

Holmsdale  
3 Kendal Gardens  
Tockwith  
York  
YO26 7QR

☎ 01423 358588  
email: [nr.waller@btinternet.com](mailto:nr.waller@btinternet.com)

30<sup>th</sup> May 2009

Ms Victoria Perkin  
Planning Services  
Trading Standards and Planning Services  
County Hall  
Northallerton  
DL7 8AH

Dear Ms Perkins

**OBJECTION RE BCB ENERGY FROM WASTE PLANT – NY/2009/0176/FUL**

I wish you to place on record my objection to the building of the above plant. There are several issues I would wish the Council to take account of when coming to making a decision. I enumerate them below for ease of reference using the conditions the County Council says must be satisfied before approval can be granted.

1. The application forms no part of the North Yorkshire County Councils Waste and Development Framework Core Strategy and in fact the council discounts a site very near to the BCB site due to **'high adverse landscape or visual effects likely. Poor accessibility.'** The rejected site is further away from the village than BCB's proposed EfW plant. The BCB site would result in more visual impact to local residents. The accessibility is just as bad. It is effectively within a large cul-de-sac and must therefore pose a serious logistic nightmare to emergency services were there to be an incident on the Business Park. The BCB site has as far as I am aware never been considered by the NYCC for waste treatment.
2. The siting and scale of the proposal is totally inappropriate to it's location. The visual impact of the 31 metre chimney and it's emissions are close to a substantial housing development and school. The additional substation and cooling fans built alongside the hangar will also impact on the visual effect.
3. There will be an unacceptable environmental impact. The plant will use un-proven technology in this country and the product to be burnt in the furnace involves hazardous materials and the contaminated residue from the chimney emissions will fall on Tockwith village endangering health. The ash residue will also most likely be contaminated and there is no indication how this ash will be disposed of or to what degree it will be stock piled. There is no indication that there will be robust independent monitoring of emissions from either the stack or incinerators.
4. The likelihood of noxious smells coming from the operation. Waste tipped in the hangar will not be odourless, one has only to experience the smells at Rufforth to confirm this and it's seems incredulous to believe that the hangar

doors will be closed to prevent these smells when quite clearly it seems to be a drive through operation. With the usual westerly winds the village will get the brunt of these smells. The applicant has not fully explained how 'negative atmospheric pressure' works to control smells. What safe guards are in place if this operation is successful to control odious smells?

5. Noise nuisance is already a concerning factor on the Business Park with the sound of bleeping reversing lorries heard up to midnight and early morning. In a flat rural landscape this noise is heard above any ambient noise there might be. By allowing operating 24hrs, where is the justification for restricting the operation of the Biffa waste transfer site on the same business park? It will open the flood gates for other businesses to apply for the lifting of operating restrictions, creating more nuisances for residents.
6. There will be an unacceptable cumulative impact on the area, due to increased traffic and the likelihood of other businesses that operate on the business park, leaving the site if the application is approved. It is worth noting here that BCB continually refer to the Marston Business Park as an Industrial Estate when it is nothing of the sort. The Business Park is just that and used primarily for storage and technology.
7. The landscaping and the screening of the site is very limited and it will be several years before any screening is effective.
8. The applicants application uses the strap line **energy from waste** often, however, the detail of how the electricity generated can be fed into the national grid is very vague as is the promise to supply hot water to residents. Without this detail I would suggest the application is incomplete. BCB need to prove that agreement has been reached with the Electricity Company to connect to the national grid.
9. The transport links are not adequate for the development. The access roads have been considered inadequate in the NYCC's own Mineral and Waste Development Framework.
10. The environmental and amenity safeguards have not been proven by the applicant, primarily since they will be using technology that is new to this Country. They will be using toxic compounds which are highly dangerous together and the site is too near residential property to take the risk. Incineration discourages recycling and therefore moves waste management away from the highest priorities recommended at National and European level. Scientific evidence shows that incinerators of the type proposed by the applicant is not carbon neutral and is not an energy efficient process. In fact they are a worse source of carbon emissions than coal fired power stations.

I would question the technical competence of the developer who does not have experience of building or operating a gasification and power generation facility. These potentially dangerous installations require skilled managers, engineers and operators and this inexperience leads me to believe that they will not be capable of discharging their legal responsibilities in respect of health and safety, noise and pollution.

It is understood that North Yorkshire County Council has already planned for where the majority of municipal waste from the County will be dealt with. The applicant to suggest therefore that this is a 'windfall' site, comparatively close to the County

Councils own preferred site is misleading. The proximity principle cannot apply in this case as there is no definite answer as to where the municipal waste will come from. We know through BCB's own web site that some hazardous waste will come all the way from Liverpool, therefore the proximity test I would suggest fails.

I hope that the County Council takes due notice of the residents and businesses in the area who are overwhelmingly against the development.

To conclude I accept the need to reduce landfill but the building of gasification plant using technology that poses several health issues is not the 'green solution'. The District Council could improve recycling opportunities.

I urge the County Council to take recognizance of all the arguments put forward against the development and refuse the application.

**Yours sincerely**

**Norman Waller**

cc. Harrogate Borough Council  
Cllr John Savage  
Tockwith Parish Council  
Tockwith Residents Association