



Operator Liaison Group

Medworth CHP Ltd

Date and time of meeting: Thursday 5th June 2025, 6:00-7:30pm

Venue: Walsoken Village Hall
53 Kirkgate Street, Wisbech PE13 3QX

Present:

MVV (Developer/Operator)	Community/education organisations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul Carey (Managing Director) – PC Mike Turner (Managing Director) – MT Gary Parkinson (Construction Manager) – GP Tim Marks (Head of Planning) – TM Jane Ford (Communications and Community Relations Manager) – JF Andy Houghton (Community Liaison Manager) – AH 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chris Stevens (Wisbech Community Development Trust) – CS Viv Atkinson (Cambridgeshire Community Foundation) – VA Rob Petto (College of West Anglia) – RP John Heathorn (Ferry Project) – JH Andrew Callaghan (Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Learning Trust) – AC Marija Lysak (Support Cambridgeshire) – ML David Page (DWP/Jobcentre Plus) – DP
Host Authorities/Regulator/statutory bodies	Residents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barbara Plumb (Cambridgeshire County Council) – BP Deborah Jeakins (Cambridgeshire County Council) – DJ Environment Agency officers – EA Fred Leach (Walsoken Parish Council) – FL Roy Gerstner (Whittlesey Town Council) – RG Neil Buttress (Hundred of Wisbech IDB) – NB Henry Duncalfe (Hundred of Wisbech IDB) – HD Mike Day (Chair, Hundred of Wisbech IDB) – MD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alan Wheeldon (WisWIN/Community Liaison Group) – AW Marcus Aspden – MA Saxongate Residents representative – SR

Item:	Notes:	Action(s):
1. Welcome, introductions and apologies	<p>Apologies received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul Sharman (North Level IDB) Nester Hakata (Reed In Partnership) Graham Moore (Middle Level IDB) Sean O'Sullivan (EoE Ambulance Service NHS Trust) Gary Monger (Resident) Keith Smith (Ferry Project) Hannah Wood-Handy (BCKLWN Planning) Nigel Eggar (CC Highways) <p>Those present confirmed their role in relation to the project. Of note: Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) confirmed that they are the Relevant Planning Authority for discharging the majority of the Development Consent Order (DCO) Requirements.</p> <p>PC invited volunteers to put themselves forward to Chair these Operator Liaison Group (OLG) meetings. There were no volunteers at this time so PC continued to lead the meeting.</p>	

2. Confirm/update agenda and timings	The agenda had been circulated in advance and was agreed by those in attendance, with no additional items raised. Discussion and confirmation of date and time for the next meeting was deferred until the end of the meeting.	
3. Terms of Reference	<p>The draft Terms of Reference (ToR) had been circulated in advance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) It was agreed that attendees may vary as the project progresses and this fluidity was welcomed b) Quarterly meetings were proposed and agreed, with the following clarifications/interpretations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The ability to postpone, rearrange and/or call additional meeting(s) based on the stage of the project and activities on site ii. This meeting was scheduled for two hours to complete administrative matters; future meetings will initially be scheduled for two hours with an option to conclude earlier if all business has been covered c) The Environment Agency officers and Saxongate Residents group representatives would prefer to appear in these minutes under their organisation name rather than be identified personally 	
4. Construction programme and project overview	<p>PC outlined the first activities that are due to commence in the last quarter (Q4) of this year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of an acoustic fence along the front of number 10, New Bridge Lane • Access improvements to New Bridge Lane to widen it and create a new entrance to/exit from the Energy from Waste (EfW) site – the Internal Drainage Board and Highways are involved in the design for this • Improvements to the junction at Cromwell Road <p>CS asked whether the current works at the New Bridge Lane/ Cromwell Road junction are related to MVV's development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ GP confirmed that they are not. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-engineering and detailed site layout design work • Temporary construction compound • Main EfW site set-up • The grid connection at Walsoken is at the early design stage and discussions with Anglian Water are underway for the potable and foul water connections <p>AW asked whether MVV have bought New Bridge Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PC confirmed that this is not the case but that MVV have bought a house there (number 9). This was necessary because it will lose most of its front garden due to the widening of New Bridge Lane. It has been cleared and tidied up so that three portacabins could be located there to create a temporary welfare compound for the acoustic fence installation. ➤ PC added that a construction village will be built on the Fenland District Council (FDC) land that MVV have occupied at the far end of New Bridge Lane. <p>DJ confirmed that the design for the acoustic fence has been approved (today – 05/06/2025) by CCC. Once the approval is formally</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction will last for around three and a half years • Commissioning will last for a period of 6-12 months, starting with cold commissioning and pressure testing • Hot commissioning is likely to start in late 2028 • The facility is anticipated to be fully operational by the middle of 2029, when the site will be handed over from KVI to MVV <p>PC confirmed that all waste deliveries will be via New Bridge Lane and no waste vehicles will access the site from Algores Way. The existing bollards across New Bridge Lane will be moved to the New Drove end to prevent it from becoming a rat run.</p> <p>MT confirmed that MVV are in the early stages of securing waste supply. 50-60% has already been contracted, with lots of interest and discussions ongoing. MVV will select a waste supplier for commissioning waste and the final mix is anticipated to be approximately 50% Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW) and 50% Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste to 60% LACW/40% C&I. MT added that residue removal and processing arrangements will follow in due course.</p> <p>MA asked whether MT could confirm which Local Authorities (LA) had signed waste contracts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ MT confirmed that such details are commercially confidential at this time. ➤ PC clarified that LA waste often comes via contracts with private waste disposal companies. <p>MA asked whether the geographical area of waste contracts could be confirmed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PC stated that this information will be shared in the fullness of time. ➤ DJ pointed out that the DCO requires geographical information on waste to be reported. ➤ DJ also confirmed that CCC waste contract tenders have to be made public so there would be complete transparency. ➤ PC explained that, pending any changes to local government structures, County Councils are the disposal authorities while town, parish and district councils are the collection authorities. <p>MA asked whether the waste catchment area covers Lincolnshire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PC stated that this information is all set out in the DCO. ➤ MT confirmed that MVV anticipate signing some contracts directly with LAs. ➤ PC further pointed out that MVV can only bid for waste when it is tendered and that is exactly what will happen. <p>PC completed the project delivery summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Combined Heat and Power (CHP) steam pipeline will be built, providing there are heat customers who choose to take up the offer, along the currently disused railway line that crosses New Bridge Lane • The CHP corridor has been designed to sit alongside the reinstated railway line, if that proposal comes forward • MVV welcome the potential opportunity for rail deliveries of waste 	
--	--	--

	<p>SR asked what the life expectancy of the facility will be and how the site will be left after MVV have finished operations there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PC confirmed that MVV's lease for the main site is for a defined period of 45 years. Under that contract it has to be returned to the landowner in the same state it was handed over in. ➤ TM added that the DCO includes a decommissioning requirement. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) had to consider all stages of the development, including construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning. MVV will be required to submit a decommissioning plan. <p>SR noted that the concern was raised because there is another site locally that still hasn't been restored after 25 years.</p>	
5. Host Authority/ Regulator updates	<p>DJ provided an update on the Section 106 (s106) funding, which is for Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and non-motorised users (NMU) enhancements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fund is £400,000 in total, with £300,000 allocated to Cambridgeshire parishes and £100,000 allocated to Norfolk parishes • Discussions and decisions about how to spend this money are still at an early stage, with Wisbech, Wisbech St Mary and Elm being the Cambridgeshire parishes consulted • Proposed schemes will be shared with stakeholders • The money can be spent on one large project or multiple smaller ones • All engagement will be made public <p>EA provided an overview of their role as the regulator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Permit to operate has been issued and this is what officers regulate against • Site visits and inspections will be undertaken • Quarterly and annual monitoring of operations and emissions form part of the routine inspection schedule • Ground water and soil monitoring are also part of the EA's remit • Operators are required to submit a pollution inventory to the EA • Each operator pays a fee to the EA to cover officer time for these activities, with higher risk sites paying a higher fee due to the increased number of audits (and therefore officer time) required • Up to 20 audits may be carried out in any given year and these include (amongst other things) checking the operator's monitoring and sampling regimes – open and transparent operators are preferred • Any emissions exceedances have to be reported to the EA by the operator, using a Schedule 5 form • The EA have a banding system for operators from A (best) to F (worst) and points are accrued by an operator for breaches of Permit based on their impact – most responsible operators are band B because a score of 0.1 will push them from band A to band B (note: a higher points score indicates poorer performance so operators are aiming for a zero score) 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Compliance Assessment Report (CAR) form will be issued to the operator after every visit – MVV's EA officer has issued 120 CAR forms in the last year, which is more than any other officer and should give confidence that the EA take their role very seriously and undertake their duties diligently 	
6. Questions	<p>A number of questions have been included at section 3 above as they relate to the flow of the discussion around the project delivery timeline. Answers to those questions are marked with arrow bullets to distinguish them from the bulleted list of project delivery and other update items.</p> <p>AW asked whether any money has been released from Cambridgeshire Community Foundation (CCF) yet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PC confirmed that MVV are waiting for their lawyers to finalise the legal funding agreement between MVV and CCF. ➤ PC added that the geographical area of benefit would be a 5km radius from the centre line of the chimneys. ➤ VA explained that the funding must benefit people from that geographical area so a project outside that could receive funding if it can demonstrate that it benefits people within the area. <p>DP asked whether CCF would talk to Norfolk because the 5km radius straddles the county boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ VA confirmed that CCF already work across county boundaries and this will not be a problem. <p>MA asked whether the Air Quality Monitoring Strategy had been agreed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ GP confirmed that the proposal and specification are both agreed. The monitoring equipment has been ordered and is on its way from America (lead time of 10-12 weeks). ➤ TM stated that it is a DCO Requirement to have the equipment installed and operational before starting construction. ➤ TM added that the original requirement was for this to be in place one year before operation of the facility commences. During the Examination period of the DCO application process, it was agreed to extend this one-year period and instal the air monitoring equipment sooner. ➤ PC noted that the monitoring is mainly for the operational phase so this is an opportunity to re-establish a baseline during construction. 	
7. Any other business	<p>Andy Houghton has been employed as Community Liaison Manager, and the first employee dedicated to this project. He will be responsible for arranging site visits (amongst other things) throughout the construction and operational phases of the project.</p>	
8. Date, time and location for next meeting	<p>MVV raised the potential to hold these meetings at the construction village, once that is a viable option. This will be kept under review. Meetings are planned to be held quarterly with the next two dates proposed in September 2025 (18th) and January 2026 (22nd). The possibility of offering an option to join on Teams was discussed and welcomed.</p>	

	<p>Walsoken Village Hall was agreed to be an accessible and suitable location. Attendees were split in their preference for a daytime or an evening meeting.</p> <p><i>Post-meeting note:</i> <i>Walsoken Village Hall is not available at the earlier time on 18th September. Changing the date is more problematic than changing the venue. The next meeting will be on Thursday 18th September at The Oasis Community Centre (St. Michael's Avenue, Wisbech, PE13 3NR) from 4:30pm.</i></p>	AH
--	--	-----------

Appendices:

- 1)** Construction Traffic Management Plan (permitted routes and route restrictions)
- 2)** Operational Traffic Management Plan (permitted routes and route restrictions)