit of its financial statements for the period ended 31 October 2018 in accordance with Section 476 of the Companies Act 2006.

The directors acknowledge their responsibilities for:

- (a) ensuring that the company keeps accounting records which comply with Sections 386 and 387 of the Companies Act 2006 and preparing financial statements which give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the company as at the end of each financial year and of its profit or loss for each financial year in accordance with the requirements of Sections 394 and 395 and which otherwise comply with the requirements of the Companies Act 2006 relating to financial statements, so far as applicable to the company.
- (b)

The financial statements have been prepared and delivered in accordance with the provisions of Part 15 of the Companies Act 2006 relating to small companies.

In accordance with Section 444 of the Companies Act 2006, the Income Statement has not been delivered.

The financial statements were approved by the Board of Directors on 12 June 2019 and were signed on its behalf by:

J D Callen - Director

The notes form part of these financial statements

ALTERNATIVE USE BOSTON PROJECTS LIMITED (REGISTERED NUMBER: 11013830)

**Notes to the Financial Statements
FOR THE PERIOD 16 OCTOBER 2017 TO 31 OCTOBER 2018**

1. STATUTORY INFORMATION

Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited is a private company, limited by shares, registered in England and Wales. The company's registered number and registered office address can be found on the Company Information page.

The presentation currency of the financial statements is the Pound Sterling (£).

2. ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of preparing the financial statements

These financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Financial Reporting Standard 102 "The Financial Reporting Standard applicable in the UK and Republic of Ireland" including the provisions of Section 1A "Small Entities" and the Companies Act 2006. The financial statements have been prepared under the historical cost convention.

Tangible fixed assets

Depreciation is provided at the following annual rates in order to write off each asset over its estimated useful life.
Plant and machinery etc - 20% on cost

Stocks

Stocks are valued at the lower of cost and net realisable value, after making due allowance for obsolete and slow moving items.

Taxation

Taxation for the period comprises current and deferred tax. Tax is recognised in the Income Statement, except to the extent that it relates to items recognised in other comprehensive income or directly in equity.

Current or deferred taxation assets and liabilities are not discounted.

Current tax is recognised at the amount of tax payable using the tax rates and laws that have been enacted or substantively enacted by the balance sheet date.

Deferred tax

Deferred tax is recognised in respect of all timing differences that have originated but not reversed at the balance sheet date.

Timing differences arise from the inclusion of income and expenses in tax assessments in periods different from those in which they are recognised in financial statements. Deferred tax is measured using tax rates and laws that have been enacted or substantively enacted by the period end and that are expected to apply to the reversal of the timing difference.

Unrelieved tax losses and other deferred tax assets are recognised only to the extent that it is probable that they will be recovered against the reversal of deferred tax liabilities or other future taxable profits.

3. EMPLOYEES AND DIRECTORS

The average number of employees during the period was 3.

ALTERNATIVE USE BOSTON PROJECTS LIMITED (REGISTERED NUMBER: 11013830)

Notes to the Financial Statements - continued
FOR THE PERIOD 16 OCTOBER 2017 TO 31 OCTOBER 2018

4. TANGIBLE FIXED ASSETS

	Plant and machinery etc £
COST	
Additions	10,335
At 31 October 2018	<u>10,335</u>
DEPRECIATION	
Charge for period	2,067
At 31 October 2018	<u>2,067</u>
NET BOOK VALUE	
At 31 October 2018	<u>8,268</u>

5. DEBTORS: AMOUNTS FALLING DUE WITHIN ONE YEAR

	£
Other debtors	<u>336,373</u>

6. CREDITORS: AMOUNTS FALLING DUE WITHIN ONE YEAR

	£
Trade creditors	138,199
Taxation and social security	2,261
Other creditors	1,531,231
	<u>1,671,691</u>

7. DIRECTORS' ADVANCES, CREDITS AND GUARANTEES

The following advances and credits to a director subsisted during the period ended 31 October 2018:

	£
J D Callen	
Balance outstanding at start of period	-
Amounts advanced	308,000
Amounts repaid	-
Amounts written off	-
Amounts waived	-
Balance outstanding at end of period	<u>308,000</u>

The director's current account was repaid on 20 February 2019.

8. RELATED PARTY DISCLOSURES

Included in other creditors is a loan of £1,530,626 from Alternative Use Projects Ltd, a company under the same control as Alternative Use Boston Projects Ltd.

This document was delivered using electronic communications and authenticated in accordance with the registrar's rules relating to electronic form, authentication and manner of delivery under section 1072 of the Companies Act 2006.

From: Peter Wilson [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2019 17:37
To: Judith Skinner <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Boston Alternative Energy Facility

Is The Boston Alternative Energy Facility really going to be a good, safe thing for the residents of Boston and surrounding area?

I have a great many concerns as my understanding of the position is this:

THE WASTE. It is the type we can't recycle, the horrible stuff, and for us it all goes in our green bin. Except it won't be our waste as it can't be put through the Facility. It will come from anywhere down the East coast of England & Scotland.

Because it is the horrible stuff, they say it is going to be sorted and the very nasty stuff like Hazardous waste taken out before it is baled up ready to be shipped. Hazardous waste can take many forms like garden pesticides, paint, batteries, unused prescriptions, asbestos, smoke detectors, bleach, dog poo, dead animals, etc. If you think that lot can be screened out you have more faith than me, especially since the waste providers are not known yet.

QUANTITY. 12 ships per week, each capable of carrying 2,500 tonnes of waste in 1,800 plastic wrapped bales.

This is 1.3 million tonnes of waste per year.

With numbers like this, what price contamination of the river or The Wash?

12,600 tonnes stored in the open on the quayside ready to be fed into the Facility in rotation.

Each bale will be outside up to 5 days. I estimate it could be up to 4 weeks from creation of the waste to some of it finally being put through the Facility.

AIR QUALITY. The emissions from the Facility are another serious concern.

During construction the Facility has the potential to pose a human health risk from inhalation or ingestion of pollutants.

In operation, the relevant Environment Assessment Level for pollutants are predicted to be exceeded, including benzo [a] pyrene (BaP), alleged to be a cancer causing agent.

Do we need to care that some pollutants will be emitted every hour of every day for at least 25 years, in a town, in one of one of the major vegetable producing areas of the country?

Yes, we do when it is on such a massive scale as this, with 1.3 million tonnes of waste shipped here annually!

With profits from the Facility going to the private investor the only benefits for the local residents appear to be the 80 predicted jobs and some rate income for our Council.

I agree we must reduce landfill and this Facility does that, but please build it in a safe place and not close to urban housing.

Hopefully these concerns can be addressed at the next Council meeting and would appreciate any feedback.

Regards

Peter Wilson [REDACTED]

From: Alison Austin [REDACTED] >
Sent: 23 July 2019 15:31
To: Matt Fisher <[REDACTED]> Christian Allen [REDACTED]
Subject: Refuse coming to Waste Transfer Unit
Importance: High

Good afternoon Matt

I believe that Chris is on leave for a few days. I would like a response to these questions before next week's E&P meeting.

Exactly how many refuse vehicles come into Waste Transfer Unit on Slippery Gowt Lane please?
Is this a constant number every day? If so how many is that daily and between what hours?
Where do these vehicles come from – which authority? Whose vehicles are they, please – I believe that some may be ours collecting outside the Boston Borough boundary.
Our neighbouring districts are all much larger than our Borough. Does all the waste from any of these authorities come to Slipperly Gowt, or is it just a proportion?
What type of waste are they bringing, please?
Are all these vehicles partly “closed” refuse lorries similar to ours?
What is their destination on leaving our WTU, please?

Sorry this contains so many questions.

FYI: I'm concerned about additional vehicle movements if we were to take a greater amount of waste as extra feedstock for the proposed Baef.
As it is planned, I and most of the local residents in the vicinity are happy. If anything that we propose to change the source of waste results in more vehicle movements onto Marsh Lane, then there will be a lot of unhappy residents.

Kind regards
Alison A

Present: Councillor Judith Skinner (Chairman), Councillor Tracey Abbott (Vice-Chairman), Councillors Peter Bedford, Anton Dani, Deborah Evans, Paul Goodale, Neill Hastie, Peter Watson and Judith Welbourn

In attendance:

Officers –
Chief Executive, Head of Environmental Operations, Head of Place and Space,
Transformation & Governance Manager and Democratic Services Officer

15 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were tabled for Councillors Sean Blackman and George Cornah.
No substitute members.

16 MINUTES

With the agreement of the committee, the Chairman signed the minutes of the previous meeting held on the 30 July 2019

17 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No declarations of interest were tabled.

18 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Mr Darron Abbott tabled the following question:

It appears from the agenda from this evenings meeting a vote was taken by the members of this Committee to approve the setting up of a Task and Finish Group into the night time economy of Boston is this correct?

The Chairman thanked Mr Abbott for the question and responded as follows:

As you will see from the minutes of the last meeting, published with the agenda papers for tonight's meeting, specifically minute 13 on page 6, the committee did resolve to establish a Task and Finish Group to examine the night time economy of the Public Space Protection Order area and the Borough as a whole.

The Chairman then asked Mr Abbott if he had a supplemental question which he tabled as follows:

At that same meeting on the 24th July did a discussion take place as to which Councillor would Chair the task and finish Group? If yes was that Councillor present? If they were did they accept the proposed appointment? At the BTAC meeting on Wednesday 21st August Councillor Hastie requested that the report from the Task and Finish group on the night time economy " be presented at the next meeting, as he was supposed to be the chair and had heard nothing" Will this report be presented at the BTAC meeting on the 2nd October 2019 and if not why not?

The Chairman thanked Mr Abbott for the supplemental question and stated:

In response to your supplementary question Mr Abbott, no the Chairmanship of a Task and Finish Group was not agreed at the meeting, any Chairmanship of a Task and Finish Review is agreed at the first meeting of the group in line with Scrutiny Best Practice. It is not for the parent scrutiny committee to agree any Chairmanship. I am further advised that when the subject matter arose at the BTAC meeting the Chairman of that committee clearly stated any such review was a Scrutiny matter and not for BTAC.

19 BOSTON ALTERNATIVE ENERGY FACILITY

The Chairman introduced Mr Gary Bower and Miss Bethan Griffiths from Boston Alternative Energy Facility and welcomed them.

Mr Bower presented a very comprehensive update supported by a detailed powerpoint presentation. The following minute highlights key points of information:

Three rounds of public consultation had taken place in September 2018, February 2019 and in June/July 2019. The proposed development would be a 102MWe Energy from Waste (EfW) advanced gasification facility. It would operate via an import/export wharf, providing waste reception and storage export of lightweight aggregates. The proposed development site is 25 ha of land, allocated in the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, as suitable for works on the banks of The Haven. Both delivery of the refuse derived fuel and the export of the lightweight aggregate is by ship.

The refuse derived fuel (residual household waste) would be plastic wrapped in 1.8cbm bales weighing 1.5 tonnes with 620 shipments per year. It would all be UK collected waste with nothing from overseas with off-loading at the site by mobile crane at one of the three berthing points.

Waste would be stored for no longer than 5 days before being shredded to allow non suitable items for the gasification process to be removed. Recyclable products such as glass and metal are captured and sent for recycling locally. The shredded feedstock is then transferred via a sealed conveyor to store in silos before gasification and conversion into approximately 80 MW of power being exported to the National Grid. Ash from the process is recycled into aggregates for the construction industry which would be exported via ship.

Members were advised that the build would be in line with the best technology available to operate efficiently and safely with strict European emission standards. Liaison with the Port of Boston was ongoing in respect of the turning of the ships which would be either at the knuckle point or within the dock itself.

Addressing the overall benefits Mr Bower confirmed that, the recovered energy from 1 million tonnes of RDF would generate power to more than 206,000 homes. It would also reduce the 3.5 million tonnes of waste currently exported and processed abroad.

With the UK benefitting from generating its own renewable energy, it would allow the UK to meet UK renewable energy targets. The initial construction phase would create approximately 300 jobs, and 80 permanent jobs once operational. It would bring new skills to the town with the developer engaging with the college in respect of apprenticeships. The facility would also allow local investment opportunities with potential exporting of Co2 which was a desirable commodity. It also had capacity within its tolerance level of 1.3 million tonnes, to take the 50,000 tonnes of residual waste for South Lincolnshire which was currently transported via road to the EFW at North Hykeham.

Highway impacts would be experienced due to the large volume of cement needed. Local batching was being considered which would significantly reduce the number of deliveries. The developer was committed to the mitigation measures stipulated within the Construction Traffic Management Plan. There would be off-site traffic noise impact assessments.

Addressing operational noise members were told that the air-cooled condenser located at the south-west of the site was the dominant noise source and the developer would work with the technology provider to alter the design to include attenuation measures to reduce the noise.

Any impact on air quality during construction was predicted to be negligible. The contributions of benzo(a)pyrene produced by the facility would be below the required environmental assessment levels but with background contributions, there was a predicted exceedance.

There was a predicted exceedance of the 24-hour Oxides of Nitrogen and Hydrogen Fluoride levels at Havenside Local Nature Reserve at the closest point to the facility and action would be taken to mitigate them.

Concluding Mr Bower explained that a Development Consent Order would be drafted, the Environmental Statement completed and then the application submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. Thereafter if it was accepted, the examining phase would take place, ahead of the application being submitted to the Secretary of State.

Mr Bower responded to members questions as follows:

- The site would be the joint largest in the UK once constructed and the tallest stack would stand 73 metres tall. Boston Stump is 83m.
- Once the power was sold on from the site it was for the distributor to determine where it went for usage. The provider had no authority in the distribution of the power.
- The number of ships per annum visiting the site would be 620: 11 ships per week delivering the RDF and 2 exporting the aggregates.
- The facility would be sealed. Levels of all emissions would be continually monitored and the facility would be built with the technology to allow it to shut itself down, should it need to.
- The initial construction of the silos which were 4000 tonnes each would be a 24 hour a day operation.
- The need to use plastic to bind the bales was to ensure secure and strong wrapping and also restrain odour. Once the bales were opened, all the wrapping is then put back into the recycling process at the facility ensuring no residual plastic waste.
- There were 2 forms of piling available but the specifics were not known: one was via hammer driving and the second via a vibration method. Agreement on which form would be used had not been finalised.
- No discussions had been held with Lincolnshire County Council in respect of the possibility of the facility receiving the residual waste from the Slippery Gowt facility in Boston. The Development Consent Order was a legal document which when agreed would then allow any negotiations to take place in respect of the transfer site.

- Where possible local companies would be contracted to provide training for specialist skills for both the manufacturing phase and the operational activity of the facility.

The chairman invited questions from the floor which Mr Bower answered.

20 CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING GROUP UPDATE

The Chief Executive addressed the meeting and tabled apologies on behalf of the Chairman of the group Councillor Anne Dorrian.

Committee were advised that two meetings of the group had already taken place with the third being scheduled for 25th September 2019. There were 7 meetings scheduled to ensure final reporting back to Full Council in December 2019.

The working group comprised of five Council Members including the Portfolio Holder and eight members of staff, plus one co-opted member of the public. External representatives would be invited as required.

At its first meeting the group had scoped its terms of reference which it agreed needed to result in tangible and deliverable recommendations. It recognised the success of the Council's own Carbon Management Plan to date, in that it had reduced its own carbon footprint by 49% since 2008 and agreed its commitment to reducing carbon emissions further.

The group recognised the importance of being pragmatic in what it could achieve and hopes to suggest 2 areas of climate emissions declaration which currently frame the work:

1. What the Council could achieve itself in a practical and achievable way.
2. Championing with others including partners to look at carbon reduction opportunities and action across the Borough geography.

No Member questions were tabled and the Chairman thanked the Chief Executive for the update.

21 THE PILGRIMS 2020 AND ALLIED OPPORTUNITIES (UPDATE)

Presenting the report the Head of Space and Place confirmed the report was an update to the initial report tabled in January 2018 and then tabled at Cabinet in February 2018 requesting support for specific elements for funding to progress projects. Plymouth had secured £500k from Visit England in May 2016 with a similar amount being secured in 2018 from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. Boston had benefitted directly from the funds resulting in it being included in travel itineraries for 2020; promoted at trade fairs and was also featured prominently on national and internationally available apps telling the Pilgrim story. Furthermore interest had increased in the Guildhall and the Boston Heritage Trail.

A bid submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund to build on the Explore and Discover project, which would introduce monoliths firstly at Pilgrim specific sites and then sites within the town, had been unsuccessful.

As such in line with the tight timescales a reduced scheme was proposed focussing on the interpretation of the Pilgrim story. Boston Borough Council had match funded the bid and also secured a further £10k from Lincolnshire County Council but that money had been dependant on securing the original bid. Lincolnshire County Council had then agreed a reduced fund of £5k and that money along with the £10k match fund from Boston Borough Council had been used to deliver the works.

Referencing the Structures on the Edge project at Havenside members were advised that it was hoped that the structure would be in place by July 2020 at Scotia Creek. Running alongside this project was that of the bouys. Five applications for siting them had been agreed at the Planning Committee in July 2019, The installations would be sited at Haven Bridge, on the High Street, at the Bus Station, alongside the footbridge and in Central Park.

The Council had been asked to join forces with the Poacher Line in April 2020, to provide specific information in respect of Boston and its American connections to be advertised at Kings Cross Station for a day. The facility was part of the Community in the City initiative which encouraged travel by train supporting rural routes to the City.

In conclusion the Head of Place noted that the list of activities was not exhaustive and that as 2020 approached it was likely that additional activity could be incorporated in the programme of events.

Member comment and questions followed including:

Noting the app. which provided the half-day tour, a member stated that the period of time given would only permit viewing within the actual town itself: any progression out towards the Pilgrims memorial site and further, once the Structure on the Edge was in situ at the wash, would be impossible on foot due to time restrictions. Further concern noted it would be very difficult to get coaches up onto the bank. The Head of Place and Space agreed but stressed that the majority of the trail was town centric and that tours and visits to the outer town sites could be arranged: members were advised that Fishtoft Parish Council were very active in both the promotion of and possible tourist visits to Scotia Creek.

Noting confusion on the cost of the illuminate festivals within appendix 1 for £110k and the monies made available by the Controlling Migration fund on page 16 of the report, a member asked what the funds on page 14 from ACE were for and if the funds noted were all the same. The Head of Space and Place confirmed that the funds on page 14 were from a separate funding stream.

Members voiced approval of the events scheduled and suggested / requested that a proper tourism offer be established which would be permanent in the town to build a reputation and make it a destination. Concern noted that after 20/20 nothing new would arise and the Head of Space and Place assured committee that projects for 2030 were already being scoped and there would be significant promotion of the town and all its history and future events going forward. Key to establishing the towns permanent heritage would be development of its strong maritime history. Alongside that would be elaboration of the American connection and the importance of Boston, its Grammar School *[and further information to yet be revealed]* in respect of the Pilgrims story and early settlers in America from Boston.

22 NIGHT TIME ECONOMY

The Head of Environmental Operations advised the committee he was presenting the report on behalf of the Head of Regulatory Services.

Members were reminded that at the committee's previous meeting held on the 30 July 2019, having considered a very detailed report in respect of crime and disorder, alongside the annual review of anti-social behaviour and the Public space Protection Order, they determined that they would like to carry out more in-depth scrutiny of such matters and agreed to convene a Task and Finish group.

Members were advised that given the size of the scrutiny task and the wide range of areas to consider, officer felt that an Inquiry Day would be the most efficient way to progress the task in first instance. At this session the committee members could receive information from Council officers and Lincolnshire Police who had already agreed to support the scrutiny process.

In receiving the information at the Inquiry Session, it would allow the committee to agree or not, if a Task and Finish Group was still necessary and to agree the scope and reporting arrangements.

If so, then a report on the Inquiry Session would be taken back to the next scheduled meeting of the Committee on the 5th November 2019, at which point members could agree or not, to convene a Task and Finish Group. If agreed then the Chairman of the group would be elected at the first meeting.

Member comment included:

Overall members noted the reasoning for having the Inquiry Session recognising that it would allow them to determine if a Task and Finish Group should be convened.

One member was keen to speak with CCTV Operatives and Anti-Social Behaviour Teams from a number of other authorities along with our own, and to also call on Enforcement Officers.

At this point in the proceedings the Portfolio Holder addressed the meeting and urged strong caution that the member be aware of being too operational. As a point of clarification and to ensure all members were aware of the process, the Head of Environmental Operations confirmed that the Inquiry Day would be the first step. Should members wish to continue scrutiny via a Task and Finish Group, they had the right to do so.

It was moved by Councillor Paul Goodale and seconded by Councillor Anton Dani that committee agree the officer recommendation and resolve to undertake preliminary scrutiny by way of an Inquiry Session.

The motion was clearly carried.

RESOLVED: That an Inquiry Session be scheduled ahead of the next meeting of the committee on the 5th November 2019 and that a report on the Inquiry Session be tabled at that meeting.

23 REPLACEMENT DOMESTIC WHEELED BIN CHARGES

The Head of Environmental Operations addressed the committee confirming the reason for the report which was to respond to the resolution agreed by the committee at its last meeting on the 24th July 2019 that charges for replacement wheeled bins be added to this agenda.

For clarity members were advised that the Brown Bin charges were not in the scope of the report as the service is in opt-in discretionary service. The report covered Blue and Green bin replacement charges only.

Referencing the 2013/14 annual budget report, the Head of Environmental Operations drew members' attention to the new charge for replacement 240L bins as being £25.00 per bin. The budget report had been taken through the Corporate and Community Committee on the 17th January 2013; Audit and Governance Committee on the 28 January 2013, Cabinet on the 20th February and Full Council on the 4 March 2013 for formal approval. The same charge had been included in subsequent budgets for each year thereafter up to and including the current financial year.

Since the formal approval of replacement bin charges in 2013/14 budget, it became apparent that the charge had not been consistently applied. On the 14th January 2019 at an Inquiry Evening held in respect of the draft Waste and Recycling Operational Procedures document, at no time during the deliberations were concerns noted by any member in respect of the charges for the replacement wheeled bins.

Income from the sale of the replacement bins from 2013/14 to date had been £5,000, £4,150 of that amount had been collected since April 2019.

Member comment and questioning included:

A member stated there appeared to be a few discrepancies within the Waste and Recycling Operations procedures document with the one tabled within the report. The Head of Environmental Operations agreed that there had been a number of draft versions of the procedures but the one on the Council's website, which had been agreed following the Inquiry evening, was the correct one. Clearly set out under Procedure 14 it stated that when a bin was damaged in the back of the collection vehicle, a note would be made by the crew and the Council would arrange a replacement bin to be delivered free of charge.

A number of suggestions by members followed including:

- Developers on new builds taking responsibility for the cost of the initial bins. Members were advised this was already in place
- Charging all residents for their existing bins and making them the owner. They would then be automatically responsible for any bin replacement subject to it being damaged by the Council.
- Charging HMO's commercial rates and not residential rates for their refuse collections. Members noted that many HMO's had multiple bins to empty.

- Waiving all replacement charges and looking at the possibility of off-setting the replacement costs through the overall waste removal system.
- Holding a 'Bin Amnesty' to allow any unused / unwanted secondary bins to be collected freeing up reusable bins.

It was moved by Councillor Deborah Evans and seconded by Councillor Neil Hastie that all charges for replacements Green and Blue bins be withdrawn.
The motion was clearly carried.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Environment and Performance Committee recommend to Cabinet that it withdraw all replacement charges for the Green and Blue domestic wheeled bins.

24 WORK PROGRAMME

The Transformation and Governance Manager presented the Quarter 1 Performance report to committee to support their consideration of the future work programme. Addressing the planning applications determined the Transformation and Governance Manager noted the improvement in performance with previous red flags having become blue. Red flags on Environmental Services were being addressed through the current trial providing separate kerbside collections for paper and card. Incidents of commercial fly tipping had reduced. Members questioned fly tipping by HMO's whereby mattresses and furniture were just dumped outside the HMO and asked if HMO owners were charged for the removal of large scale furniture item and abandoned white goods.

Noting the decline in the markets a member questioned the previous Task and Finish Group review and questioned if the outcomes and recommendations had been monitored and reported back. **Committee agreed that a report on the outcomes of the markets review simply updating on each recommendation be tabled for a future meeting.**

At this point in the meeting a member questioned the Chairman as to why only one portfolio holder had taken the time to turn up at the meeting bearing in mind the number of reports on the agenda. The Chairman confirmed that all portfolio holders were invited to attend the meeting.

The Head of Environmental Operations duly noted apologies for Councillor Yvonne Stevens for having been unable to attend the meeting due to annual leave.

The Meeting Closed at 10.00 pm

**NOTES FROM BAEF MEETING
WEDNESDAY 25TH SEPTEMBER 2019, AT 2 00PM
COMMITTEE ROOM – MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS**

Michelle Sacks, Deputy Chief Executive, Boston Borough Council (MS)
 Mike Gildersleeves, Growth Manager, Boston Borough Council (MG)
 Christian Allen, Head of Operations, Boston Borough Council (CA)
 Peter Udy, Planning Officer, Boston Borough Council (PU)
 Warren Peppard, Lincolnshire County Council (WP)
 Neil McBride, Lincolnshire County Council (NMcbB)
 John Coates, Lincolnshire County Council (JC)
 Gary Bower Royal HaskoningDHV, (GB)
 Andy Ross Royal HaskoningDHV, (AR)
 Helen Scarr– Athene Communications (HS)

	ACTION
<p><u>Introductions</u></p> <p>MS opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and round the table introductions took place.</p> <p>MS advised that she was very impressed that as part of the consultation, the documents had not only been translated into braille, but a home visit had taken place with Mr & Mrs Fixter.</p>	
<p><u>Context</u></p> <p>MS advised that both Boston Borough Council (BBC) and Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) be committed to being involved in this key strategic project, hence both authorities being represented today. BBC and LCC have developed a joint board that will exist for the duration of the project and will ensure a consistent approach. Pauline Chapman () telephone 01205 314211 will be the conduit for the meetings and as such all correspondence/documents should be sent to her and she will ensure that they are disseminated to the correct recipients. Today the principles of how this group may meet throughout the process will be established.</p> <p>BBC and LCC have submitted consultation documentation and have requested further information from BAEF. There will be 2 further meetings after this one; each meeting will include an update on the agreed actions from the previous meeting. Additionally, meeting 2 will focus on Environmental Health/Regulatory Issues and meeting 3 will be a mop up session for all other topics including principally Economic Development.</p>	BAEF
<p><u>The Options of Traffic Mitigation</u></p> <p>A lengthy discussion took place, during which BBC/LCC were interested to learn how the option presented to mitigate traffic impact during the construction period and when operational was considered to be expedient and in particular they would like to know what other options were considered to mitigate consequential negatives.</p>	

MG referred to the proposal for one way in and one way out and advised that the authorities both need to understand the level of detail that has gone into that decision and what other options there were around mitigation actions. In summary, how did this option become the only solution? He added there is sensitivity around the area and there will be impact on residents and businesses and the traffic movement is likely to have economic implications.

MS advised the joint board would like to engage positively, inputting into the proposals that will help it to become further enhanced. She added Members are generally supportive, but the board needs to demonstrate it can sit down with BAEF to explore options, mitigations, proposals for the businesses, etc. From an economic development perspective, the project is exciting; however, for governance reasons MS will lead on economic development and MG on regulatory and CA on waste.

AR sought clarification as to whether those present had experience of the DCO process, rather than the traditional Town & Country Planning Act. He added there is a defined process for the DCO including a Preliminary Environmental Information Document (PEI) that results in a full impact assessment. He added that the PEI process is designed to be flexible enough to provide enough information for the project to then be developed, but may not have the preferred level of detail at this stage.

A discussion followed, after which MS confirmed the project board would like the ability to be able to flag potential issues up at this stage and the full details will be required at some stage in the project.

General Site Area

The following key points were raised:-

- There will be an impact on employment, businesses, residents and the transport network and so the board will like to see how BAEF approached this and what mitigation is planned.
- The key impact for businesses is likely to be delays and capacity issues associated with the numbers of vehicles on site, especially at peak times and during construction.
- There are some very commercially sensitive businesses who are very keen to see what the proposed mitigations are.

WP summarised by stressing that the board needs to be satisfied that all options have been fully considered, why others were dismissed in favour of the final one and why it is the best.

GB advised that some of the fundamental principles are guided by EN1 and EN3 and are supplemented by the National Policy Framework and the Local Plan. There also specific principles for the transport perspective which have been identified. MS confirmed there is a general principle of support for the project, but there are concerns about the impact on the amenity of the area both during construction and once operational and so it is helpful for BBC/LCC to have the opportunity to raise potential issues that can be addressed at an early stage.

BAEF

<p>GB reported a key concern that was picked up on the public information days was that there is a view that the public may not be asking the right questions, in the right way, to get the right answer and so it is helpful for BBC/LCC to ask the questions as it will allow BAEF to better shape the answers.</p>	
<p><u>Transport</u></p> <p>AR advised that the EN1 is a formal transport assessment and the environmental assessment relating to traffic follows the GERT principle which addresses amenity, severance, fear and intimidation, on with noise and air quality picked up in a further chapter. Additionally, the Department of Transport assessment guidance focussing on the operating capacity of the highway and road safety; and capacity and delay on the network.</p> <p>A lengthy debate took place regarding the temporary impact of the traffic demands and it was noted that BAEF will need to build up knowledge of what the traffic demands will be, looking at activities, etc. The construction traffic management plan is in the first instance a general commitment on how to manage traffic; this will then be picked up by the contractor and refined, but it was acknowledged that this is produced to mitigate the chosen option; we do not yet know if other options would have been more appropriate.</p> <p>During further discussions, which included reference to the Tritton Knoll site, AR declared an interest as he had worked on the Tritton Knoll project.</p> <p>Summarising, MG advised that the board needs to better understand:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That all alternatives have been considered and why they have been discounted • what options have been considered and have they been looked at in a realistic way, • what lead BAEF to the current position • what the unintended consequences of contractors using specific routes will be. • If a haul road has been considered as an option. • What will be the impact on John Adams Way as if there are delays this will cause economic impacts on various businesses, such as the Geoff Moulder Leisure Complex, food processors, manufacturing businesses that transport goods where John Adams Way is their major route, drivers running out of time and refuse collections. Air quality issues have already been identified in John Adams Way and what assessment of impact and delays has been done. • How will BAEF reflect that one delay in one area quickly impacts on the whole traffic network. • That BAEF reflect that the project is not just about the impact on the highways; it's about the economic growth and the delay on delivery of projects and businesses and air quality issues. <p>It was noted that 25 years is a long time and during that time, BAEF may seek expansion, change of operating systems, etc. Design is key to future proofing and it is important that the site is not constrained by issues that could be addressed now. GB advised any expansion will require further planning through the DCO process.</p>	<p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p>

<p>GB confirmed that BAEF will take a more flexible approach to discussing mitigation and will demonstrate a wider coverage of mitigation and why specific things have been discounted. There will also need to be an audit trail to show how/why mitigations have been discounted. BAEF will also identify the impacts of the specific development.</p>	BAEF
<p>A discussion followed regarding the impact of the mitigations imposed and how will they be enforced as there are likely to be enquiries around this, how to enforce vehicle movements, etc. GB confirmed there are various measures such as cab management, vehicle identification, etc. A monthly report will also be produced which will be reviewed and monitored.</p>	BAEF
<p>WP reiterated that the board needs to go through BAEF's option appraisals, to be able to confidently understand why/how BAEF has deemed this the best option.</p>	ALL
<p>A further discussion followed regarding transport arrangements. There will be more boat movement than anticipated due to aggregate being removed via barges. Such barge movements and enforcement will be subject to legal agreement.</p>	
<p>GB confirmed that discussions have taken place with the owner of the unadopted road. Discussions have also taken place with the Crown in respect of the Wharff and consequently an agreement is now in place with the Crown.</p>	
<p>AR gave a brief presentation on transport that included a transport activity schedule and advised that, in terms of traffic movement, week 5 is when the concrete pour is planned and so the anticipated traffic numbers are extremely high.</p>	BAEF
<p>WP noted that the figures in the initial assessment are based on assumptions, but he would like to see evidence of construction activity, in terms of where the material is coming from. AR gave an absolute commitment that contractors will not be using the Liquorpond Roundabout route and appropriate enforcement will be in place to monitor and manage this. He added that the construction traffic management plan will be provided as part of the tender information for perspective contractors and will include a clear instruction on what constraints will be in place.</p>	
<p>GB reported there is a waste transfer station very close to the BAEF and so it would be sensible for BAEF to deal with this waste, rather than sending to Hykeham, although this will need to be balanced with BAEF not attracting more waste than is already processed.</p>	
<p>JC expressed concern that there many assumptions around access to LCC's waste. Although there has been concern about capacity at Hykeham, the Government's proposed new waste strategy will result in Hykeham's capacity not being exceeded.</p>	
<p>A lengthy discussion followed around waste processing, during which it was noted there is no certainty of recyclate staying on the Riverside Industrial Estate. AR confirmed that the traffic management assessment provided for some waste material being take off site including metal 42,000 tonnes, non-ferrous 9,000 tonnes and ferrous 34,000 tonnes. MS expressed concern that existing businesses have the capacity to both receive, store and process this volume of waste and requested BAEF undertake further consultation with existing business users. In addition, it was also highlighted that there will be additional traffic movement from these businesses</p>	

<p>in processing and managing this product that will require traffic movement off site via Marsh Lane.</p> <p>JC asked that BAEF model the impact on the waste and recycling collections. Any significant delays to the freighters will potentially mean that daily refuse collections will not be completed. Agreed that LCC would provide data relating to the movement for the Boston Transfer Station.</p> <p>MG expressed concern that the figure of 150 tonnes of materials referred to is significantly differed to the PE1 information on traffic that suggests 30 tonnes per annum.</p> <p>A discussion took place in respect of the maintenance requirements associated with dredging. It was noted the Port of Boston has a licence to deposit 60 tonnes of sediment, but only deposits 30 tonnes.</p> <p>BAEF also need to be mindful of the number of vessels in the Port, the Fishermen's access and marine life.</p> <p>AR advised the next stage, in terms of traffic management is to model the sensitive junctions, based on data provided by LCC and BAEF's own. Mitigation will include avoiding sensitive times and areas.</p> <p>WP reiterated that as part of reviewing BAEF's options appraisals, evidence will need to be provided on traffic management, mitigation, etc. and once the board is satisfied that the chosen option is the best one it will be signed off.</p> <p>In terms of the network in future year, BAEF will:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine what developments have been approved and their transport assessment • Examine the general economic growth, using a database that gives growth factors based on the Local Plan and so gives an idea of the general increase on traffic associated with economic growth. 	<p>BAEF</p> <p>LCC</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p>
<p><u>Communications</u></p> <p>In respect of communications, the following was noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of discussions with local businesses in respect of capacity and BAEF's longer term plans, given this is a 25 year project is required • BAEF to work jointly with the businesses to make them aware of any possible opportunities • BAEF to consult with existing businesses, particularly food related businesses in respect of the construction plan timing and potential impacts. • Freshtime is the only business to respond and they have expressed a concern about the cost of their insurance and accidents on site, but felt this might be lack of clarity of project. • The Council to consider hosting an event to ensure that all of the correct businesses are invited – suggested Clive Gibbon to invite. 	<p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>MS</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fishermen have appointed a legal representative for this scheme. 	
<p><u>Actions</u></p> <p>In addition to those recorded within the notes, it was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> JC/CA would provide vehicle information on refuse vehicle movement. JC to provide the modelling impact on Market Deeping The next meeting will be a 2 item agenda, i.e. Update on actions arising from this meeting and Environmental Health/ Regulatory Issues GB to provide a brief resume on actions taken as a result of consultation feedback on an ongoing basis, although it was acknowledged that full feedback will not be available until all of the meetings have been concluded. WP advised that, once the options appraisals have been reviewed and the board is satisfied that current option is the best one, the model can be agreed, all of the data that is available needs to be sensitively tested, agreement needs to be reached between all parties. BAEF will need to drill down into the model and so will need to meet separately with LCC to agree the right model. NMCB requested that all future meetings are focused through the project board, rather than a scattergun approach, however he was content the meeting with the Heritage team which has already been arranged could go ahead. <p>END</p>	<p>JC/CA JC</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>GB</p> <p>BAEF</p> <p>BAEF</p>

**NOTES OF BAEF MEETING
WEDNESDAY 3RD OCTOBER 2019 AT 9 AM
COMMITTEE ROOM, BOSTON BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Present:

M Sacks, Boston Borough Council (MS)
 Mike Gildersleeves, Boston Borough Council (MG)
 Peter Udy, Boston Borough Council (PU)
 Nick Davis, Boston Borough Council (ND)
 Nicole Hilton, Lincolnshire County Council (NH)
 Neil McBride, Lincolnshire County Council (NMcb)
 Emily Anderson, Lincolnshire County Council (EA)
 Gary Bower, Royal HaskoningDHV (GB)
 Ben Cartwright, Royal HaskoningDHV (BC)
 Bethan Griffith Athene Communications (BG)
 Pauline Chapman, Boston Borough Council (PC)

Apologies received from Warren Peppard, Lincolnshire County Council

	ACTION
<p><u>Introductions</u></p> <p>MS opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and round the table introductions took place.</p> <p>MS reminded the group the last meeting related to highway and traffic matters, this one will focus on regulatory matters and next week's will discuss economic development and mop up any outstanding matters.</p>	
<p><u>Notes of the last meeting, matters arising</u></p> <p>Agreed as a true record with the following matters arising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GB confirmed that Christian Allen (CA) has provided information, but he will check if any further information is required. • Agreed that NMcb would contact John Coates (JC) to remind him to provide the outstanding waste data and the Market Deeping information. • Agreed that a fourth meeting is required to revisit highways and that JC and CA should attend. • In terms of the modelling which has taken place, GB confirmed within commercial activities "driver delays" is one of the 4 core aspects and a holistic approach will be taken, i.e. it will not just relate to commercial activities. The collection data for each junction will also be assessed. 	<p>GB</p> <p>NMcb</p> <p>JC/CA</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timescale for submission of the application has been delayed and it will not be the end of the month as originally planned. • Bullet points regarding transport have been sent to BAEF who will provide supporting information. GB to provide dates when the information will be available. • Correction to the minutes – GB to provide wording, to reflect that a formal agreement with the Crown is not required because the wharf does not go over their land. • NMcB advised research has taken place regarding the waste facility on Riverside Industrial Estate (RIE) that has confirmed there is very little capacity for the site to receive/recycle the waste arising from the BAEF project. GB to ask the project team to have discussions with the relevant companies regarding the waste that will be generated from the project and ask the technical team to assess the volumes of waste that will be produced. 	<p>GB</p> <p>GB/PC</p> <p>GB</p>
<p>GB advised there will need to be an absolute number which will be refined, based on the likelihood of waste materials going into the RIE; and based on none going into the RIE (the latter being the worst case scenario when all waste will be in the road network, in which case the traffic team will calculate the traffic movement). NMcB advised the waste team will need to have input, as it will be useful to know the amount of waste already coming into RIE.</p>	<p>GB/JC/CA</p>
<p>Agreed this issue will form part of the discussions at the next meeting, in respect of economic impact.</p>	<p>MS</p>
<p>ND added as there is a likelihood existing companies will not be able to take the volume of waste, BAEF will need to be aware of what capacity there is within the waste network. GB confirmed an assessment will be done on which waste facilities within 10 kilometres of the site are able to take it. Agreed BAEF would provide the results of the assessment to LCC to cross-reference to local intelligence.</p>	<p>GB</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MS reminded BAEF they will need to look at how to engage with businesses effectively and covering not just the impact on the businesses, but how the businesses can work in partnership with BAEF. • GB confirmed BAEF has tried engaging with businesses, but it has been difficult, with only Freshtime responding. Agreed Clive Gibbon will assist as he has the correct contacts for the businesses. 	<p>CG</p>

<p>movement will have to be re-assessed/remodelled and the red line revised accordingly.</p>	<p>GB</p>
<p>The transport team will be working on standard calculations which identify how many people per vehicle, how many vehicles will be arriving on site, on a daily basis and reflects contractors shift patterns during the period of the project. The traffic assessment, noise and AQ impacts will be revisited, with the results fed back into the construction management plan.</p>	<p>GB</p>
<p>ND sought clarification the plan reflects the timing of the piling work will be tidal dependent. GB confirmed this will be worked into the construction methodology, he added that working practices will be in the construction environmental management plan which will be submitted with the application.</p>	<p>GB</p>
<p>A discussion followed regarding the construction phase assessment and what it would include in respect of AQ, during which ND advised the results of the assessments could have a bearing on what the Environment Agency (EA) permit on site and in particular, the EA has the ability to set stricter targets to reflect local impacts.</p>	
<p>ND expressed concern that the removal of Park & Ride will increase the AQ and so to help mitigate it would be helpful if contractors shift patterns did not clash with peak traffic times. He added the ATS roundabout is currently being monitored as a potential AQ management area that is close to the site and so the consequences of traffic congestion in this area will need to be considered. MS added that health deprivation in nearby residential areas will also need to be considered, as AQ is key to health.</p>	
<p>GB confirmed the operation of plant is within acceptable limits, but thresholds for both will potentially need to be revisited due to changes in legislation. He added that deposition in the Wash was initially about the screening threshold and so this will be done as part of the wider core assessment.</p>	<p>GB</p>
<p>A discussion took place regarding the feasibility of a haul road, which both authorities were supportive of. GB confirmed this would be looked at, however a new road would result in other issues for the client. MS confirmed the authorities would be happy to look at the intended consequences, but traffic, AQ and NP are all linked and do impact on residents. Given the project has a 4 year construction period, which now suggests 300 contract workers (subject to car share, etc.) will be accessing the ATS roundabout which as per previous discussions is clearly subject to monitoring for a 3rd AQ management area, both authorities need to be confident that the option of a haul road was seriously considered and understand the reasons it was discounted. If any restrictions cause an ongoing</p>	<p>GB</p>

<p>financial impact, a financial comparison of restrictions versus the cost of a new road should be considered.</p>	
<p>Agreed that ND would catch up with Charlotte Goodman regarding AQ and that ND should also attend the 4th meeting planned for this group.</p>	<p>ND</p>
<p><u>Noise Pollution (NP)</u></p>	
<p>ND expressed concern about the low level of detail in respect of construction noise. GB advised a full set of data regarding this is now available and so further detail can be added. Further work is also required on the assessment in respect of the concrete patching plant and it has been confirmed that the vessels bringing clay in can be used to take aggregate out.</p>	<p>GB</p>
<p>During discussions it was noted that:-</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BAEF is still waiting for data to reflect the changes to traffic movement (shipping and road). • A meeting took place with ND in 2018 to discuss criteria that was put in place and the team hopes to get close to meeting the criteria. • A noise and vibration monitoring system will be developed as part of the code of construction practice and there will be a commitment to monitoring this. • ND expressed concern that the commitments seem loose and need to be more specific, with the assessment reflecting exactly what will be done -GB confirmed there is a general approach to minimising noise during construction, but a more refined code of construction will pick this up. • GB confirmed a meeting has taken place with the Barrier Team, with a view to learning from their good practices and clearly strong communications with all potentially affected parties is key. He added that BAEF plans to have a visitor's centre as part of the site and is looking at what interactive activities are possible during the construction period. • There is currently a project website, which is hoped will progress to allow key information to be published on. • MS advised Elected Members are keen to see a visitor's centre, but asked that consideration be given to utilising one of the empty shops in the Market Place for this purpose, to minimise visitor traffic to the site area and be more accessible to everyone. • Work on 200 new residential properties has started nearby and this needs to be reflected. Work on the Quadrant has also commenced. • The softer side of noise must also be considered. In particular, the country park is across from the site and there will be some 	<p>GB</p> <p>GB</p> <p>GB</p> <p>GB</p>

<p>noise implications on the tranquillity of this area that may reduce the number of visitors. Agreed that landscape and the visual impacts requires further discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be three berths on the wharf, two will receive RDF bales and may operate overnight, but the one receiving aggregate will not. • Cold ironing will be in situ on the wharf which is ship to shore power, but this should not create a noise, • NB requested that vibration noises be factored in and added that there is not enough information to comment further at this stage. In particular, there is no reference to low frequency impacts. • GB advised the operational noise is well balanced and key is looking at opportunities to reduce noise for the air condenser, ND stressed this is essential. 	<p>GB</p> <p>GB</p>
<p><u>Light Pollution (LP)</u></p> <p>GB confirmed that BAEF has been guided by PINS in terms of the EIA for LP. There will not be a standalone chapter on lighting but the impacts of lighting will be discussed as an item on each topic chapter. Any implications will be identified before application stage.</p> <p>He confirmed the wharf lighting will be passive and will not be lit up when there is no activity in that area. However, the site will be open 24 hours day/365 days year and so from a health and safety perspective will need to be safely lit.</p> <p>Feedback has been received from the Port and the fishermen as to the potential impacts on their operations, both identified navigational lighting and lighting of the wharf as issues. This will be managed and lighting will be where and when it needs to be, will be passive, directional and low height.</p> <p>MG suggested BAEF's approach to lighting should be discussed at the 4th meeting and sought agreement to an extension to the scoping for this.</p> <p>Further points regarding lighting and impact on the landscape and heritage aspects are noted:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAA wants red beacons on the stack, which is 70m in height. Comparisons were made with Boston Stump which is between 80m and 90m and it was felt that when the stack is lit up it will have similar impact on the landscape to the Stump. • Bats and fish are potential issues; the lighting will need to be as such that it does not attract fish into the berths. 	<p>MG</p> <p>GB</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lighting assessment is not yet available. GB confirmed that elevations will be circulated for discussion and it was agreed this would be discussed at the fourth meeting. • GB confirmed the heritage and cultural impacts will be discussed at tomorrow’s heritage meeting. • A theoretical visibility assessment has been based on the tallest building (44 metres) and it shows that the site is most visible from Kirton, Frampton and Fishtoft but this does not reflect the 70metre height of the stack. • It is expected that the EA will issue a single permit for the whole site, which will take into account the air control residues. • A meeting has taken place with the RSPB as the site will be in their line of sight, but from an LVIA assessment perspective, they have specific criteria to use, but they are not necessarily concerned about the stack. MG stressed it is about the impact on the view from the RSPB and it the impact it might have on tourism and recreation if visitor numbers reduce and the wider economic impact. • GB agreed that consideration would be given to the possibility of adding something to the structures to attract wildlife (such as a nesting site) as BAEF is keen to “put things back” and is already working with the RSPB and Lincolnshire Wildlife • It will be important that the site is screened sensitively and in keeping with the area, but noted an “industrial” area. • With regard to increased shipping movements, GB confirmed that numbers of vessels, navigational risks and navigational safety are the three key issues to discuss with the Port, fishermen and leisure users. • The impact of moving vessels passing through the wash will form part of the marine impact assessment and will reflect the impact on habitat and the sediment process. • The navigational safety impact is about how the vessels turn. The Port wants to control this as this will take place in the Port or in the turning circle and will increase its licence for dredging to accommodate the turning circle; and as part of the barrier work there is already provision for maintaining the turning circle and improving the knuckle. • ND advised there will be noise implications associated with vessels using the turning circle as it is close to residential areas. Agreed that GB and BC would consider this issue, which will result in a short intense burst of noise, which will be at differing times because of the tide changes and create more impact on local residents because of uncertainty as to when noise will occur. ND suggested it may be better to use the option for turning in the Port at inappropriate times. Agreed GB to discuss further with the Port and update at a future meeting of this group. 	<p>GB</p> <p>GB</p> <p>GB/BC</p> <p>GB</p>
<p><u>Other Issues</u></p>	

<p>NMcB advised at the scoping stage last year, the issue of capturing major accidents and issues relating to fire was raised. Specifically, BAEF needs to be mindful of the impact on the local community if an accident resulted in a road closure and/or the impact of a significant fire. GB confirmed this will form part of the environmental impact assessment and will be a condition of the EA's site permit. The application will also include an accident and risk management sector. NMcB advised this will be a planning consideration, even though there will be some overlap with EA's requirements.</p> <p>A discussion took place regarding the fire risks associated with storing materials on site. GB confirmed there is already a skeleton fire prevention plan and this will be used to look at fire management and monitoring on site. Lincs Fire & Rescue and the HSE do not have any major concerns; however, a technical report will then be produced to cover off any emerging issues.</p> <p>There is a significant water main running through the site and the potential for grey water harvest and so there is an initial design concept for that.</p> <p>GB advised discussions are taking place with a major RDF supplier on how they manage odour and vermin. He added that bales will be on site for no more than 4 days and as RDF have bales on site much longer, problems are not anticipated.</p> <p>NH advised that, from a heritage perspective, the site will need to be properly tested as this is a site of archaeological interest for a significant period and so the chances of not disturbing anything or not finding something are remote. GB confirmed BAEF is working with the Heritage team to agreed terms for testing, which will be proportionate based on the evidence based desk assessment.</p> <p>Discussions have taken place with Boston College about hosting an information day for children on the project. Agreed that MS would speak to Jo Maher at the College regarding this. GB added that BAEF is also speaking to the College regarding bespoke apprenticeships for the scheme. Agreed that MS would also discuss this Jo Maher.</p>	<p>GB</p> <p>GB</p> <p>MS</p> <p>MS</p>
<p><u>Summary:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The next meeting would be on economic development and would include:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information around capability and capacity of on-site businesses to deal with waste products arising from the project. - Wider engagement with businesses 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- How can BBC/LCC work with BAEF on behalf of “Team Lincolnshire” to reflect this is a place of investment and how to generate interest in businesses coming to and investing in Boston.- Local Community Fund- Progressing an apprenticeship scheme. <p>2. 4th & 5th meetings will be arranged. The 4th will revisit Traffic, Highways, Air Quality and Lighting. The 5th will revisit Noise.</p> <p>3. Thereafter there will be monthly meetings for the next 6 months and will inform the agenda for the next meeting as we progress.</p>	
--	--

**NOTES OF BAEF MEETING
THURSDAY 9TH OCTOBER 2019 AT 9 30 AM
COMMITTEE ROOM, BOSTON BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Present:

M Sacks, Boston Borough Council (MS)
 Mike Gildersleeves, Boston Borough Council (MG)
 Nick Davis, Boston Borough Council (ND)
 Neil McBride, Lincolnshire County Council (NMcbB)
 Jill McCarthy, Lincolnshire County Council (JM)
 Emily Anderson, Lincolnshire County Council (EA)
 Gary Bower, Royal HaskoningDHV (GB)
 Ross Lillico, Royal HaskoningDHV (RL)
 Bethan Griffith Athene Communications (BG)
 Pauline Chapman, Boston Borough Council (PC)

Apologies received from Nicole Hilton & Warren Peppard, Lincolnshire County Council and Peter Udy, Boston Borough Council.

		ACTION
<u>Introductions</u>		
MS opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and round the table introductions took place.		
<u>Notes of the last meeting, matters arising</u>		
i) It was agreed that a number of the points designated as actions, are ongoing topics, rather than specific actions.		
ii) Correction to the minutes "Agreed that GB would provide a copy of the draft DCO when it is available" (not DCS as noted).	PC	
iii) Correction to the minutes on Light Pollution. - Para to read "MG suggested BAEF's approach to lighting should be discussed at the 4 th meeting and sought agreement to provide supplementary information to the scoping for this".	PC	
iv) Correction to the minutes " NATS wants red beacons on the stack (Not CAA as noted).	PC	
v) The heritage meeting was good and a way forward was agreed. The notes will be circulated to all attendees and thereafter to this group. Any impacts will be discussed at the 5 th meeting.	GB	
vi) Internal discussions regarding risk and accident management have commenced and information from a similar scheme (Riverside & Thames) will be used as a model.	GB	

<p>Outstanding actions are recorded at the end of these notes</p> <p>Thereafter the notes were agreed as a true record.</p>		
<p><u>Economic Development</u> Information around capability & capacity of on-site businesses to deal with waste products arising from the project.</p> <p>i) Wider engagement with businesses ii) How can BBC/LCC work with BAEF on “Team Lincolnshire” to reflect this is a place of investment and how to generate interest in businesses coming to and investing in Boston</p> <p>MS advised that the governance for this project has been separated, she will be leading on economic development and MG will lead on regulatory matters.</p> <p>MS & JM have already spoken about the potential of this project in terms of existing businesses in the Borough expanding to take the products locally, or new businesses sitting closely to BAEF to take the products, thus minimising traffic movement.</p> <p>The Local Plan identified 800 new jobs, this project once completed, will bring 100 and so need to look at what opportunities there will be for associated new jobs. A cohesive strategy on how and what will make the investment attractive will be key.</p> <p>JM appraised the group of how Team Lincolnshire came into being and it’s relationship with the LEP. In particular the following key points were noted:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All District Authorities have signed up to Team Lincolnshire. • There has been a build-up of investment, predominantly from the construction industry, but now includes support businesses such as finance and HR. • Within a 2 year period, there are now almost 100 members and includes agri-food, foreign businesses, etc and all recognise the benefits of Team Lincolnshire and in turn all are asked to spread the investment message throughout the country. <p>CG stressed the importance of looking at the operational delivery and creating economic development resilience by</p>		

working closely with BAEF. If the plan is to create sectors around the bi-products then all delivery aspects will be required.

GB confirmed his role is to deliver the DCO and in that role there are limits to what can be delivered. His focus is on the information that is required to support the DCO submission and Economic Development is much wider than that. GB will therefore take all ideas back to his client to make them aware of how the scheme can interact with Boston. If the DCO has supporting information that purposely commits to this requirement then it will be more favourable. It is important that common ground in respect of the client, economic development and Team Lincolnshire is achieved.

MS acknowledged GB's role and remit, but felt it would be beneficial for the client to work with Team Lincolnshire as the scheme is a tangible scheme that could be raised at MIPIN.

RL advised it is helpful to demonstrate that the LEP is geared up to deliver the strategic direction. It's about understanding what the opportunities may flow from the scheme for businesses, including an apprenticeship scheme to be able to provide a skilled workforce.

MG suggested the scheme may be the catalyst for the change of employment land to an energy quarter. RL added that being able to point potential investors to a specific cluster of activities is powerful. MS confirmed both LEP priorities and the Council's aspirations also include zoning.

MG confirmed there was a generous amount of employment land within the Local Plan, which has been pared back. A number of time critical local businesses are already looking at what land opportunities there are to the South of the Borough, which would result in improved travel times, traffic flows, etc and so the current employment land allocation may need to be moved to reflect this. RL confirmed that a number of local authorities are moving away from traditional employment land areas to reflect demand and need.

During discussion, it was agreed that it would be useful to do a piece work on the sustainability of the scheme and in particular if any businesses wanting to use the bi-products can be relocated into the area, equally businesses currently located within the "energy zone" may

wish to move out. This will include looking at growth, how to integrate different sectors to maximise use of the bi-products. It was noted that Mick George's operations on the Riverside Industrial Estate are small, but as a national company there may be potential for them to expand if the land is available to do so.

GB confirmed the client team has been tasked with speaking to businesses to find out what they are willing to take and if that would displace some other activities. This information will be fed into the highways impact assessment. The heating facility is configured to use the heat it produces, but may be amended to allow additional heat to be exported and the power output is fixed going into the Western Power grid.

The aggregate product will total about 1/4million tonnes, it is very versatile and can be used in a number of ways, but local usage will have a positive impact on the network, as the current plan is it will be moved by ship. The model will be based on the worse case scenario, in terms of shipping, but can be amended to reflect local use.

GB will provide details of exact quantities of CO₂, which is likely to be 12 tankers daily, but similarly, if this can be used locally it will also have a positive effect. The CO₂ can be refined so that it can be put into food and so local food producers may be a potential market.

MS & JM have discussed hosting an event with the client to talk about residual and bi-products to promote to the local market and beyond. GB confirmed that if products are used locally it may influence how it is transported.

JM outlined the role that Team Lincolnshire can play in respect of the scheme, i.e.

- Hosting events, promoting via social media
- Working with bespoke groups of interest
- Softer landing package, outlining the benefits
- Links with agritech – particularly the South Holland food enterprise zone.
- Raising the profile at MIPIN
- Communications around all of this, building up the proposition.
- Links with foreign investors

During discussions, MS suggested it would be helpful to host an event, especially given the local business interest

and therefore consideration should be given to how such an event could be facilitated. GB agreed that whilst from his perspective, a legislative path must be followed, it is possible at the same time move away from this and talk to people.

It was agreed that:-

- A collective group of CO2 end users are meeting within one month to receive information and a presentation.
- A wider sales pitch on what the scheme can deliver will be made to all businesses.
- CG will help engage with the client team and contact local businesses.
- CG/JM/MG to come up with a strategy to identify 10 – 12 key people to hopefully get a flavour of their requirement and interest.
- The strategy to be available for meeting 4.
- GB to produce data for an event, using theoretical assumptions.
- If the land allocation is not sufficient to be able to exploit the potential for new businesses to come in to use the waste materials, then BBC will work with LCC through the South East Local Plan on the employment land aspect.
- A separate meeting with LCC/BBC and the client team to be arranged within 2 months regarding possible promotion of the scheme as a potential inward investment opportunity.

It was confirmed there is interest in outside investment from the UK and through MIPIN these contacts are already established.

iii) Local Community Fund (LCF)

GB confirmed his client is aware of the expectation to provide an LCF, but he is not aware of the size, criteria, etc and so he will discuss with his client what this might be.

MS asked that consideration be given as to how community groups will be allowed to bid for the LCF. As an example the Tritton Knoll project has allowed villages that are outside of the parish to bid, as it is recognised the project will impact upon them. She added the LCF

provides an opportunity to work with parish councils that will be directly affected by the scheme, in particular Fishtoft, Wyberton and Frampton. The Environment Agency, is involved with a coastal art project and the RSPB, are also organisations that will be affected. ND enquired if the LCF might include provision to support local community transport as there are issues with public transport from the villages. Such an initiative would also support Air Quality Management.

- iv) Progressing an apprenticeship scheme
- v) Tourism

MG advised that consideration needs to be given to the softer impacts of the scheme and how that translates to tourism, which is significant in terms of the local economy, specifically the impacts on the river, heritage, St Botolphs Church and the RSPB. In addition, there has been no consideration of the Country Park on the opposite side of the river which is managed by the Boston Woods Trust, who are working with the Environment Agency encouraging people to use the river walk way.

GB advised he is keen to establish names to discuss this, however, the immediate surrounding area is allocated to the industrial estate and so from a tourism perspective there will be no immediate impact. He added that the views from other sites will be picked up on, along with the use of the river and this information will be cross referenced to the social economic development chapter.

A desk top analysis on how the scheme may link to tourism perspective has been done, but BAEF has not engaged with relevant officers. Agreed that RL would facilitate a discussion with Phil Perry, Luke Skeritt and MG. MG advised this is more about pulling together the outcome from other chapters, in terms of landscape, heritage, RSPB, etc. As an example, the stack will compete with the Stump and so the potential impacts will need to be considered.

A discussion followed regarding the possibility of a visitor centre on site once the scheme was completed, similar to that at the North Hykeham Energy from Waste Facility, which is very successful and helps to engage the community.

<u>Any Other Business</u>		
<u>Agree Meeting Dates</u>		
OUTSTANDING ACTIONS		
NMcB to contact John Coates (JC) reminding him to provide information relating to Market Deeping.	NMcB	Asap
Transport assessment to be available for Meeting No. 4 once confirmed.	GB	TBC
GB to provide ND with Charlotte Goodman's contact details.	GB	Asap
GB to work with Athene on utilising an empty shop in the Market Place for a Visitors Centre	GB	Ongoing
Ben Cartwright to ensure that vibration noises be factored in to the noise assessment and identify the noise arising from vessels turning.	BC	
Visual Landscape to be added to Meeting 5	PC	
In the context of the lighting scoping, the report has been agreed with PINS, but additional work is being done which will link with landscape visual and softer amenity meeting.		
MS to update GB on her discussions with Jo Maher from Boston College regarding hosting an information day for children; and a bespoke apprenticeship scheme.		

Minutes

**HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.
Industry & Buildings**

Present: Mike Gildersleeves, Michelle Sacks, Pauline Chapman (Boston Borough Council), Neil McBride (Lincolnshire County Council), Gary Bower (Royal HaskoningDHV, EIA Project Manager), Abbie Garry (Royal HaskoningDHV EIA Co-ordination) Bethan Griffiths (Athene Communications)

Apologies: [Click to enter "Apologies"](#)

From: Abbie Garry

Date: 19 May 2020

Location: Teleconference

Copy:

Our reference: PB6934-RHD-ZZ-XX-MI-Z-1055

Classification: Project related

Enclosures:

Subject: Boston Alternative Energy Facility Update Meeting with the Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council

No.	Details	Action
1	Project Update	

Following discussions, the client has decided to move away from gasification to Energy from Waste (EfW) as the gasification technology supplier made the decision to divest their business away from gasification. This has the benefit that there are more reference plants for EfW, as opposed to gasification plants. This is also beneficial from an investment perspective.

Construction

Previous Scheme Detail: concrete was needed for six large silos for storing processed RDF which were to be constructed by slip-form concrete. This requires a high number of vehicle movements during construction. This was a concern for some consultees.

Current Scheme Detail: There will be a concrete batching plant on site. The raw materials for making concrete can be transported in larger quantities, thus reducing vehicle movements. Furthermore, there will be aggregate delivery via ship during construction due to early construction of part of the wharf.

Outcome: Overall there will be a reduction in the volume of concrete necessary as silos are no longer required. There will be a reduction of construction vehicle movements associated with concrete supply.

The calculation of the reduction in traffic movements has not been completed but this can be sent when complete.

The overall construction timeline is the same as with the previous scheme detail, with a 4 year construction time period.

No. Details

Action

RDF Supply

Previous Scheme Detail: Main supplier was N&P however they changed their business priorities to 'subcoal' and SRF. Previously the RDF was coming from 3 UK ports.

Current Scheme Detail: The client has engaged with a company called Totus. These have a wider range of ports (11 UK ports) which will lead to a more widespread distribution of source material. Some suppliers will have different bale sizes which could impact on the number of bales per ship. Due to these different sizes there will be consideration of the number of bales per stockpile stored on site to maintain compliance with the 450m³ limit in EA Fire Prevention Plan guidance.

Previous Scheme Detail: Gasification technology had a very specific RDF specification required, hence 1.5 million tonnes of RDF was needed as worst case to cope with potential variation in calorific value and quality and to ensure that sufficient material was available following processing in the RDF Processing building (see below).

Current Scheme Detail: Conventional Energy from Waste (EfW) facilities can cope with wider variances in calorific value and RDF quality, hence the worst case can be reduced to 1.2 million tonnes of RDF.

Therefore, the worst case quantity is reduced by 300,000 tones, leading to approximately 120 less ships are required annually.

The RDF supply will still come from the UK only – not Europe or the Republic of Ireland.

NM asked if we are moving away from black bag waste and whether that would impact on taking supply from the transfer station at Slippery Gowt Lane, which currently transfers waste to the EfW at North Hykeham.

It is the view of the Project team that it is unlikely to impact this. The main source of RDF that Totus will supply is residual recycling material. The calorific value and specification of the local waste would have to be considered to identify whether any further processing would need to be assessed as would other factors that would need to be considered in any procurement decision by Lincolnshire County Council (as waste disposal authority) in this regard.

RDF handling (wharf)

Previous Scheme Detail: One crane at each berth. Cranes offloaded bales and these were removed to the external bale storage area by trailer. Approximately 4 days of supply was anticipated to be stored at the wharf in an area of approximately one hectare.

No. Details

Action

Current Scheme Detail:

- Two cranes per berth.
- Automated cranes offloading the ships and moving the bales from the stockpiles to the conveyors.
- Bales can be directly loaded onto the conveyors to be shredded and stored in the EfW bunker.
- Bunker has 4 days of supply.
- External storage area has approximately 1-2 days of supply and which means less storage area is required (between 25 and 50% of previous storage requirements).

Outcome: Reduction in the impacts associated with external storage of bales in a larger area. Increased efficiency in offloading the bales. Reduced health and safety and nuisance risks.

In addition the red line boundary (RLB) has been amended (by contracting the boundary) to exclude a main sewer line, as discussed with Anglian Water.

RDF Pre-Processing

Previous Scheme Detail: Large RDF processing facility involving eight shredding lines and automated segregation of ferrous metal, non-ferrous metal, fine inert material, hard plastic and medium to heavy density inert material. This was required due to the sensitivity of the gasification process. EfW does not require this level of pre-processing.

Current Scheme Detail:

- Increased space and less compact layout by removing this large building and the six 48,000 m³ silos required to store the processed RDF.
- Simplified layout works more efficiently and allows for construction flow to be optimised.
- No pre-processing or segregation, therefore no vehicle movements associated with removal of inert materials or metals off site from the RDF pre-thermal treatment.
- Has allowed for repositioning of the air cooled condenser (ACC) and turbine building to a central point to potentially reduce noise impact from the site.

Thermal Treatment

Previous Scheme Detail:

- Gasification technology, three line system.
- One combined stack with three cores within, one for each line – approximately 5m width.

No.	Details	Action
------------	----------------	---------------

- High level of screening and segregation of metals and inert materials prior to processing etc.

Current Scheme Detail:

- Energy from Waste technology (still three lines).
- Three lines but one individual stack per line, these stacks will be the same height but narrower than the combined stack in the previous design.
- Plant is slightly taller (approximately 4-6m taller)
- There will also be more cladding around this facility which could reduce the noise impact.
- Greater amount of ash and ash processing – ash will be ground and sent to the Lightweight Aggregate (LWA) Facility as previously. Around 10% more aggregate would be produced.
- Metal will be screened from the ash and sent for offsite recycling (but there will be a reduction in the number of lorries compared to previously).

Outcome: There will be an updated Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment with the Zone of Theoretical Visibility checked.

Emissions for the EfW will be required to comply with the new BAT Waste Incineration document issued in December 2019 – this would be the same for gasification – there are no different standards. The emissions of the three separate stacks as opposed to one would be modelled but are unlikely to exceed previous scheme levels.

Other Changes

The red line boundary has been reduced at the southern end, however there is still space for laydown associated with construction of the facility. The operational boundary will likely be reduced to exclude some of this area. This will be represented by the construction and parameter plans produced for the DCO application.

The power output will be the same as previous, as the agreement with Western Power has not changed.

Previous Scheme Detail:

- One carbon dioxide capture unit.
- The Roman Bank (also known as 'Sea Bank') embankment running through the site and a public footpath follows the route. There is a gap in it currently and the previous plan was to route pedestrians down across the gap, which be across a road leading from the main gasification plant to the Lightweight Aggregates Plant and back up the bank (making sure to consider safe passage where this crosses the site road).

Current Scheme Detail:

- Adding another CO₂ capture unit, so two in total. The capacity for further CO₂ units in the future.

No.	Details	Action
------------	----------------	---------------

- Amended red line at the wharf storage area.
- Footbridge over the gap in the bank. As this bank has heritage significance this will be discussed with the Lincolnshire County Council heritage team.

MG suggested viewing platforms, improving access etc. Suggested including as part of consultation.

MG asked whether the bale conveyors were open. The conveyor is open near to the external bale storage at the site of the wharf, but then becomes enclosed for the majority of its length. It will have access points from the sides and top via hinged flaps.

Regarding job opportunities, post construction (during operation), there will be around the same number of jobs estimated (around 125). Although there is more automation there will still need to be operators for the cranes etc. With no automation it was estimated there would be around 130-140 jobs.

Heat will be a by-product of the lightweight aggregate facility however there is no opportunity for export of heat and this was not included previously. Instead the heat is used within the lightweight aggregates process.

2 Consultation

The current general arrangement of the site now represents the frozen scheme design and we are not anticipating changes of plant within the boundary. We are still waiting to confirm vehicle movements, parameters plans and elevations, then we can begin consultation.

We have had a preliminary discussion with the Planning Inspectorate. They were content that we didn't need to have a formal consultation process, however the Project team identified that there is a need to inform stakeholders.

For regulators and statutory stakeholders we will plan meetings, hold webinars and send information via email.

We will engage with the public but cannot hold public exhibitions.

We are proposing a 4 week consultation period where we notify members of the public. We propose to undertake a maildrop in the Boston Borough area with a summary of the proposed changes and an opportunity to provide comment with a 28 day consultation window and then a 2 week period where we will consider those comments.

We will also update the website.

As we have already undertaken formal consultation, we are not proposing to update the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), as this would

No.	Details	Action
	<p>significantly increase the timescales needed. BBC agreed in the approach to not changing the SoCC and requested that we inform them of when we are ready to go with consultation and provide them with a Briefing Note to outline the changes and proposed consultation strategy that can be distributed to Members.</p> <p>It was suggested that for public and parish councils engagement a webinar could be hosted using an appropriate platform (Facebook live or other social media platform). There is also more access to video calls now, so these could be used such as using Zoom etc which could incorporate a Q&A element.</p> <p>We will also set up calls and digital round table discussions with consultees we have previously been in contact with.</p> <p>We will not be able to produce plant design visuals as 3D images as part of the mail drops but we will update this for the LVIA work as part of the assessment process prior to submission.</p>	<p>Project team to inform BBC and LCC of the beginning of consultation</p> <p>Project team to provide Boston BC and Lincolnshire CC with a briefing note</p>
3	<p>Timescales</p> <p>Aiming for early Q4 submission.</p> <p>It was noted that we should manage expectations by giving stakeholders an idea of timescales.</p>	
4	<p>AOB</p> <p>Noted that there were action/ discussion points from the previous meeting which need highlighting. Pauline to review and highlight the key points.</p> <p>We will have another catch up meeting to discuss any outstanding points during the consultation period.</p> <p>NM asked if there would be contaminated material and metals in the feedstock from the MRF facilities.</p> <p>GB stated that there will be a reduction in the amount of metal captured because the majority of recyclate (including metal) would have been removed in the materials recycling facility before the RDF is supplied to the Boston facility, however there would still be some. There would be a screening of metals from the ash.</p> <p>Although there is less material being taken off site for recycling than previously, the material has already been subject to recycling and the current facility is considered a recovery facility (this is the same as for gasification).</p>	<p>PC to circulate previous action points</p>



Boston Alternative Energy Facility Project Team Meeting with Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council

31 July 2020

1. Welcome & Apologies

Present

Christian Allen, Head of Environmental Operations – Boston Borough Council (Chair)
Mike Gildersleeves, Growth Manager – Boston Borough Council
Michelle Sacks, Director of Group and Deputy Chief Executive – Boston Borough Council
Peter Udy, Planning Policy Office – Boston Borough Council
Nick Davis, Principal Environmental Health Office – Boston Borough Council
Neil McBride, Head of Planning - Lincolnshire County Council
Nicole Hilton, Assistant Director for Communities – Lincolnshire County Council
John Coates, Head of Waste - Lincolnshire County Council
Jon Sharpe, Principal Highways Office – Lincolnshire County Council
Emily Anderson, Trainee Planning Officer – Lincolnshire County Council
Gary Bower, EIA Project Manager - Royal HaskoningDHV (GB)
Kelly Linay, Director of Community Engagement - Athene Communications

Apologies

Pauline Chapman, Executive Assistant - Boston Borough Council
Clive Gibbon – Economic Development Manager – Boston Borough Council
Abbie Garry, EIA Coordinator - Royal HaskoningDHV
Mark Gilbert – Boston Borough Council

2. Notes of the last meeting dated 19 May 2020 / matters arising

No comments

3. Overview of the changes to the project by Gary Bower

There has been a lot of work going on in the background, getting the consultation ready and sorting some technical details. We now have a design freeze as of the end of June 2020. GB went through the presentation that documents the changes that have been made since the project pause. The main areas of change are around construction, supply of RDF, how we off-load and store the RDF and the change to thermal technology.

Construction – our main focus has been to reduce transport movements during the construction phase. This has been implemented by including a concrete batching plant on site and we plan to have early construction of part of the wharf, which means we'll be able to bring construction raw materials in by ship. Other aspects are largely unchanged. We are estimating 46-48 months construction, this includes the building and commissioning phase.

Supply – the original supplier wants to move to supply higher grade (calorific value) fuel, so we have identified a new supplier. The new supplier has a wider distribution network. Previously there were three ports, however, this new supplier has access to eleven ports all within the UK. The type of material is residual household waste that has been processed through Materials Recycling Facilities (MRFs) so there is no change to the specification of the supplied refuse derived fuel RDF.

Technology – moving from gasification to conventional thermal treatment by Energy from Waste (EfW). This technology is less sensitive to variances in RDF composition and calorific value so we can reduce the ‘worst case’ amount of supply.

Wharf – the bales were previously going to be off-loaded by mobile crane and placed onto a mobile trailer which would then remove the bales to an external storage area. Bales would be removed from the storage area on a first in first out basis and loaded onto a conveyor to be taken for processing. Under the revised proposal the bales will be loaded directly from the ship onto the conveyor and then transferred to a bale splitter and RDF bunker. This reduces double handling. The bunker will have four days’ supply, however, there may be the need for contingency storage in the outside storage area at the wharf. This will reduce the number of bales in storage at the wharf by 50%. This will reduce potential nuisance impacts. The number of cranes has increased to two cranes per berth.

Processing of RDF – the reduced sensitivity of the new technology means we now don’t need to pre-process the RDF before it goes into the Facility. We don’t need to have the ability to separate metals and glass. In the previous proposal we were taking out 300,000 tonnes of potential recyclate but now we don’t need to do this which means we are able to manage the layout of the site more effectively. This also has an effect in reducing the number of operational HGV movements that would be required to remove the 300,000 tonnes of separated material from the site.

Thermal changes – we have changed the scheme to have a more linear layout making the plant more efficient and safer to build. The previous layout had the stack from each of the three lines combined into one wide chimney which was 5 metres in diameter. The current proposal has a stack per line, which means they will be much thinner in diameter. The new technology provider’s plant is mainly enclosed. This will have some benefits in reducing noise and the revised layout allows the air-cooled condensers to be moved to a more central position and will be further away from residential receptors. With the new process there will be more ash at the back end. This is because there is no pre-processing and separation of material from the RDF before thermal treatment. There will be some screening of the ash. The ash will be ground down into residue and the sent to the on-site aggregate plant.

CO₂ capture - We are introducing two CO₂ capture units, which is doubling the capacity compared to the previous scheme.

Changes to the Red Line Boundary (RLB) – the RLB has been amended at the north of the site beyond the extent of the RDF bale contingency storage area so that it doesn’t include the line of the main sewer. This means that Anglian Water don’t need to come on the site to do any work to the sewer. The redline is also changed at the southern boundary of the site because the revised layout means that there is less space required. The revised redline boundary will run more closely to the area required for the power export substation.

We have now created more of an option for potential landscaping and screening of the site in the south-western corner and are investigating this further.

There is no change to the proposed 80MW power output or the turbine technology, nor any changes to the lightweight aggregate technology. However, more ash will be produced, therefore more aggregate will be produced.

Footbridge - We are looking to put a footbridge across a gap in the Roman Bank (Sea Bank) along the public footpaths so at no point do pedestrians have to access to the site. This is still being discussed.

Consultation - These changes are largely positive so will reduce the footprint of the site, and potentially reduce transport and reduce impacts. There are some potential negative issues e.g. moving from one wide stack to three individual stacks for the EfW is a change that needs to be assessed. The plant will also be slightly taller; changing from 38 to 44 metres high. This still needs to be assessed, however, most topics will remain unchanged.

We have spoken to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) about the approach to consultation and we proposed an informal approach over a 28-day period. PINS were supportive, however, required that the project find ways of engaging with the public. As we cannot meet face to face we're using a newsletter and are hosting two webinars and a telephone surgery. We anticipate submission in November 2020, however, are mindful there could be some outcomes from the consultation that changes this but we don't anticipate any.

Questions / comment invited:

MG - is a resident who received the newsletter and it is very clear explaining the changes. He has spoken to friends who have also commented about how good it is.

CA - said his portfolio holder has received the newsletter and her invite to a stakeholder meeting.

ND – you speak about reducing transport but has that been quantified. GB – yes this is being worked on. Numbers are less and there are fewer instances of busy weeks.

ND – have you decided on traffic routes. We spoke in the early days about the Spirit of Endeavor roundabout and making sure the town is avoided. What alternatives have been looked at? GB - we have looked at traffic numbers based on where the movements will be. We looked inside the industrial estate and local roads within one mile and also those coming from wider. The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will identify the optimum routes. ND – would prefer the traffic coming in from the south, rather than west or north. GB – we share that preference. Note that the Transport assessment will feed into the air quality and noise assessments.

NM – in terms of the info supporting the consultation, there isn't a lot behind it, where they can look at the details to say whether they think they're acceptable. When will this information be available, will it be at submission or will there be another round of consultation? GB – this round is solely about notifying the public and the PEIR represents the worst-case position. This is purely a consultation to inform that there is a change. BBC and LCC will see early sight of the EIA work. There is an interim period prior to submission where draft assessment findings can be shared with relevant stakeholders. This is likely to be in September. NM - will this be formal? GB – no, this is purely for comment, but it is useful to gather your input before we submit.

CA – as you have previously hosted exhibitions are you using the website to share wider information? GB – the newsletter is on the website and the links to the PEIR remain visible.

JS – learning from experience with other big projects in the area (for example Triton Knoll), the CTMP states that vehicles will display a prominent logo clearly identifying they're working as part of the project. Can this be incorporated in? GB – this is something that will be included. We will also recommend routes and tracking using a cab GPS system.

JS – it would be good to know where the source materials are from. He wasn't aware until recently that some of the road on the Riverside Industrial Estate were private roads.

MG - we need to consider the McMillan Way and the public footpath and the opportunities this creates in relation to tourism. Assume previous comments will be picked up e.g. the views from the RSPB nature reserve and the impact on 'the Stump' as a Grade I listed building. It would be good to have early site of the LVIA and heritage work. He can help set up early meetings. GB –The footpath will be improved as part of the project and a meeting with heritage stakeholders will be welcome.

ND – on the traffic movements, will part of the CTMP be to avoid peak traffic hours? GB - Yes

ND – are you using a turning circle in the Haven or the port. Has there been any further discussion? GB – the port wants to retain the right to choose. They will dictate by shipment. It will take approximately 10-15 minutes to turn at the knuckle and 30 minutes to turn the port. ND – there is a potential for using both so if there were problems then we could speak nicely to the port.

ND – there could be potential for complaints from a local company called DCI (manufacture recycled ink, inkjet cartridges and toner) about the dust from the concrete batching plant impacting their equipment. Can the concrete batching plant be moved elsewhere? Can it be switched with the construction area? GB – will see if it can be switched.

4. Revisit BAEF outstanding actions dated 22 May 2020

Traffic Movement – GB - this was a priority issue last year. Lots of design changes have reduced the traffic movements. GB – this chapter is likely to be available first (hopefully 3rd week of August) and it will be good to have a transport specific meeting. HGV information relating to waste vehicle movements at Slippery Gowt Transfer Station has been fed to the transport team giving an indication of movements. We now have a wider package of info for transport numbers. ND – how soon after the transport chapter will the air quality chapter be available? GB – this will follow about a week or so behind. The latest annual screen assessment has been sent to DEFRA **Action – ND to provide a copy to GB.**

MG – where has the project team got in their discussions in relation to the Southern access (the haul road)? He believes this has been discounted but says BBC is still looking at it via alternative schemes. Is there a strategy for people travelling to work on the site and will there be collection of workers from Boston town-centre car parks? There are also potential opportunities to improve cycling and the people strategy. GB - we moved away from a minibus collection from the town centre. Instead, there will be two contractor car parks. A minibus will be used to transport workers from the contractor car parks to specific points of work on site.

Waste Processing – GB - previous concerns were about the recyclables coming out of the facility. We carried out some investigative work at the time and Mick George agreed to take a large proportion of the segregated recyclable material from the RDF Processing facility. However, with the design change the amount of segregated material will be significantly reduced (from 300,000 tonnes to 5,000 tonnes) and can be dealt with locally.

ND – we are looking to review our minerals and waste local plan and wants to look at the capacity gap they have and examine if the Facility can be available to deal with Lincolnshire household waste, and municipal-like commercial and industrial instead of sending it abroad. They will bring this to the attention of the examiner at the examination waste stage. GB – are there any studies that can be shared? ND – This was last updated in 2015 and is public document so can be shared. **Action – ND to share info with GB.** The latest info will be available before we get to examination.

MG – confidence in the carbon capture – so this is a real positive. The agri-food sector is keen to see this

Consultation – CA – BBC is hosting GB at the scrutiny committee on 8 September. ND – LCC still need to identify at what stage they'll take it to committee. They're not sure they have the information yet to be able to do this. It may be a bit premature at this stage. The next stage is when the DCO starts properly. It will probably be at this stage as NSIPs usually go to the planning and regulation committee, but they'll have some internal discussions which the relevant committee is. GB – Our recent experience with PINS has identified that the pre-examination stage is stretching out to around 6 months. So there is plenty of opportunity pre-examination to get the points agreed and clarified. ND – LCC will provide a response but it will be caveated that they can't make a definitive view at this stage (i.e. before submission) as they don't have all the information. It is too premature to give a firm commitment to whether they support the Facility or not.

Design – GB – we spoke previously about how the wharf will evolve and we now have some outline information. GB to share after the meeting the high-level designs to give an ideal of the layout.

Action – GB to share high-level design of the wharf.

Air Quality / Noise Pollution / Light Pollution / Noise Assessment – ND - we need to wait to see the assessment now. It's not worth discussing anything further. Concerns have been raised previously so GB is aware. The good news is that the changes have make it likely to be less noisy, so hopefully this is a bonus but they need to see facts and figures. GB – we will the review noise and air quality assessment. We are guided by PINS' Scoping Opinion on the light assessment. ND – major area of concern is the unloading process as this is likely to be 24-hour process. Housing is across the river. Need to see the impacts. GB – we're conscious of this and it is useful to us to inform our work.

Fire Prevention Plan – GB - the client has a fire prevention advisor on his team. This will be a major document to inform the environmental permit for the site and we also propose to submit an outline fire prevention plan with the DCO application

Market Place Visitors Centre – CA – is it still the intention to have a visitor centre in the Market Place and on site? – GB – definitely on site. This hasn't been ruled out in the town and will be discussed nearer the time. MG – it would be a good tick box to have it in the town. Opportunities for engagement will be greatly increased. GB – particularly in the construction phase is advantageous, so we will look at this.

Heritage Impacts – GB – we had a meeting with heritage stakeholders, and they wanted confidence about what we don't know. We have done a lot of desktop work and they've appreciated this. They wanted to know about any potential hidden assets, so we're doing geophysical surveys of the area where the thermal treatment facility will be (which is landward of the original path of the River Witham before it was canalised in the early 19th century) MG – what public benefits can be squeezed out of this? CA- a visitor centre on site will be a good opportunity for this to identify any heritage significance.

Economic Developments – CA – discussed at end of last year to coordinate briefings or seminars with CO₂ users. MG – this happened and led to the change in the scheme. There is a demand locally. It would be good to build the links with the college, particularly in relation to apprenticeships.

Local Community Fund – GB – the client is positive about having a community led fund and this is on the horizon.

Apprenticeship Scheme – still a project commitment to this

Tourism – Haven Countryside Park – previous minutes stated it was managed by Boston Woods Trust – PU says this isn't the case and isn't correct. MG – BBC recently approved a piece of artwork near the Pilgrim Fathers Memorial Stone. Could the Project do anything similar? Would like to have this discussion at the appropriate time as to what can be done. PU – is the visitor centre just before construction? – GB – the main focus is afterwards. **Action –Boston Borough Council to confirm who is responsible for the management of Havenside Country Park and amend 1st paragraph of page 13 of the 'BAEF OUTSTANDING ACTIONS 22 05 2020.doc' accordingly and circulate an updated version**

5. Project Update

Covered earlier in the meeting

6. AOB

GB – we have met with the EA drainage board and Lead Local Flood Authority

JS – where does the power get connected into the grid? GB – we will build a substation on the southern edge of site that we will connect into the pylon. No underground cable route (e.g. to the substation at Bicker Fen) is required.

MG – can we talk about PPA arrangements in terms of the examination process? As things move forward we'd like to have that conversation. GB – we'll pick that up in the pre-examination stage.

NM – PPA was mentioned very early on. We'd like to have that discussion.

CA – MS has been trying to organise a meeting to meet with the landowner. GB – not aware of this.

MG – this links to the southern access route conversation. **ACTION - GB to contact Alan and ask him to get in contact with Michelle.**

GB – We need to set up meetings to discuss transport data and then air quality and noise. MG – suggested a full day session CA -this would be good to tie in with the scrutiny panel.

ND – ideally it would be good to have a meeting about all three as they are so interlinked. GB – happy with this as an approach.

JC – how much heat is produced during the power generation? GB – we don't know the amount but the heat we do produce will be reused within the scheme and there is no plan to distribute heat externally.

CA - to circulate the minutes once they are ready.

7. Date of next meeting

TBC

Present: Councillor Judith Skinner (Chairman), (Vice-Chairman), Councillors George Cornah, Anton Dani, Deborah Evans, Paul Goodale, Neill Hastie, Peter Watson, Judith Welbourn and Stephen Woodliffe

In attendance:

Officers –
Assistant Director - Regulatory, Assistant Director - Planning and Senior Democratic Services Officer

59 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were tabled for Councillor Peter Bedford. It is noted Councillor Bedford attended this meeting for the initial presentation of the item but left thereafter taking no part in any deliberation. Councillor Stephen Woodliffe was in attendance for Councillor Bedford.

60 MINUTES

With the agreement of the committee the Chairman signed the minutes of the previous meeting held on the 14 July 2020.

61 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No declarations of interest were tabled for the meeting.

62 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions.

**63 BOSTON ALTERNATIVE ENERGY FACILITY (BAEF) PHASE 4
CONSULTATION SUBMISSION**

The Council had provided feedback on previous phases of public consultation, which had been warmly welcomed by the agents acting on behalf of the applicant. Many of the amendments to the revised scheme before Members today had been incorporated into the development proposals as a direct result of feedback provided by this Council. Significant changes included reductions in shipping movements, reduction in road transport movements, site layout and noise mitigation, siting of concrete batching facilities, addition of a public footbridge and a proposed visitors' centre, both on site and in the town centre.

Phase 4 consultation enabled the Council, as a consultee, to make further comment and seek clarity on outstanding issues to continue to influence the final proposal in a positive way for the benefit of the residents of Boston and the Borough as a whole.

Madam Chairman invited Gary Bower, Development Consent Order Project Manager for the applicant's agent, to address the Committee.

Mr Bower gave a PowerPoint presentation setting out the details of the BAEF proposal as they stood for Phase 4 consultation, and highlighted the differences between the Phase 3 proposal and the Phase 4 proposal.

The facility remained an Energy from Waste (EfW) facility, although the technology used to convert waste to energy had switched from gasification to traditional EfW thermal technology. The changes were anticipated to have only minor and net positive effects, resulting in an overall reduction in potential negative impacts from the development.

[A copy of the PowerPoint presentation to be e-mailed to Members upon request.]

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services expressed concern regarding emissions from the site, in particular, the release of CO₂ into the atmosphere, and the importance of using the facility for Lincolnshire's waste, particularly Boston's, rather than transport it anywhere else by road.

In response to these issues and other questions raised by the Portfolio Holder, Mr Bower explained the following.

The site would have three lines of thermal plant and there would be additional plant on site capable of capturing CO₂ from the exhaust gas connected to two of the three lines. Each CO₂ plant would capture 12% of the CO₂ emitted by the line it was connected to; however, there would be no CO₂ capture from the third line, which would release 100% into the atmosphere.

At the current time of submitting the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, it would not be possible to connect a CO₂ plant to all three lines. This was because the amount of CO₂ that would be produced by the facility was dictated by market demand and it would not be appropriate to create more CO₂ than there was a defined market for it. The facility would still be compliant with emission limits without capturing any CO₂; therefore, capturing any amount of CO₂ was beneficial.

The household waste currently bulked at Boston's Slippery Gowt transfer station was taken to the North Hykeham Energy from Waste facility. The Applicant and the County Council (as Waste Disposal Authority) had both expressed an interest in taking the Boston waste into the BAEF site, although this could not be guaranteed because it was subject to current procurement rules. Dialogue would continue with the County Council on the matter.

The Port of Boston did not dredge at the point of the proposed berthing pocket for the BAEF. The Applicant proposed to dredge and excavate the land in front of the flood defence line to create the berthing pocket for the wharf. The wharf would form the new flood defence line at a height agreed with the Environment Agency in line with Boston's Flood Defence Strategy. The Applicant would then have to keep this clear and the sediment would be used as the binding agent in the facility's aggregation process.

Committee Members raised similar concerns to the Portfolio Holder. However, there were some positive comments regarding the effect of planned shrub planting on CO₂ emissions and creation of the berthing pocket on water flow making the level more stable between the Haven and the Witham leaving less mud visible.

In answer to further questions, Mr Bower explained there was more evidence available regarding the environmental impact of energy from waste schemes than from gasification schemes and it was not possible to make a direct comparison of emissions. Each facility was unique because there were variants in waste streams. The actual level of emissions would not be known until the facility was operating, which was the reason requirements were in place that would have to be met. These requirements were European Union Commission-level standards.

The estimate of actual CO₂ emissions was all part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, which included impact assessments of the level of CO₂ and air quality. The applicant and agent recognised the significant importance of Boston as an agricultural area and the need to meet requirements with respect to emissions.

Two assessments overlapped in terms of identifying the approach for visual screening, one identifying biodiversity and another the use of landscaping; this was all part of the assessment work. The sediment process, water flow and water quality were all important parts of the assessment work.

A Member then voiced particular objection to the proposals in terms of the location, deeming its proximity to residents inappropriate, and concern regarding the chimneys' plume dispersal. The chimneys would be high, at 70m, and it was considered that the prevailing wind would spread gas emissions quite widely, affecting two wards, reducing house prices and tourism. Furthermore, the site would emit not only CO₂ but also other, more toxic, chemicals.

Mr Bower responded by pointing out that the location was an industrial estate identified in the local plan for energy from waste development for facilities of this type. The air quality assessment would cover the plume dynamics. The recommended modelling approach, the national ADMS dispersal modelling (a planning standard) would be used. It would model the three stacks omitting exhaust at certain velocities and how they interacted with each other under the standard and worst-case perspective. They used five years set of wind data and took into account the height, shape of roofs etc. Contaminants would be emitted, as they were from all combustion engines, including vehicles, and would have to comply with standards in the same way. For example, dioxins were measured by extremely stringent standards set by scientists to EU Commission-level in respect of the impact on human health and the environment. It was not possible to have zero emissions. The facility would be designed so that it would not cause an unacceptable risk; it would be within acceptable limits.

Still concerned, the Member remarked that the emissions would not be known until the facility was operating and it would be burning feedstock without knowing what was in it. Mr Bower explained that was exactly why they would be continuously monitoring exhaust gases to ensure it was demonstrating that it was working at the best operational limits.

Another Member agreed that the location was too close to schools, amenities, and villages, particularly as the proposed site was significant in size with a high chimney and they did not know what emissions it would produce or its effect on the town. Globally, there had been explosions at such facilities in the past. Although supporting the project in principle and the jobs it would create, the Member had reservations, including concern about waste being stored for 4-5 days and the odour it could cause.

Mr Bower advised Members that there was potential to create over 120 jobs plus 300 during construction. They would attract engineering skill sets and they were looking to engage with Boston College in relation to apprenticeships.

They had increased the capture of CO₂ for no other reason than that there was space for doing so on the site and there was a market for it. The health and environmental impact assessments were ongoing and it was hoped that the outcomes would be known by the end of September. The findings would be shared with Members before the application was submitted.

With respect to safety, allowing the developer and regulators to implement technology and requirements that were more stringent would mean there would be much tighter control on the build and operation and so reduce the chances of such things happening.

With respect to odour, negative pressure in the shredding building and bunker meant that air would flow into these buildings when a door was opened and, furthermore, the odorous air would be diverted to the thermal treatment plant to be destroyed in the EfW. For the bales stored outside, they would be tightly wrapped in plastic and only stored for a minimum period and would be monitored. They would go from the ship to the sealed bunker system and storage would be minimised. To comply with the environmental permit the operator of the facility would have to demonstrate there would be no odour outside the site boundary.

A non-Committee Member pointed out that Lincolnshire's waste did stay within Lincolnshire and considered the location of the site satisfactory, as it had been identified in policy and within the local plan. In addition, the prevailing wind was actually in a direction away from the town. The Member reported that Marsh Lane residents were satisfied there would be fewer vehicle movements and added that the response of the RSPB was disappointing, as it was unduly negative.

The Member asked how the system would compare with gasification scheme emissions, how it would compare with the unit at North Hykeham, and if the PEIR document had been updated or whether it was considered acceptable as it was.

Mr Bower confirmed that there was one proposed CO₂ unit with gasification. The volume of exhaust emissions without capture on either was approximately similar because there was similar power output. The comparison was the capture of 12% from 2 out of 3 lines compared to 12% with one on the previous gasification proposal. Mr Bower did not know the facility at North Hykeham in terms of its elements of abatement and capture, but assumed the composition of the exhaust gases would be similar and that the Boston site would capture more CO₂ because North Hykeham did not capture CO₂.

Mr Bower reiterated that the prevailing wind had been taken into account and modelled for accordingly in the air quality assessment. The PEIR had been submitted and formal consultation had been carried out. It had been updated and every aspect would appear within the environmental statement with the application. Again, all the information on all these topics that the assessment would cover would be shared with Members.

There had been two strands of negotiation with wider stakeholders and they had been working with the RSPB site manager at Frampton Marsh and the RSPB at policy level. There had been a change of policy contact and the letter copied to Members had been sent after a meeting with all parties. The writer had missed the first part of the meeting when compilation of bird data was reported. They had contacted all parties regarding the birds and marine life and had subsequently informed the applicant who was dedicated to provide adequate habitat compensation where there was unavoidable significant impact. They had not started consultation with the Wash local group, as it was not a statutory consultee, but they could still do so, and they were more than willing to attend meetings with colleagues and professionals working with the scheme.

A Committee Member voiced support for the scheme, having visited other such systems and finding them impressive. They had to be mindful of emissions for the sake of residents and the food producing nature of the area, but this would probably be no worse than sprays used in farming. It was understood that if the site's emissions went anywhere near the limit the plant would shut down and the scientists had to be trusted with respect to what they considered safe levels. It had to be borne in mind what the environmental impact would be if the facility was not built, particularly as landfill was harmful. They needed to be open to industry, with safeguards in place, and demonstrate that Boston was open and receptive to business, new industry and initiatives. A large private investor with a scheme that would provide a number of jobs could not be dismissed. The changes were welcomed with respect to vehicle movements, and the work put in by the applicant and the agent were commendable. It was reassuring that the agent and the applicant were organisations worth dealing with and it was hoped the Council would support the proposals.

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development commented that it had been a long process to get to this stage and he looked forward to the application's approval. Boston was definitely open for business. It had started as a port and had deteriorated; this would bring in more boats and increase jobs. There were no negatives; waste had to go somewhere. It would kick-start business positivity, attract more and improve the national profile of the town.

Madam Chairman was supportive the scheme and its location having received confirmation that notification would be sent to residents regarding piling and that the facility would be used for UK waste only for the lifespan of the facility. The site would reach its end of life after 25 years at which point the company was responsible for reinstating the site. It was especially timely, as the site at North Hykeham would soon reach capacity. All Committee Members would have sight of the results of the assessments.

Mr Bower added that he had held discussions with Boston Barrier's company liaison officer regarding notification of local residents with respect to piling and were intending to learn from their good experience. In terms of the use of the site for UK waste only, they had insisted on this at an early stage and it would be written into the Development

Consent Order, which was legislation. In terms of decommissioning, they were obliged to put this in place. It was usually a 25 five-year lifespan, or earlier if the technical environmental assessment changed and the facility could no longer demonstrate it met requirements. The site would be left in the condition it was found. The wharf would remain because it would be part of the new flood defence scheme.

The recommendation was then read out and it was clearly carried, with one Member voting against.

RESOLVED: To delegate authority to the Assistant Director Regulation, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, Planning and Environment to finalise the Council's submission in response to the Phase 4 consultation.

The Meeting Closed at 7.50 pm



Boston Alternative Energy Facility Project Team Meeting with Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council

18 November 2020

1. Welcome & Apologies

Present

Christian Allen, Head of Environmental Operations – Boston Borough Council (Chair)
Mike Gildersleeves, Assistant Director for Planning – Boston Borough Council
Peter Udy, Planning Policy Office – Boston Borough Council
Nick Davis, Principal Environmental Health Officer – Boston Borough Council
Neil McBride, Head of Planning - Lincolnshire County Council
Jon Sharpe, Principal Highways Officer – Lincolnshire County Council
Emily Anderson, Trainee Planning Officer – Lincolnshire County Council
Gary Bower, EIA Project Manager - Royal HaskoningDHV (GB)
Kelly Linay, Director of Community Engagement - Athene Communications
Pauline Chapman, Executive Assistant - Boston Borough Council
Clive Gibbon – Economic Development Manager – Boston Borough Council
Mark Gilbert – Boston Borough Council
Ryan Eldon – Transport – Royal HaskoningDHV (GB)
Charlotte Goodman – Air Quality – Royal HaskoningDHV
Dean Curtis – Noise – Royal Haskoning DHV (left meeting early replaced by SC)
Paul Salmon – EIA Project Manager – Royal HaskoningDHV
John Coates, Head of Waste - Lincolnshire County Council
Anne-Marie Read – Environmental - Boston Borough Council
Sebastian Chesney – Noise – Royal HaskoningDHV

Apologies

Nicole Hilton, Assistant Director for Communities – Lincolnshire County Council
Warren Peppard – Lincolnshire County Council
Abbie Garry, EIA Coordinator - Royal HaskoningDHV
Michelle Sacks, Director of Group and Deputy Chief Executive – Boston Borough Council

2. Notes of the last meeting dated 31 July 2020 / matters arising

NB did not realise the chapters were embedded into the meeting so has not had a chance to review the documents supplied earlier. JS also said the same.

Top of page 6 – should be attributed to Neil McBride not Nick Davis – **Action: KL to amend**

3. Outstanding actions

GB to resend high level design of the wharf – **Action: GB to send high level design of the wharf to attendees**

4. Chapters for review

This meeting is to get some initial feedback and is not the opportunity to input into the content of the chapters. This will inform future meetings post submission stage.

GB – we have committed to submit to PINS on 27 November 2020. We are submitting electronically and are in the final stages of pulling everything together for the DCO. There are six main categories of documents:

1. Application form, covering letter and S55 checklist
2. Draft DCO itself and explanatory memorandum
3. Land and CPO information – incl. book of reference
4. Suite of plans – site location, landowner plan, phase of works, access and rights of way, landscaping and biodiversity, marine plan, heritage assets plan and indicative generating station plan, services connection plan
5. Reporting statements – consultation report is the most important of these. Also includes; planning statement, design and access statement, other consents and licences, habitats regulations signposting statement, nuisance statement, combined power statement, grid connection statement, fuel availability and waste hierarchy statement.
6. Environmental statement including key topic areas the public has raised. There are 24 chapters in total.

Once we've submitted PINS will start to assess this. They will determine if it is a duly made application. We expect a response by mid-January. They will then start the determination process. This can take between 2-4 months. This will then set the diary for the examination phase. Examination will last 6 months, so we expect this to start middle of next year finishing towards the end of the year. This then goes to the Secretary of State, so looking mid-2022 for an outcome.

MG – we had an initial conversation about a PPA, we now need to advance this and continue the dialogue. NB is also keen to get this sorted out. **Action - PS to take take this forward.**

- Air quality

CG - The assessments have changed since the PIER. The design has changed. From an air quality assessment, vessels are now used during the construction phase. We also included odour. For the operational phase we incorporated the design changes. We also increased the stack height to 80m as this is beneficial to the impacts in relation to the nearest receptors. Responding to comments made during the consultation – we've extended the markers and concluded a minor adverse impact but this is not classed as significant. There is a commitment during construction to use Euro6 HGVs. From a dust emission perspective, we are using best practice. In operation the facility will be permitted, and we'll have to work within the permit limits.

ND – we spoke about moving the concrete batching plant to another location on the site due to a company who would be impacted. GB – this has now moved into the centre of the site. GB showed on a plan where it has moved to.

CA - the stack height has been increased to 80m. Was this to improve air quality dispersion. CG – it applies to all stacks and will reduce impacts. Raising the stack height by 10m was more appropriate. CA – is this normal practice. Is it just pushing the emissions higher, not reducing them? CG – Yes. GB – we would like them higher but don't want to go higher than the Stump. CA – do you have to demonstrate in your application that you've used the best available techniques to reduce the output of emissions? Was raising the stack the last option? CG – yes, there will be a lot of flue gas treatment that occurs before it comes out the stack. We've also done a stack height calculation. Increasing the height does help but it is also considered as an overall planning balance.

MG – we definitely don't want to be going higher and there will be some nervousness about this. We'll cross this bridge when we get to it. We've considered the human receptors but what about the Agri food companies in the area? You may want to tweak this chapter to say they've been considered. CG – hasn't received any comments on this lately. GB – we've been to see one company and we've tried to engage with them all. The one we did engage with their concern was that the facility would blow up and them not being able to work. This is something we can discuss post submission.

ND – we have a lot of experience with Boston Barrier being built. Will there be regular road sweeping? What about dealing with low level complaints such as dirty cars etc.

GB – the application considers how it will handle things like this, however, it will evolve post-submission stage. This is a condition that we must meet - code of construction package. A fundamental part of this is a complaints procedure.

PS – this document will be done in the post application period and agreed with key stakeholders.

CA – with your experience of doing this chapter what are likely to be the most contentious comments. CG – stack emissions but these are heavily regulated. The facility wouldn't be able to operate if these were not acceptable. Also, road traffic. This has been reduced significantly.

These are both related to construction, so hopefully nothing too contentious.

GB – this was one of the most popular topics for discussion with the general public.

- Noise quality

Dean has had to leave so Sebastian has stepped in.

SC – construction, operation and road traffic noise assessment have been undertaken. With construction we have had to implement certain mitigation measures to reduce the impact. The traffic noise assessment deemed nothing significant.

ND – surprised when looking at the background noise, can't quite understand why the levels during night-time readings are higher than those in the daytime. I've never seen this before.

What is the reason behind this? SB – it depends on when the tide is coming in and out. There may have been greater activity on the river. GB – there has been two noise surveys. Both recorded higher noise levels at night.

ND – there is a variation in night and day predicted levels.

SC - the weighting of the night is higher. The day is 16 hours, but the night is only 8 hours. There is more activity at night-time. ND - Daytime backgrounds has been taken as 36 but when you look at the L9s taking 36 for over 50% of the time it is actually lower than that. It's around 30-31.

This suggests that more has to be done in terms of noise. SC – we've tried to look at the spread of background noise levels. GB – there is requirement in the DCO about operational noise limits. This has the potential to evolve following your feedback.

CA – Is mitigation that you've put in place is this standard construction practice? SC – for the construction it was piling noise at night that was the main issue so we've added a piling shroud that would enclose it. This is fairly standard. GB – the likelihood of piling at night is fairly low. Concrete pouring is the only thing that is likely to happen at night. The ES is done on a worst-case basis.

CA – what about operations noise? SC – one of the main things is the noise break out from machinery within the buildings. We've made the panelling more robust. Design around the air condenser. GB – we've assumed this is working 100% of the time all the time. In normal operation not all fans will be in operation all the time.

ND – in terms of construction have you put in the application your construction workings hours?

GB – yes.

- Transport quality

RE – Project design changes – we were assessing 1,083 vehicle movements, this has reduced as we're now using vessels as much as possible rather than road. 1,273 this has dropped to 273 movements with the average 163 flows in PEIR to 70 in the ES. The employee movements in

PEIR was a minibus pickup from town centre. Now they can travel directly to site, parking at onsite car parks and then a small minibus journey to the actual facility. There have been a number of junction models undertaken and a full cumulative impact assessment. Impacts have substantially reduced since PEIR to ES. We are showing negligible or minor for all assessment criteria.

ND – mitigations for roundabout on A16, was part of this to route some traffic from the south?
RE – this is a worst-case assessment assuming 100% coming from the north or 100% from the south. In reality it will not be like this.

CA – Am I right that mitigation is sufficient assuming the worst-case scenario? RE – yes. GB – we are submitting an outline version of the traffic management plan. This will evolve and will require signoff from the local authority. This includes a travel plan.

NM – is there a possibility that some material will need to come in via road? Will the DCO say no traffic will access the site by road at the operation stage. GB – the premise is that no RDF will come via road. There will be a commitment to a number of vehicles per day. If ships can't come in due to weather we have a couple of days contingency.

MG – we've now moved to a more realistic scenario but we also need to consider sustainable motor transport. This is missing in the chapter. Also, there is mention of the net spend of the people on site. If they travel by car they're unlikely to spend outside of the site location. I'm comfortable how this has moved on in the past year.

RE- we have just assessed on the worst case of the traffic movements, so we understand the impacts on the network. In the traffic management plan we have spoken about how we can encourage sustainable transport, so we can see if any are taken up by employees.

MG – are you comfortable the level of parking is suitable and will not impact on the local network. GB – showed a plan to show car parking

JS – unlikely that Alan will want the road adopted

JC – we use a booking system to access the recycling centre which means there may now be queues on the private road.

PU – Can the minibus run on a circular to allow employees to get provisions locally? GB – don't see why not but not included in the traffic plan at the moment. We can think about this as part of the community involvement perspective. PU – if it is an electric bus it would be even better.

5. Any other business

GB - Gary advised he is leaving RHDHV and Paul will take over the project management. Paul has plenty of experience post submission so the project is in good hands.

CA – wished him the best for the future

MG – Is there an update on the RSPB? Also, heritage implications were left hanging due to the height of the stack. Will we get to have sight of this before you submit? GB – will send the heritage chapter for you to see. **Action – GB to send heritage chapter to MG.** RSPB – we have worked with them focussing on marine issues and are working on building in some mitigation. This will evolve post submission working with the RSPB, Natural England and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.

CA – how is the potential for local waste delivery being dealt with in the final submission? – GB – we have identified that local waste is taken to Slippery Gowt and then North Hykeham. We have said in the DCO application the facility taking the waste is a possibility subject to procurement rules. Therefore, it has been left open.

NM – LCC has received notice from PINs that the application is about to be submitted. We may have to met separately going forward. I'll be the contact for the County Council.

6. Date for next meeting

The next meeting will be when we're looking at the determination and will be a slimmed down meeting. It will be guided by the PINS process.

NOTES OF TELECON WITH Boston CC
4th June

Present:

Mike Gildersleeves, Boston Borough Council (BBC) (MG) – Assistant Director of Planning
Chris Allen, BBC (CA) – Assistant Director of Regulation
Peter Udy, BBC (PU) – Forward Plans Team
Lewis Humphreys, BBC (LH) – Planner, Climate Change Team
Paul Salmon, Royal HaskoningDHV (PS)
Sophie Reese, BDB Pitmans (SR)

Introductions

Everyone introduced themselves.

Project Update

PS provided an update on the application noting the reasons for withdrawal in December and outlining how the issues identified by PINS had been addressed.

PS identified that a without prejudice HRA Derogation Case would likely be presented as part of the Examination.

PS said that BBC should have received a section 56 notice which give notice of the accepted application and the 18 June deadline for making a relevant representation. MG confirmed the notice had been received but hadn't appreciated the deadline for making relevant representations. They would review this and contact PINS directly if they had timing issues.

MG noted that no major issues had been identified to date.

PS provided an update of the project's timescales and the potential for a predominantly virtual examination (as advised by PINS verbally). MG said this was in line with what is happening for their planning inquiries.

Waste and Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)

CA queried how things were progressing with LCC. PS said that we had met with Neil McBride who was handling this for LCC. The key issue identified by LCC was waste and some potential issues around compliance with their waste policies. PS said he had sought further details from Neil on the exact nature of their concerns. MG said that they had been trying to convey to LCC that the project is something that they would like to see happen.

PU noted that the documents only raise the option of taking Boston waste but there was no commitment to this but that this might be something BBC would like to progress given they are currently sending lorries across the county to the North Hykeham Energy from Waste (EfW) facility so would be beneficial from an

environmental perspective. PS noted that the scheme is predicated on bringing in waste via boat and that the ES currently doesn't factor in traffic movements from bringing in local waste. MG suggested given the proximity to the transfer station this could be done via an internal road or conveyor.

Having up to date information on the capacity and usage of North Hykeham would be useful to see.

Use of the River

MG noted that from development perspective the council was progressing the Port of Boston - Gateway to Growth project as BCC sees The Haven as a working river. A cabinet paper had been prepared regarding establishing a working group of collective bodies predominantly in the agriculture sector to see if the port could be utilised more for distribution of food products.

CA asked for an update as to the fishermen. PS said that they had engaged a lawyer and we had seen their draft relevant representation. It largely related to their view that the increased vessel movements will impact their operations. PS noted that the Port wasn't raising any navigational safety issues and a navigational management plan would be prepared.

Other Matters

MG outlined the other key matters that had been raised through the consultation process:

- Noise, lighting – Council was generally comfortable given construction materials were now coming in via boat.
- Heritage and impacts on the Stump – PS said this had been assessed in the ES.
- PRoW and whether there was any ways of improving that through interpretation panels and bridge design. PS said the client is open to discussing these options.
- Dust on neighbouring food producers may be an issue raised by others on the Industrial Estate (e.g. DCI).
- Use of heat for nearby users. MK identified that BCC had received enquiries about using the heat from the facility nearby e.g. hydroponics – SR outlined that CHP had been assessed in the application and a requirement had been included in the DCO to require consideration of opportunities to export heat.
- Education – MG suggested the use of a redundant unit in town for an educational site but this can be worked out through the section 106. CA also suggested continuation to a community fund. PS noted that the applicant had had a meeting with the local technical college around apprenticeships and that the DCO contained a requirement for the development of an employment, skills and training plan.
- RSPB Frampton Marshes site and impacts on it as a tourist attraction (80,00 visitors a year). MK wondered if visual impacts of the stack may be an issue from this location and if this may be thought of as affecting visitors

to the site. PS noted that we are working with the RSPB to develop compensation measures there.

- Landscaping and if there had been any consideration of offsite landscaping – PS said there hadn't been off-site landscaping included as was considered to have limited value given the scale of the project.
- New Haul road and whether this was included – SR said it did not form part of the application as the traffic assessment determined it wasn't necessary as construction materials coming through wharf. MG noted that BBC was looking to get another access road into Marsh Lane.

PS asked about whether BCC could provide updated tourism figures. MG said he could assist as a first point of contact (e.g. access to their STEAM database).

Climate Policy

CA noted that LCC has published a climate change policy – green master plan. BBC/East Linsey Council published a recent environment policy and are in the process of drafting a climate change strategy. CA said they will share that with us.

Power and Access to the Grid

MG noted a general concern that there wasn't any capacity to export power into the grid locally with links to the grid being turned down. BCC have been looking at ways to link renewable power with their new housing developments and developing battery storage but there wasn't any capacity to connect to grid – this may affect growth objectives for the town. BCC asked if there was the opportunity to connect to the grid via the Facility, Paul will enquire with the client. MG also queried where the lines running through the site went to. PS said he would ask the client.

Next Steps

MG said he would let us know if they pick up any issues once they review the DCO application documents.

PS to put socioeconomics expert in touch with MG.

PS to enquire with client regarding grid connection and lines.

It was agreed that once the relevant reps has been issued a draft SoCG would be produced by The Applicant team for review/update by BBC with a meeting to follow 2 or 3 weeks after.

SR to follow up with Marisia regarding the PPA.

Minutes

**HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.
Industry & Buildings**

Present: Paul Salmon (PS), Abbie Garry (AG) and Vic Cooper (VC) (Royal HaskoningDHV), Denise Drury (DD) (Heritage Lincolnshire), Tim Allen (TA) and Matthew Nicholas (MN) (Historic England (HE)) and Jan Allen (JA) (Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)).

Apologies:

From: Abbie Garry

Date: 9th August 2021

Location: Teams

Copy:

Our reference: PB6934-RHD-ZZ-XX-MI-Z-1081

Classification: Project related

Enclosures:

Subject: **Boston Alternative Energy Facility Cultural Heritage Meeting 09.08.21**

Number	Details	Action
---------------	----------------	---------------

1

Introduction

PS noted that:

- examination will be mostly virtual;
- there will likely be two preliminary meetings (PMs) on 28th September with the second on 7th October;
- the Rule 6 letter will be received w/c 16th August; and
- there will likely be one face to face open floor hearing.

Post meeting note: the Rule 6 letter is [here](#), published on 17th August.

2

Summary of Relevant Representations (RR)

VC summarised previous consultation including a meeting in 2019 where it was agreed to take forward the geophysical survey and make updates to the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (OWSI). VC noted due to project delays and Covid-19, full consultation was not able to be progressed prior to application submission.

Historic England's (HE's) RR

VC noted that HE's RR focussed on the value of the geoarchaeological work and requested further detail on how it would be approached within the WSI. VC noted the RR mentioned ensuring geoarchaeological involvement in planning the post consent ground investigations.

VC confirmed that this was the strategy that would be put in place, but this will be made clearer in updates to the OWSI.

Number	Details	Action
--------	---------	--------

VC has noted reference to HE guidance on deposit modelling and piling, and the preservation of archaeological remains which includes wetland areas. Therefore, updates will be made in terms of recent guidance.

VC noted the approach to archaeology will come out of the discussion on evaluation and how it integrates with the overall strategy.

TA noted that the OWSI will be required by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to discharge the requirements within the Development Consent Order (DCO). TA mentioned that where investigations are post consent, there should be clarity within the OWSI on what the final WSI will be addressing.

VC noted that there would be further detail added within the OWSI, including the commitments required and the process for demonstrating how the conditions are discharged should be included.

Lincolnshire County Council's (LCC's) RR

VC noted LCC's RR that the geophysical survey should have been followed by trial trenching prior to submission of the application, and therefore there is a lack of information for informed planning recommendations.

VC noted a note had been circulated on the reasons why trial trenching was proposed post consent and following geoarchaeology.

Boston Borough Council's (BBC's) RR

VC mentioned that BBC's response included comments on cultural heritage and the focus on public interpretation and appreciation of the environment. VC also noted views from Boston Stump.

3	Approach to Evaluation	
---	-------------------------------	--

VC summarised the note circulated on the mitigation strategy. VC noted the purpose of the note was to provide streamlined information on how the strategy was formed.

VC summarised the strategy which included:

- Phase 1 within the OWSI comprised of a programme of geoarchaeological monitoring and assessments,

Number	Details	Action
--------	---------	--------

including geoarchaeology advice in planning the investigations and including targeted geoarchaeological investigations, informed by the geophysical survey to understand the ground conditions;

- Phase 2 is trial trenching if shown to be appropriate based on the geophysical survey and geoarchaeological assessment; and
- Phase 3 which is dependent on detailed design and construction methodology, which would include set-piece excavation, archaeological monitoring/ watching briefs during construction – but this depends on the results of the evaluation.

VC noted the comments in the RRs were about when this takes place. VC stated that we are proposing this to be done post consent due to the programme of ground investigations which is planned post consent. VC noted the evaluation would be better informed by having the geoarchaeological investigations done first.

VC suggested that, as the results of the desk-based assessment and geophysical survey do not suggest the presence of significant or extensive archaeological features, the risk to the project of encountering such remains would be limited.

JA noted we aren't in a place to fully understand that there is no significant archaeology.

VC mentioned that we know there is potential for remains but the ability to identify and target this is difficult due to the amount and depths of alluvium.

VC noted that the trial trenching at Boston Biomass No. 3 revealed only alluvium and no archaeological remains.

JA confirmed we are in agreement in terms of the process [of geoarchaeology and then trial trenching]. JA noted less than half of the site had the geophysical survey, and noted that 'we don't know enough'.

VC noted that in terms of the work currently done, we can make a judgement that there are no extensive archaeological sites here although it is agreed that the potential for archaeological material to be present cannot be ruled out.

Number	Details	Action
	<p>VC showed the areas of geophysical survey were the open areas of the site, whereas other areas are covered by existing facilities. VC noted that the geophysical survey has shown that we wouldn't be able to find out anything more with evaluation at this stage.</p> <p>JA noted there was 12.7 hectares (ha) of the 26.8 ha site geophysical survey undertaken. JA noted there should be sufficient evaluation before submission.</p> <p>JA noted that they would be consistent in the advice based on guidance and policy.</p> <p>VC confirmed there would be a whole suite of ground investigations post consent which would cover the whole site.</p> <p>VC noted there are specific features such as a palaeochannel and field boundary, therefore, if we could agree with the client taking forward 2-4 boreholes sooner, rather than waiting for the Ground Investigation (GI) that could be a potential solution.</p> <p>MN noted it was important to have a synergy between the geotechnical investigation and geoarchaeology.</p> <p>TA noted that issues should be dealt with before the examination hearings.</p> <p>PS noted that we need to consider the timescale we've got left and we could do something now which would provide information within the examination.</p> <p>MN asked for further information on the wharf area.</p> <p>VC noted that the approach to assessment and geotechnical investigation would be different for the intertidal/subtidal area compared to the onshore assessments. VC stated we don't have details on how the geotechnical investigation will be carried out for the wharf area.</p> <p>AG noted we would need to check details of geotechnical investigation for the wharf area within the draft DCO. <i>Post meeting note, the draft DCO includes Requirement 9 stating "No part of the authorised development may commence until intrusive geotechnical and geo-environmental phase investigations have been carried out". The wharf area is not specified separately.</i></p>	

Number	Details	Action
	<p>VC noted they could liaise with MN on locations and could plan some boreholes in the onshore area, with a view to undertake larger scale investigations at a later date.</p>	
	<p>DD asked what details we have of the GI works.</p>	
	<p>VC confirmed we don't have locations of where the boreholes are going and what the engineering designed GI will be.</p>	
	<p>DD noted that the borehole locations would be for the engineering purpose rather than geoarchaeology.</p>	
	<p>VC mentioned that boreholes located for geoarchaeological purposes could also be used for geotechnical information.</p>	
	<p>VC noted action on considering a proposal of boreholes to take to the client. VC noted timescales would be considered for the WSI, and if the boreholes were undertaken a smaller WSI would be needed to inform the process.</p>	<p>VC to consider proposal of boreholes and discuss with the client.</p>
	<p>VC noted if boreholes are going to be undertaken now the OWSI would need to be updated to reflect that strategy.</p>	
	<p>JA mentioned that the geophysical survey suggested some archaeology could be masked.</p>	
	<p>VC noted the trenches at the Boston Biomass Facility which is adjacent to the site. The trenches went to 2 m and extended half of those to 4 m, which showed mostly alluvium, although there was a layer with organic material (roots) at depth suggesting a previous land surface.</p>	<p>VC to send over details of Boston Biomass trial trenching.</p>
	<p>TA noted that although you can extrapolate to an extent from the adjacent site, there could still be defined areas of paleochannels and creeks.</p>	
	<p>VC noted it would be useful to understand the depths of the deposits before doing trial trenching.</p>	
	<p>JA asked what the maximum impact depth would be.</p>	
	<p>PS noted we don't currently have this information but we could find out if it is available at this stage. PS noted we would need client signoff on the proposed plan for boreholes.</p>	<p>PS to confirm if we have information on maximum impact depth.</p>

Number	Details	Action
4	<p>DD noted that the OWSI seemed to imply that trenching wouldn't be necessary following other pieces of work. DD noted upper deposits would need to be checked.</p> <p>VC noted the wording would be made clearer within the OWSI.</p> <p>PS mentioned we would be seeking Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) through the various organisations (LCC/BBC).</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>VC noted mitigation would need to be fully considered when evaluation has been undertaken.</p> <p><i>BBC Mitigation Suggestions (public interpretation/ landscaping)</i></p> <p>VC noted that there is a commitment in the OWSI on including publication, heritage boards etc., but currently we don't have details on what that would look like, as this would be determined with consultation with stakeholders and the final design process.</p> <p>VC mentioned we don't have the details on physically how the mitigation could be done, for example boards, or a heritage trail, however we could look at options.</p> <p>PS noted if there were specifics on what could be done, this could be considered within the Section 106 agreement.</p> <p>DD mentioned public art projects in the area including a focus on heritage.</p> <p>DD asked if there is consideration for schools.</p> <p>PS confirmed there will be provision for schools visiting and there could be a provision of information on heritage. PS noted would discuss this within the legal agreement.</p> <p>JA mentioned that there are opportunities for creative digital ways to engage with the public.</p> <p>PS noted the Section 106 agreement would be in consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Boston Stump</i></p> <p>VC mentioned there was a comment from BBC on the predominance of the Facility within views from Boston Stump.</p>	<p>PS to discuss heritage aspects of Section 106 agreement with lawyers.</p>

Number	Details	Action
--------	---------	--------

DD noted this was considered at previous meetings but it wasn't considered by DD for the relevant representation.

PS mentioned that there are significant effects predicted in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, however this is within a current industrial landscape with a current biomass facility and pylons.

VC noted that within the settings assessment the Facility was not considered to be a concern in affecting the significance of the Stump as a heritage asset. VC mentioned the point was more related to the landscape and visual impact assessment rather than the heritage assessment.

TA mentioned GPA 3 setting of heritage assets should be considered.

VC noted the GPA 3 guidance was followed for considering the contribution setting makes to significance.

5 **Conclusions/ Next Steps**

VC stated we would come back with a proposal on the boreholes if the client approves the work.

VC noted the OWSI won't be updated until the boreholes aspect is determined. The separate WSI and method statement for the additional boreholes would be developed with MN.

Statements of Common Ground

PS noted SoCG are currently being written and will be based on the RRs prepared. PS mentioned we would like to have draft SoCG progressed prior to examination.

PS noted that for the local authorities the subjects will be split up.

PS mentioned there isn't currently a timetable but that we are in discussions with BBC and LCC.

Minutes

**HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.
Industry & Buildings**

Present: Paul Salmon (PS), Abbie Garry (AG) (Royal HaskoningDHV), Nick Davis (ND), Mike Gildersleeves (MG), Christian Allen (CA), Lewis Humphreys (LH) (Boston Borough Council (BBC)), Richard Woosnam (RW), Sam Williams (SW) (Alternative Use), Richard Marsh (RM) and Rahil Haq (RH) (BDB Pitmans).

Apologies:

From: Abbie Garry

Date: 12th August 2021

Location: Teams

Copy:

Our reference: PB6934-RHD-ZZ-XX-MI-Z-1082

Classification: Project related

Enclosures:

**Subject: Boston Alternative Energy Facility Boston Borough Council (BBC) Meeting
12.08.21**

Number	Details	Action
---------------	----------------	---------------

1	Examination Update	
----------	---------------------------	--

PS noted that:

- examination will be mostly virtual;
- there will likely be two preliminary meetings (PMs) on 28th September with the second on 7th October;
- the Rule 6 letter will be received w/c 16th August; and
- there will likely be one face to face open floor hearing.

Post meeting note: the Rule 6 letter is [here](#), published on 17th August.

2	Boston Borough Council (BBC) Relevant Representation (RR)	
----------	--	--

MG confirmed that in principle this is a project they would like to support and could create a legacy in the town. There were however some matters which required further discussion/work.

MG noted they wanted to confirm details of the Public Right of Way (PRoW). MG mentioned there is a difference between the Havenside footpath and the Roman Bank footpath through the site.

PS noted there was consultation with Councillor Chalmers to provide information on the project. PS noted overall there have been very few RRs on the project.

Key objections and consultation related to the BAEF scheme

PS mentioned one of the key objections to the scheme is from Natural England and RSPB, however we have been collecting additional data,

Number Details

Action

bird surveys and technical work. PS noted we are likely to submit a without prejudice derogation case to the examination.

PS noted the holding objection from the Environment Agency (EA) on flood risk however we will be holding a site visit and will provide further information to them.

RH mentioned there is a holding objection from Western Power.

PS mentioned the fishermen have objected to the scheme as they have concerns over additional vessels within the Haven and the turning circle threatening their livelihoods. PS noted we are proposing a Navigational Management Plan (NMP). PS stated that the fishers are proposing a quayside downstream of Boston AEF, and we have done a small impact assessment on this wharf. PS also noted commissioning some further technical work to on navigation to show the numbers.

MG confirmed it was important to have evidence to back it up.

MG noted alignment between RSPB and fishermans RR's, could indicate that RSPB may use the fishers' comments that the Haven is 'at capacity' as an argument.

MG noted river is a working river and having the data to back up the capacity will be useful for this scheme and wider objectives.

PS noted we have an agreement with the Port of Boston and they have not raised any commercial and navigation issues.

CA noted that it is good to have confirmation from the Port.

RW noted a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is currently being negotiated with the Port.

MG noted the Port of Boston Gateway to Growth project to raise the profile of the Port and to keep developing it. MG noted it would be useful to get support from interlinked industries which rely on the Port such as Metsä Wood.

PS noted a holding response from the Maritime and Coastguard Agency, which can be addressed through the NMP.

AG noted we are following up with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) on their position following the committee meeting.

CA asked if there were policy objections from LCC.

Number Details

PS noted one of the concerns was with policy W1, however this is a national project taking Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) from approximately 12 UK ports.

CA noted this would be the same issue in any county it was located due to the scale.

PS noted additional work has been done to ensure we can take waste from local authorities and there is no policy reason why that wouldn't be possible. PS noted work is also currently being undertaken on carbon and comparison to export to Europe.

Biodiversity Net Gain

PS noted that biodiversity net gain (BNG) has been taken account in the [Outline Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Strategy \(OLEMS\)](#) (document reference 7.4, APP-123).

PS noted that the overall BNG is negative however for hedgerows it is positive. There isn't currently 10% BNG but as the main impacts are for marine ecology and ornithology we are aiming to look at funding enhancements and increased habitats at the current RSPB reserves.

MG noted Policy 29 of the Local Plan which is on BNG and interconnectivity of ecological networks. MG suggested we could consider Boston Woods Trust sites or Havenside Country Park which would be beneficial to the local community as well as mitigation.

PS noted although we wouldn't want to amend the red line boundary of the scheme we could, subject to further consideration and AUBP's approval due to the financial implications, consider including this within the Section 106 agreement which could be tied into targets for wildlife and outdoor amenity.

MG requested that if we come back with a proposal of what is within the Section 106 agreement then we can have a separate meeting on Section 106.

PS confirmed a draft 106 agreement has been produced.

Pollution

MG noted concerns over controls on litter and mechanisms to ensure it wouldn't be a problem.

Action

PS to arrange
Section 106
meeting
(arranged for
07/09/21)

Number Details

PS noted there will be operating procedures such as a large net to catch any litter during offloading of the bales. The site will be permitted by the EA and we are currently having discussions with the EA on this.

MG noted there were dust sensitive businesses nearby.

AG noted this would be covered in the Air Quality topic meeting in September.

Landscaping

PS noted BBC's comment on particular species for particulate removal. PS stated that the species within the OLEMS were based on local landscape character and native species, but we could consider these additional species.

PS mentioned the comment fly tipping and noted this may be within the operational management plan.

AG noted there is a requirement in the OLEMS on inspecting fly-tipping annually, however the BBC response noted they would consider quarterly to be more suitable. AG stated the landscaping lead would update the OLEMS to include a quarterly inspection.

OLEMS to be updated

RW mentioned there will be fencing, security and CCTV cameras at the site, with a security manager in operation at all times.

MG noted one of the RRs was that one viewpoint's significance of effect should be major adverse.

MG noted the interplay between landscaping mitigation, ecology, education etc., to cover multiple benefits.

Transport

MG mentioned BBC are currently considering how the area might be better served by public transport.

MG noted there is a 'levelling up' bid on better distribution of traffic around the Spirit of Endeavour roundabout, and access between Boston and A16/A17 junction at Sutterton

MG noted they had been considering a link road into the A16 which was discussed previously before bringing in further construction materials via the River.

MG noted a bus route into the industrial estate.

Number Details

Action

PS noted the comment on road adoption.

MG noted that adoption of the road is with the County Council. MG mentioned the road is currently not up to the same specification as would be preferable. MG noted it could be a benefit to the industrial estate and solve a long standing issue.

PS noted that there is consideration of the landowner to consider, and we will come back in writing with a response on this.

Response on road adoption required.

MG mentioned monitoring of routes would be necessary in order to reduce use of rat runs.

RW noted that suppliers would be required to stay to a permitted route.

AG noted the [Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan](#) (document reference 7.2, APP-121) includes details on routes and monitoring.

Socio-economics

PS noted the Applicant has had discussions with Boston College and are working towards an agreement that apprenticeships will be funded.

PS noted we are currently considering the different types of skill levels for the jobs such as the NVQ levels.

PS noted our socio-economics lead has had a discussion with Polly Wilkinson.

PS noted we have had some comments on the views from Boston Stump but this is within an industrial area, and it won't take away significantly from the view.

MG noted it is good to have the apprenticeships. MG mentioned there are businesses in the areas which would want the CO₂ input.

MG mentioned the tourism impact might have been underplayed and confirmed it was good to have the information from Polly.

MG noted we could consider some information at the top of the Stump to indicate what they are looking at.

PS confirmed we can consider the additional benefits within the Section 106 agreement which is subject to further discussion at a later meeting.

Number	Details	Action
--------	---------	--------

Additional Benefits (battery storage / other renewables)

MG noted in a similar way to the ongoing studies with relation to Combined Heat and Power, BBC would like to see similar studies in relation to the potential for battery storage or other forms of renewable energy being able to access the infrastructure.

MG also suggested we could consider doing more CO₂ capture.

MG considered these could be requirements within the DCO.

PS noted there are some restrictions in the megawatts which can be outputted.

RW confirmed there would be 102MW gross electricity production and 80MW net into the national grid.

PS confirmed we would come back with some clearer wording on this.

MG noted if more electricity is produced than could be outputted according to the DCO could this be captured rather than wasted, using battery storage.

RM noted a battery storage element would need to be within the scope of the DCO, and if the DCO was subsequently sought to be amended this would result in a material change leading to a smaller DCO process.

MG confirmed it wouldn't be part of the DCO.

RM noted any Section 106 obligation could include reasonable endeavours to working together on any adjacent battery storage or ancillary facilities, not requiring amendments to the DCO.

Transport

Road Adoption

AR noted the point regarding adopting Nursery Road and questioned the drivers behind this and how far have the local authorities gone with moving this forward.

MG confirmed it has been a long-standing local issue, however LCC are the adopting authority. MG noted landownership issues have prevented this previously.

Number Details

Action

AR confirmed that it was their understanding that the landowner wouldn't be willing and therefore LCC would be required to use compulsory powers under the highways act to get the road adopted.

SW noted the landowner has the responsibility to maintain the road to a certain condition which will be required for the types of traffic using the industrial estate. SW noted that for the scheme the roads would be required to be maintained to a sufficient level.

MG noted that if an agreement can be reached for adoption then compulsory power could be avoided.

SW noted conversations would be had to ensure the road will be at a high standard.

AR noted he would engage with the highways authority (John Sharp) to understand any further background information to support further discussions.

Pedestrian Access

PS showed where the Havenside route would be closed (which is also the indicative route for the England Coast Path), and the footpath would be diverted to the Roman Bank footpath. PS noted there would be a footbridge to go over a conveyor.

MG noted it would be difficult to put a bridge over an active wharf but questioned whether the whole thing needed to be closed. MG noted that for the 'landing points' at either end of the path it is clear on where they are going and why they are going this specific route [rather than along the Havenside route]. MG noted BBC didn't want the palisade fencing alongside the footpath.

PS noted there were options which could be considered for changing the route such as:

- surfacing (however this should consider the significance of the Roman Bank);
- vegetation; and
- signage and interpretation.

MG noted the routes should be understood in more detail.

PS noted we could do an outline design approach to the PRoW, which becomes a requirement of the DCO.

MG noted the county council would hold usage data of the path. MG noted Peter Udy would be able to support on this.

PS to contact
PU as
necessary for
PRoW design.

Number Details

Action

PS noted that we could do a site visit with Peter or anyone else from the council.

Carbon Emissions

MG noted BBC have commitment for reducing carbon emissions.

MG mentioned the potential for using electric vehicles (EV) and getting EV charging points, or getting contractors to commit to EVs.

PS noted carbon assessment is currently being undertaken to look at the comparison between taking waste abroad or keeping in the UK.

Community Benefits

CA also noted there could be a visitor centre off site.

RW noted there would be a community viewing platform and a construction period hub for information on the project.

CA mentioned there could be information on the habitat offset for the public to be informed of what is being done.

MG suggested the 'community hub' could be in a central part of the town so that the public could ask questions.

RW noted this would be considered.

MG noted another point on monitoring impacts in terms of bed spaces.

Draft DCO

MG ran through the relevant representation points on the draft DCO.

MG noted that under Part 4 Supplementary Powers noted there should be a reference to the BS5837 standard for tree work and mitigation planting for any tree felling.

RM mentioned they would consider any additional wording on this.

MG confirmed this is within planning applications particularly with relevance to tree works applications.

MG noted in terms of Schedule 1 it was questions what provisions were made for offsite works.

RM to provide a written response to the points raised on dDCO.

Number Details

RM noted that in terms of the PRoW works even the area outside of the Order limits is under the ownership of the main landowner or the council. If it is outside of this it would be under Section 106, 278 or 38.

MG noted in terms of Schedule 2 requirement 2 in terms of notification of intention to start work on site.

RM noted there was a note in the Section 106 agreement on notice of implementation.

MG noted comments on Schedule 2 requirement 16 in terms of local labour opportunities and monitoring.

RM noted in terms of local labour and apprenticeships we have draft wording in the Section 106.

MG noted comments on the discharge of requirements and noted a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) for discharging requirements has worked previously.

RM asked MG to send an anonymised version of that PPA for them to consider.

MG noted the potential for taking local feedstock material in terms of the household waste facility next door.

CA noted that the Facility is currently set up to receive feedstock from the river. CA noted that it would be useful to consider the feasibility of taking waste from the transfer station in the future.

RM noted that legally there would be nothing stopping the Facility from taking the local waste as there wouldn't be any additional HGV movements. RM noted it could be included as part of the Section 106 agreement for reasonable endeavours to take the waste following the contract which is currently in place.

SW noted due to long term contracts there might not be guarantees that waste can be taken locally at a specific time but it doesn't mean that the option wouldn't be there, subject to practicalities in the future.

Community Benefit Fund

CA questioned whether a community benefit fund could be secured as part of the Section 106 agreement or within the DCO.

MG mentioned this can be discussed as part of a focussed Section 106 discussion.

Action

MG to provide
anonymised
version of PPA

Number Details

RM asked what is done in terms of a fund on other local projects.

MG mentioned for Triton Knoll windfarm there is a % of the profit year on year which is a fund to cut across different opportunities.

PS noted we could have a look at the Section 106 agreement and come back on this.

RM noted they would produce a head of terms schedule to act as an agenda for the Section 106 meeting.

3

AOB

PS noted that we would get together a draft SoCG and also initial responses to Relevant Representations.

Action

RM to provide heads of terms schedule as agenda for Section 106 meeting.

PS to provide draft SoCG and Relevant Representation responses.

Minutes

**HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.
Industry & Buildings**

Present: Mike Gildersleeves (MG) (Boston Borough Council), Christian Allen (CA) (Boston Borough Council), Richard Marsh (RM) (BDB Pitmans), Jessica Hobbs (JH) (BDB Pitmans), Sam Williams (SW) (AUBP), Paul Salmon (PS) (RHDHV), Ashleigh Holmes (AH) (RHDHV)

Apologies: Abbie Garry (RHDHV)

From: Ashleigh Holmes

Date: 07 September 2021

Location: Teams Meeting

Copy:

Our reference: PB6934-RHD-ZZ-XX-MI-Z-1084

Classification: Project related

Enclosures:

Subject: Boston Alternative Energy Facility Section 106 Meeting with Boston Borough Council 07.09.21

Number Details

Action

- 1
 - Introductions
 - Draft Heads of Terms, schedules:
 - **Need to make clear the separation of interests for Boston Borough Council and Lincolnshire County Council**
- 2

Schedule 1 – Local Labour

 - SW and Richard Woosnam in conversations with Boston Technical College (Richard Chambers)
 - MG mentioned there are no standard labour provisions, BBC employment team would deal with this, but the information will need to be agreed with the Economic Growth Function and Planning Team. Ultimate sign off rests with Planning.
 - **MG mentioned BBC seeks the inclusion of regular updates – annual/monthly monitoring provisions.**
 - Regarding apprenticeships – SW to contact Clive Gibbon
 - Primary engineers programme – provide teachers with engineering understanding/tools to teach children
 - When project is under construction, AUBP is unable to control contractors over a multi-year period. Under negotiations AUBP will encourage contractors to talk to college/community.
 - Network Rail agreement – MG mentioned BBC worked in partnership to deliver. This is a potential funded opportunity.
- 3

Second Schedule – Interpretation Board

 - RM noted there is no substantive drafting in this Schedule, as it subject to discussion between the parties.
 - SW – speaking to Richard Chambers this week at Boston Technical College – competition at the high school for signage.
 - Mitigation of PRoW, heritage (offsetting impacts)
 - Provision of a visitor's centre:

SW to contact
Clive Gibbon.

Number Details

- RM – better to have information at the Facility to that we can see it near the site. Offer college and school opportunities to visit the site.
- MG – good idea to have education centre but for a multi-year construction phase, council members would like to see a ‘hub’ in the town centre during construction phase.
- CA – include description of the visitor’s centre in this schedule.
- RM – expensive to let shop front, unnecessary if we are able to deal with queries promptly.
- SW - agree there should be a place for people to talk direct and in person.
- MG – potential for ‘hub’ to host meetings and having a visitors centre therefore generating economic benefits.
- SW – this will be contracted to 3rd party (the EPC contractor). EPC will have offices on site and offices nearby therefore will be more localised. But yet to be determined,
- MG to check Viking Link – commercial agreement for ‘hub’. MG response (post meeting) – “It was within the works tender not a planning restriction”.
- Schedule to include reasonable endeavours regarding discussion about contractor looking at office space/hub in the town centre.
- PS – potential initial presence in Boston town centre for a few months could deal with initial interest and encourage local business involvement in advance of going to site.
- Presence in town centre to be incorporated in a different Schedule.
- Change name of Schedule to ‘Scheme for Interpretation’ rather than ‘Interpretation Board’.
- MG requested a spreadsheet of agreements from this meeting, RM identified that a Heads of Terms document would be produced – shows what is agreed in principle and monitoring of impacts.

4 **Third Schedule – Public Rights of Way (PRoW)**

- PS - liaising with Natural England (England Coast Path) and Lincolnshire County Council. An outline PRoW document is being drafted.
- MG mentioned Peter Udy contact at BBC:
Peter.Udy@Boston.gov.uk

5 **Fourth Schedule – Climate Change and Renewable Energy**

- RM – included provision around CO₂ capture, reasonable endeavours for export, provisional EV charging points on site during construction
- SW – we have to discuss this with EPC
- MG – potential promotion of EV charging facilities in the town. EV charging points are becoming more apparent therefore need EV charging to be included. Provision for this in DCO or in Section 106.
- RM replied heat study requirements are separate. AUBP are showing the Facility will be CHP ready, battery storage isn’t

Action

MG to check Viking Link ‘hub’ was commercial agreement.

JH – to draft a Heads of Terms for the s.106.

MG to provide Peter’s contact details.

Number Details

Action

something we need to consider, but SW will look at battery storage as a reasonable endeavour.

- Reasonable endeavours to look at local export opportunities.
- Paragraph 2.2 of Schedule Four of the draft Section 106 agreement – the phrase ‘maximisation’ should be used rather than ‘utilisation’.
- SW logistics of electrical connection is difficult, means a major infrastructure investment from the grid.

6 **Fifth Schedule – Biodiversity**

- PS stated that AUBP want to discuss BNG opportunities at Boston Woods and Haven LWS for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) opportunities.
- Boston Woods trust is a private entity - Adrian Isaac and Cllr Richard Austin
- Havenside Country Park – Borough Council asset managed on operational basis – Sarah Baker and Lewis Humphries.
- CA to be central point of contact for AUBP’s specialist (Chris Adnitt)

Chris Adnitt to contact CA

7 **Sixth Schedule – Local Feedstock**

- CA – suggested the defined term ‘Boston waste feedstock’ be changed to ‘waste from waste transfer station’ which comes from South Holland and East Lindsey. Waste feedstock from the Waste feedstock station is not solely from Boston. LCC contractual limits at North Hykeham.
- PS – objection from LCC about waste and also no extra HGVs on the roads. HGVs – exceptional circumstances within DCO. Current review of sustainability of the project.
- CA - establish the carbon benefits of transferring waste straight to the site next door.
- RM – AUBP can’t absolutely commit to it.

8 **AOB**

- **Discussion regarding BBC’s request for a community fund**
- RM – BAEF is a renewable scheme, diverting waste from export, capturing carbon, exporting CHP ready (with obligation in the DCO), a Lightweight Aggregate facility and a comprehensive Facility looking to reduce CO2 emissions, AUBP plan to use reasonable endeavours to consider further opportunities in relation to renewable energy, in addition to what the scheme is already going to do. Given these, AUBP does not currently see the need for the fund.
- MG – BBC will be disappointed with this approach as there will be residual impacts and there should be mitigation/offsetting for these impacts. Impacts include: PRoW – riverbank walk, to something going through industrial estate, ecological impact, visual impact, construction CO2.
- MG - BBC urges AUBP reconsider this approach. Secure a positive legacy.
- SW response:

Number Details

- There is no money/budget for setting up a community fund until operation stage (once the Facility is up and running).
- RM response:
 - Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations – demonstrating links between the effects of the scheme, and how mitigation impacts the effects.
 - Effects that MG mentioned are mitigated – we need to BBC to clearly set out what effects it considers such a fund would provide mitigation for and what the fund would look like.
- MG - Landscape 'minor adverse' impact – BBC disagrees and thinks impact should be higher
- RM – queried whether BBC have a precedent of asking other developers for such a fund. MG replied that other schemes had such a fund: Quadrant – windfall project, Triton Knoll – in line with policies in place at that time. MG clarified there was no precedent of BBC requesting such a fund from another developer.
- CA - BBC members want the fund community.
- PS – call to discuss the community fund once we have received information and have a response.

Action

MG to provide list of impacts that are not mitigated for and what the funding should entail.

PS to arrange call to discuss community fund.

Minutes

**HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.
Industry & Buildings**

Present: Paul Salmon (PS), Abbie Garry (AG), Alun McIntyre (AM), Charlotte Goodman (CG) (Royal HaskoningDHV), Aranya Tharumakunarah (AT) (BDB Pitmans), Sam Williams (SW), Richard Woosnam (RW) (Alternative Use Boston Project (AUBP) Ltd.), Mike Gildersleeves (MG), Nick Davis (ND) (Boston Borough Council (BBC)), Jake Newby (JN), Kevin Burton (KB), Helen Dale (HD) (Environment Agency (EA)), James Stewart-Evans (JSE).

Apologies:

From: Abbie Garry

Date: 7th September 2021

Location: Teams

Copy:

Our reference: PB6934-RHD-ZZ-XX-MI-Z-1087

Classification: Project related

Enclosures:

Subject: Boston Alternative Energy Facility Air Quality Topic Meeting 07.09.21

Number	Details	Action
1	<p>PS gave an introduction to the project.</p> <p>KB asked if there is a plant with step grate in the UK, of a similar design to that proposed.</p> <p>SW noted that they are still in discussions with technology providers but there are plants in the UK and EU with this technology.</p>	
2	<p>Boston Borough Council Relevant Representation (RR)</p> <p>ND noted the main issues were related to dust and particulates, particularly as there is a sensitive operator close to the site producing ink cartridges. ND mentioned active dust monitoring would be required particularly during construction.</p> <p>AM noted that continuous dust monitoring would be covered in the Code of Construction Practice. AM noted we could also have some engagement with the company.</p> <p>AM also mentioned there would be a permit for the concrete batching plant.</p> <p>RW noted they were going to be part of the Considerate Constructors Scheme which includes dust monitoring during construction and operation.</p>	<p>AM to consider engagement with ink cartridge company</p>
3	<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>KB noted that the EA don't use air quality experts to review an application until the permitting stage.</p>	

Number Details

KB noted that the 94% headroom stands out.

CG noted that the receptor at which the maximum impact was predicted to occur, as a result of emissions from operation of the facility (R35) was located just across The Haven from the Facility. The contribution from the Facility was 10% of the air quality objective, but the background concentrations at R35 are well below the air quality objective and the combined impact plus background is well below the air quality objective. At receptor R28, within the Boston AQMA, background concentrations are close to the air quality objective but the contribution by the facility at this location is much smaller, so it is the background in the AQMA, principally, which accounts for the Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) of 94% of the air quality objective.

AM noted the detailed schedule of nitrogen dioxide concentrations should have been included in an appendix. This will be submitted as part of an updated appendix. AM noted we could send it through first to the EA in advance of the formal submission.

HD asked when the applicant will be submitting a request for an enhanced pre application meeting.

AM confirmed a colleague Iain Johnson has submitted the pre-application request.

PS noted we would confirm who this request went to.

JN noted that at the Preliminary Meeting the EA are going to raise that the 6 month timetable may not be sufficient to resolve all environmental permit issues. JN noted it may take 12 months to finalise the permit process.

Stack height

AM noted the stack height is proposed to be 80m above ground level, this limit is due to the height of St Botolph's Church but we have not seen a specific planning requirement related to this.

MG noted that Policy 29 notes the dominance of the church in the landscape and there is importance in terms of tourism and from a historic point of view. MG noted increasing the height would lead to more dominance and competition with the landscape views.

AM confirmed there was five stacks all together including two related to the lightweight aggregate facility and three associated with the Energy from Waste lines.

Action

CG to send table of data to JN and KB.

PS to confirm the EA officer working on the EA permit

Number Details

Action

AM noted in the assessment NO_x emissions would be at the maximum of the range of the BAT AELs. AM noted if selective non-catalytic reduction for NO_x control was implemented then the emissions could be reduced.

KB noted contour maps were requested.

AM confirmed the contour maps are within [Figure 14.6 – 14.15](#) (doc ref: 6.3.22, APP-088).

Gas fired peaking plant

AM noted EA's comment on the gas fired peaking plant at Lealand Way. AM confirmed this was taken account of.

KB noted the comment was because the long term impacts were covered rather than the short term. But confirmed the short term impact would be insignificant.

AM/CG to compare NO_x levels on Haven vs rural land.

Defra background mapping

AM noted EA's point on whether the Defra background mapping included shipping. AM confirmed that shipping emissions (for particulates) was included within the grid square, with data from 2018 maps.

KB questioned if there would be a difference in NO_x from a square over the Haven compared to rural land.

AM noted that they could have a look at that comparison and could include in the information.

LWA Kilns

AM noted the EA's comment that the EP would need to limit operation to three kilns of the LWA at any one time.

RW confirmed that one line is standby for maintenance, there are two lines which will take the ash and one which will use the APC residues.

AM to consider note on vaporisation of metals

AM asked about vaporisation of metals from the APC residues.

RW confirmed they would be contained within the vitrified ceramic rather than at a higher temperature. RW confirmed it was a lower temperature than WID requirements, there would not be vaporisation.

AM asked if we should provide a note on this.

KB noted this will be asked either now or as part of the permitting process.

Number Details

Action

Visible Plumes

CG noted further analysis has been done on visible plumes based on the number of plumes in daylight hours. This will be submitted as part of the application.

With regards to photomontages PS noted this should be considered whether it is necessary based on the data.

CG mentioned a photomontage may give the impression the plume is there all of the time.

AM noted that in the ES 925 m is the maximum length of the plume, however this has been revised. AM noted the methodology in the SEPA guidance document included a framework was used for assessing the plume and was assessed as being of between small and medium significance. AM noted this report could be shared early.

CG noted they have worked out the plume in the daylight hours and considered whether the plume extends beyond the boundary of the facility site.

Odour

AM noted the EA's comment on odour in terms of bale splitting.

RW confirmed this was all under cover in a building and the splitting and bunker are under negative pressure.

HD asked about damaged RDF bales.

RW noted that if the bales are identified as split whilst within the vessel they won't be taken off the vessel. If they are damaged during handling they will be re-baled.

PS noted there will also be a large catch net which will catch any debris which might fall out of any split bales.

PS noted the drainage on the wharf area would go into an internal drainage system on site.

KB noted that for other application the EA have issued a draft permit in advance of a decision being made by PINS to give confidence that the operation is permissible.

AT to check
dDCO for
EA as
CoCP
consultee

Number Details

Action

KB also noted concerns in terms of noise impacts and would like to have further conversations which would usually be part of the permitting process.

PS noted the noise expert was not part of this call. But to provide any questions to us.

JN also mentioned adding the EA as a consultee for the CoCP.

AT noted she will check the draft DCO.

Public Health England

AM noted PHE's comment on the dioxins and furans emitted and stated that a detailed updated assessment of dioxins and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) has been commissioned, which will be submitted at Deadline 1.

AM noted deposition on farmland, horticultural land and uptake into the food chain is being considered, including uptake by shellfish.

JSE noted that PHE would need to see if metal deposition and uptake has been screened and addressed.

JSE noted that the Food Standards Agency (FSA) would consider whether deposition would lead to food chain problems.

AM requested contact details.

JSE to email over contact details.

JSE to
provide FSA
contact
details

Euro 6 Vehicles

JSE noted that for ship emissions a similar standard as Euro 6 should be considered. JSE noted ship idling at berth.

RW noted there would be 'cold ironing' so the vessels can switch off their engines and rely on shore power.

CG noted this was factored into the assessment.

Health Impacts

AM mentioned pre-existing health conditions and noted we will follow up with that information.

Number	Details	Action
--------	---------	--------

	JSE mentioned exposure reduction considering different populations and vulnerabilities including where they are.	
--	--	--

	<i>Accidents/ Fire</i>	
--	------------------------	--

	JSE noted that with regards to fire prevention plans it should be confirmed how far the permit would go including whether this will include materials on ships.	
--	---	--

	RW noted the exterior temperature of the hold can be measured and a mobile tank of CO ₂ can be injected to it cool down. This could be moved to another dock or to the Port of Boston.	
--	---	--

Appendix B Glossary

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited	AUBP	The Applicant.
Development Consent Order	DCO	The means for obtaining permission for developments of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP)
Habitat Mitigation Area	-	A 1.5 ha located approximately 170 m to the south east of the Principal Application Site, encompassing an area of saltmarsh and small creeks at the margins of The Haven where habitat mitigation works will be provided.
Habitats Regulations Assessment	HRA	A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) refers to the several distinct stages of Assessment which must be undertaken in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) to determine if a plan or project may affect the protected features of a habitats site before deciding whether to undertake, permit or authorise it.
Lightweight Aggregate	LWA	Plant for the manufacture of lightweight aggregate used to produce lightweight concrete products such as concrete block, structural concrete and pavement.
National Site Network	-	Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) in the UK no longer form part of the EU's Natura 2000 ecological network. The 2019 Regulations have created a national site network on land and at sea, including both the inshore and

Term	Abbreviation	Explanation
		offshore marine areas in the UK.
Principal Application Site	-	A 25.3 hectare site where the industrial infrastructure will be constructed and operated. It is neighboured to the west by the Riverside Industrial Estate and to the east by The Haven.
Refuse Derived Fuel	RDF	The fuel produced from various types of waste, such as paper, plastics and wood from the municipal or commercial waste stream.
Statement of Common Ground	SoCG	This document.