

SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULE

Summarised Comments received after 12/11/10			
Respondent Number	Correspondence Number	Issue	
			KEY
			Comments made by
Pub 001			Public
Com 001			Commercial organisations
PCo 001			Parish/ Town Councils
CGr 001			Campaign and Representative Groups
MPM EP 001			Member Parliament/Member of the European Parliament
PCo 015	PFI/ 283	01	Your letter of 18 October in connection with the above was considered by the Town Council at their meeting last night and I was asked to reiterate their previous comments made on 4 August.

PCo 041	PFI/ 284	01	<p>At our last meeting members asked me to contact you regarding Seamer Carr Re-cycling Plant on Dunslow Road in Scarborough. Members are concerned about the future and the knock on effect of Seamer Carr Recycling Plant if the proposals for the Allerton Incinerator go ahead.</p> <p>Members wish to invite a representative from North Yorkshire to a meeting ofParish Council to discuss the above. If this is not possible could you write a letter to me addressing the above points.</p>
Pub 107	PFI/ 285	01	The AmeyCespa proposal is for far too long 25 years & leaves too much waste 70-80% to go into the incinerator.
Pub 107	PFI/ 285	02	AmeyCespa's recent acquisition of Donarboon creates I feel an opportunity for NYCC to review the proposed contract & opt for a smaller, shorter term commitment along the lines of that in Cambridgeshire. When Cambridgeshire county council went out to tender for its long-term waste treatment contract, Donarboon proposed to extend its operations by developing a mechanical biological treatment (MBT) plant which would remove recyclable material from 179,000 tonnes of black bag waste a year and then compost it to produce a soil conditioner. This has recently opened & provides a more sustainable solution. I also feel residents can with support up their recycling to the 70% seen elsewhere in the UK & in other countries.
Pub 107	PFI/ 285	03	I still plan to send you the views of the young people in the climate change group the views above are my own as a Harrogate council tax payer. Can you please confirm where my views will be passed onto
CGr 012	PFI/ 288	01	Although NYCC explained how they had arrived at their target figures for increasing recycling to 50% + it was not stated what participation rate they had factored into the model. Please provide the participation rates that were factored into the model.
CGr 012	PFI/ 288	02	NYCC stated that there were no financial penalties to Councils for failing to achieve their GMT. Rather that any shortfall would be taken up by Amey Cespa with Commercial & Industrial waste. Please explain. Will Councils be encouraged to meet their contractual obligations to provide GMT or will they suffer no penalty as in question 2?
CGr 012	PFI/ 288	03	Will the processing of Commercial & Industrial waste be charged at the same rate as municipal waste?
CGr 012	PFI/ 288	04	On the company schematic of the plant in operation and in the Scoping Document C&I waste is shown as going direct for incineration, by-passing the Mechanical treatment plant. Why is C&I waste not being pre treated to remove the recyclable and organic factor?
CGr 012	PFI/ 288	05	Does the contract exclude the sourcing of waste from outside of the County by either the contractor or the councils?

CGr 012	PFI/ 288	06	Why is there no mention of the use of the AD digestate for land reclamation?
CGr 012	PFI/ 288	07	Recyclates from a mechanical treatment plant tend to be of a poorer quality than those collected from the kerbside. What markets are available and are they in the UK?
CGr 012	PFI/ 288	08	Who takes the risk if there are legislative changes over the 25 years; ie landfill tax on bottom ash, incinerator tax, the banning of incinerating organics?
CGr 012	PFI/ 288	09	It was explained at the meeting how particles and dioxins will be removed from any emissions through the use of filters. Please confirm the minimum size of particles that will be removed.
CGr 012	PFI/ 288	10	With regard to the figures on electricity generated at 24 MW. I understand that the industry norm is that 1MW of electricity will power @1,000 homes however you are claiming that there will be sufficient power for 40,000 homes. Please explain.
Pub 002	PFI/ 289	01	Following the correspondence and interviews reported in the press, I have a couple of supplementary questions: Who made the decision and why that AmeyCespa should only be asked to tender for an Incinerator?
Pub 002	PFI/ 289	02	Were any of the requests for tender in relation to any other method of dealing with the waste than incineration?
Pub 002	PFI/ 289	03	Bearing in mind that a large amount of the total price of this contract relates to interest, is there any clause within the contract that permits AmeyCespa to increase the price to NYCC in the event of an interest rise?
Pub 122	PFI/ 290	01	I write to protest against the current NYCC waste strategy proposals They are based on unrealistic targets for recycling that overlay the financial case for a single 'super-facility' for the entire county. They are misleading because recycling rate will be much higher than predicted, with the result that landfill costs will drop significantly
Pub 122	PFI/ 290	02	The strategy is based on old technologies, including incineration, which has one of the highest levels of CO2 emissions
Pub 122	PFI/ 290	03	It ignores the new Government's commitments to a massive increase in recycling as well as its plans for an immediate review of all waste management strategies
Pub 122	PFI/ 290	04	And it ignores the public's views of today, instead relying on consultations completed several years ago.

Pub 122	PFI/ 290	05	I understand that you will be asked to vote in favour of the Council's plans later this year. I urge you to oppose this plan and instead ask for a thorough review of the best way forward. In particular I ask that you push for a big increase in recycling, thus removing the need for such a colossally expensive and risky venture.
Pub 122	PFI/ 290	06	At a time of deep Government spending cuts it would be irresponsible to continue the current strategy without careful review .
Pub 122	PFI/ 290	07	For your information, please find enclosed photomontages of the proposed incinerator taken by ArneyCespa. These are the views which will affect the Clareton residents -the top picture being the view from our garden
Pub 123	PFI/ 291	01	We cannot continue to use landfill for reasons that are well known to all. Recycling needs to increase in this area and many other parts of the U.K. The proposed solution to take out a contract with ArneyCespa raises a number of concerns.
Pub 123	PFI/ 291	02	Health -Are emissions safe and will they be controlled"?
Pub 123	PFI/ 291	03	Environmental - The visual impact will be a massive blot on the rural landscape far more obvious from all points of the compass than first suggested. Traffic will Increase.
Pub 123	PFI/ 291	04	Financial - The cost of the project to the tax payer. PFI's are expensive. Large profits taken by the developers. This solution is on a scale much larger than is required. When recycling increases the Incinerator will have to be fed by sourcing waste from elsewhere.
Pub 123	PFI/ 291	05	We hope that you are aware that there is a large groundswell of opposition to this project. North Yorkshire Action Group www.nywag.org can provide you with further information on the financial folly of this venture.
Pub 123	PFI/ 291	06	The Allerton Park Site could still be used for waste disposal on a smaller scale without the outdated process of incineration. I am sure that you will be aware that there are Incinerators within easy reach that are underused and could be considered by NYCC if necessary
Pub 123	PFI/ 291	07	We understand that you will be asked to vote in favour of the Council's plans at a meeting in December. You will know that our local MPs Andrew Jones and are against this project. We urge you to oppose this plan and instead ask for a thorough review on the best way forward
Pub 124	PFI/ 292	01	. I am writing to you to ask you to please vote against the proposal to build an incinerator at Allerton Park.

Pub 124	PFI/ 292	02	The issue of penalties incurred by exceeding landfill limits are of course important, but I do not consider that this proposal is the only option, or even that it is better than incurring them.
Pub 124	PFI/ 292	03	I am appalled by the admission by AmeyCespa, dragged out of them eventually, that they in fact would be burning 80% of waste brought to them, with 20% supposedly recycled, but only if they could make a profit from recycling the remaining 20%. If they could not make a profit this 20% would also be incinerated bringing the figure to 100% incineration, Their pledge to be sorting the rubbish and removing 'recyc1ates' seems a little thin, To me this is all the more shocking, as I know from personal experience that once you genuinely remove everything from your rubbish that can be recycled, there is in fact, very little left. So, if recycling were something that North Yorkshire County Council was really serious about, there could be very little sent to landfill, and no need for an incinerator.
Pub 124	PFI/ 292	04	I have done a lot of research into the health risks of living near to an incinerator, and I am not at all happy at being so close to the one proposed for Allerton Park. I am very concerned about the dioxins and particulates that are undeniably produced by these facilities falling on myself, my family and on the fields around us where our food is grown.
Pub 124	PFI/ 292	05	In addition, what sort of a "Welcome to North Yorkshire" will the giant chimney for this incinerator make, sited as it is on the main artery to Yorkshire and the north? What does it say for the value we place on this beautiful part of the country that we can put something so industrial, dirty, ugly and huge at its entrance? Not only this, but it will mar the wonderful vistas to be seen such as from the top of the white horse, so unspoilt and marvellous as they are now.
Pub 124	PFI/ 292	06	I am not impressed by the electricity generation element of this proposal. This is not a sustainable way of electricity production. The emphasis in this area needs to be on cleaner ways of generating, and more efficient use of electricity.
Pub 124	PFI/ 292	07	I think the proposal for an incinerator at Allerton Park is a big, giant step in the wrong direction. At a time when we need to be looking to reduce what we use in the first place, and re-use and recycle as much as possible, this proposal locks the whole of North Yorkshire in to the production of waste as a raw material for the next 25 years. It is an absolute disincentive to reduce waste and to recycle. This is simply an unacceptable position to take at a time when environmental issues are of such global importance.
Pub 124	PFI/ 292	08	Please do not vote for this proposal because there appears to be no alternative at the present time. 'Plan B' is the status quo while a better, more sustainable, socially and environmentally acceptable solution can be devised .
Pub 125	PFI/ 293	01	I fully understand the proposal does solve problem in that it will dispose of waste without landfill but what is the REAL cost?
Pub 125	PFI/ 293	02	Why is its capacity so large?

Pub 125	PFI/ 293	03	Why has no attempt been made to recycle more?
Pub 125	PFI/ 293	04	Can you be sure about the long term health and environmental consequences?
Pub 125	PFI/ 293	05	The impact of moving all the waste from all over the county to this site is a grey area -its scale and location in rural countryside are quite out of order. Why burn the waste when it could be used as fuel for the new power station at Ferrybridge?
Pub 125	PFI/ 293	06	Finally and above all look behind the very professional presentation on the money issue and do the figures for yourself-do please check it out carefully and you will see you will be using public money to process commercial waste and the cost of this project and the savings are not what they seem! To agree might have been viable in 2005-it isn't now. You should be broad minded enough to ditch your PFI funding and find a more imaginative and cost effective solution. Future generations will thank you for your courage to think for yourself on this very complex issue
Pub 126	PFI/ 294	01	We live at ... and from my house I do not want to look out onto the incinerator. Please don't build it. This will be our future. My sister and I don't want it to go ahead. I am 9 yrs old and it will be here for long after me. Please say no to the incinerator
Pub 126	PFI/ 294	02	It will cost a lot more pocket money than I have got so it will be better to recycle
Pub 109	PFI/ 295	01	There are many concerns shared by the residents affected by this scheme. I realise that for the meeting in December the main consideration is purely the financial figures and I'll address that aspect. The incinerator will have a capacity massively exceeding what is required. The projected waste figures are out of date and fail to take into account any increase in recycling or waste reduction (despite the latter being a key Government target). This will mean that NYCC will have to import waste to feed the incinerator, something which has happened at our Councils unwise enough to adopt incineration. How on earth is that in the best interests of the people of North Yorkshire. The anticipated increases in landfill tax have no basis in fact and yet the project fails to take into account any impact potential from other taxation e.g. on CO2 generation which could come into play thereby undermining the project financial viability The ineptitude of Councils throughout North Yorkshire on their poor handling of recycling gives me no confidence that you will achieve anything like the £320M savings. The history of PFI funding is hardly a glorious one, as has been shown in a recent Audit Commission Report.
Pub 109	PFI/ 295	02	Given that the Government will be consulting on the national waste disposal strategy early in 2011 it seems insane for NYCC to sign us up to a £1Bn mortgage.

Pub 109	PFI/ 295	03	Why are NYCC the only rural authority considering incineration?
Pub 109	PFI/ 295	04	Why has York banned incineration within its city boundaries?
Pub 099	PFI/ 296	01	North Yorkshire has undoubtedly a big challenge in dealing with its waste, which has been not been helped by poor recycling facilities and hence poor recycling rates particularly in the Harrogate Borough
Pub 099	PFI/ 296	02	North Yorkshire needs to be dealing with its waste in a way which is financially sound, and uses the waste hierarchy as a guide to its waste strategy; firstly continually striving to reduce waste in the first instance, secondly facilitating reuse and repair to prevent waste and thirdly to recycle waste so it can be used in manufacturing once again. Using the principles of the waste hierarchy correctly will help reduce costs associated with dealing with waste, will reduce the need for transportation of waste, processing waste, will save energy, will reduce greenhouse gases and other pollutants associated with landfill.
Pub 099	PFI/ 296	03	I am however very concerned about the proposals put forward by North Yorkshire county council and AmeyCespa's planned Allerton park waste site. On the basis of evidence I have read Incineration is not a sustainable option either in financial terms and certainly not environmentally.
Pub 099	PFI/ 296	04	Incineration creates toxic fly ash. Although modern incinerators doubtlessly produce less toxins in chimney emissions compared to older incinerators, more toxins are transferred into the fly ash instead. This ash has to be land-filled or spread on land, just moving the toxins elsewhere, rather than eliminating them. The toxins could then leach into the water table. Such toxicity problems don't occur if this waste is recycled or composted instead.

Pub 099	PFI/ 296	05	<p>From a climate change perspective, most worrying is the greenhouse gases produced by incineration. To a large extent incinerators burn fossils fuels, because of the plastics burnt, which are of course oil derived. Alan Walgate of Goldsborough Parish council calculates using median carbon dioxide emissions from incinerators that CO2 emissions from the incinerator will be 300,000 tonnes per year, possibly raising by 2035, to well over 300,000 tonnes per annum.</p> <p>Waste production makes up a small but non the less significant part of the UK's green house gas emissions, 3.6% in 2008 .</p> <p>A Friends of the Earth (FOE) report calculates that incinerators emit 33% more fossil fuel derived Carbon dioxide than gas fired power stations. By 2020 FOE calculates that electricity only incinerators (which Allerton Park would be, as opposed to combined heat and power incinerators) will emit "78% more fossil CO2 than gas fired power stations and only around 5 per cent less than coal-fired power stations"³, given projections that plastics will make up more of household waste by 2020.</p> <p>Another 2008 report by three American NGOs takes a life cycle approach to incineration and suggests that contrary to many waste operators claims that waste incineration is carbon neutral, the truth is far from it. Most waste has high embodied energy (mostly fossil fuel derived energy) from its growth and production and is therefore not carbon neutral; some products which are burned will also be contributing to deforestation. It report also says that incinerating products discourages more recycling and therefore creates more demand for natural resources and their subsequent products which creates more greenhouse gases in the extraction and production. The report concludes "The bottom line is that tremendous opportunities for greenhouse gas reductions are lost when a material is incinerated"</p>
Pub 099	PFI/ 296	06	<p>Incinerators need to be continually fed waste to keep the power output constant. If, as should be the aim, household waste continues to be reduced the AmeyCespa have stated that they would then use commercial waste. I think this is problematic for the same reasons the above reports mention, that businesses would then recycle less and therefore energy and greenhouse gases savings couldn't happen.</p>

Pub 099	PFI/ 296	07	<p>Another issue is health concerns over emissions. Of particular concern are Dioxins, one of the mostly harmful toxins to Human health. These are released by incinerators and long term exposure in the wind fall area would be damaging to human health. Also particulate matter PM2.5 and PM10 are carcinogens, there is no know safe level of these particulates. So when as claimed, the emissions are regulated by the Environment Agency, safe regulation of particulate emissions isn't actually occurring. As Dr. Keith Rowell a former World Health Organisation authority on respiratory disease stated, long term exposure to these particulates can lead to a number of respiratory diseases 5.</p> <p>With a good wind these pollutants will be well dispersed, but the vale of York often experiences little wind and temperature inversions, when pollutants will quickly sink to ground level. People visiting the area or passing through will be little affected but for those who are residents in the Vale of York in the prevailing wind direction over 20 years or so people will be to suffering the effects of the dioxins and particulate matter which they have inhaled.</p> <p>AmeyCespa have sought to alay fears about air pollution by correctly stating that the Health Protection Agency and Environment Agency do monitor and regulate incinerators. However the regulation will only really safe guard peoples short term health, as with vehicle pollution near roads, those whom live close by suffer respiratory illnesses over a prolonged period of time and regulation of course evolves over decades in response to health studies and scientific findings.</p>
Pub 099	PFI/ 296	08	<p>I am surprised that this scheme with incineration as a central aspect, has claimed to be the option with the biggest cost savings. I would have thought a scheme which maximised recycled and Anerobic Digestion would be far more cost efficient if health costs and the different environmental costs are factored in, as recommended in planning guidance. I doubt the waste strategy or the business plan has done such a vigorous cost benefit analysis because it had I am sure incineration would not be a central part of this plan.</p>
Pub 099	PFI/ 296	09	<p>As many others have commented in the local press, the county council officers or Amey Cespa seem to have got some of their figures incorrect with regards to the amount of municipal waste which is predicted for coming years. The approximate current municipal waste is 470,000 tonnes for North Yorkshire. There have been claims that waste in the county has gone up. However this more likely to be due with waste streams, being moved. For example the introduction of a home, garden waste collections would have produced figures which would have made it look like waste was increasing, when in fact it meant less people having to go to their local tips such as Stonefall in Harrogate, so overall household waste is unlikely to have risen. Indeed DEFRA's on figures show that household waste has been decreasing since 2006, from 2008/09 to 2009/10 there was a 2.7% decrease in waste. The plans for the Allerton Waste recovery park raise questions of over capacity right from the start, with average recycling rates in the county of 45%, 211,500 tonnes out of the 470,000 is recycled, leaving 258,500 black bin waste. So why is the facility and the incinerator being built to handle a total of 320,000 tonnes? Its certainly not because household waste is going up because the figures shows its not and neither is DEFRA predicting it will be</p>

Pub 099	PFI/ 296	10	I conclude that incineration should be excluded from a waste plan on the many grounds I have covered.
Pub 099	PFI/ 296	11	<p>An Alternative solution Friends of Earth says that by 2020 the UK should be aiming for a recycling rate of 70% by 2020, which will have a large impact in reducing greenhouse emissions, create thousands of new jobs and help us on the path to a zero waste or closed loop economy 6. Indeed the current target which is 50% recycling may be revised upwards to 70% by the Government when their waste strategy is produced in the spring.</p> <p>A zero waste society should be one which we aspire to. It is surely desirable for society, to try to eliminate landfill as much as possible and have no need for incineration. It is also desirable because it will help create a closed loop economy where waste is not seen as waste but it is used as resource to manufacture new goods, such an economy would create more jobs as would a waste facility in North Yorkshire with recycling rates of 70% or more .</p> <p>Recycling rates of 70% and higher are technically possible now, Flanders in Belgium already recycles over 70% 6. At the University of Leeds, Premier Waste the Universities waste contractor recycles over 90% of Universities waste, which just shows what is actually possible. The high recycling rate is partly because there is a separate collection for Food waste which means the majority of organic waste can be put into an Anerobic Digester (AD).</p>
Pub 099	PFI/ 296	12	<p>A strength of the current proposal is the plan for an anaerobic digester which would handle 40,000 tonnes per annum. Anaerobic Digestion, produces low carbon electricity (much lower than incineration) and produces a compost which can be used on farms or in gardens. However 40,000 tonnes out of a total of 470,000 is only 8.5%, or 12% of Dust Bin waste (excluding kerbside recycling), this seems a much too small amount. Figures from waste studies from 2000-2005 show that food waste makes up between 15-20% of waste from Dust Bins. If the county council had a more joined up approach and asked local authorities to implement a separate food collection then potentially up to 20% of dust bin waste could be put into an Anaerobic Digester. This step alone would substantially increase recycling rates, in a relatively small amount of time.</p> <p>As well as AD, recycling more types of plastics, cardboard, more paper types at local authority level or at the size by using the latest mechanical machines could increase recycling of materials substantially more than is currently planned. Additional recycling planned of 20,000 of dustbin waste equates to a mere 4.3% extra of total household waste. Although Arney Cespa state the opposite, the planned facility would without a doubt be burning waste which could be recycled. At least 70% of waste can be recycled now, with more waste types predicted to become economic to recycle in the future with rising oil and natural resource prices.</p>

Pub 099	PFI/ 296	13	<p>Together a materials recovery facility and an anaerobic digester create an anaerobic mechanical biological treatment (Anaerobic MBT) facility, these can significantly reduce landfill whilst avoiding all the ill effects incineration. Indeed in Friends of the Earths' analysis of all waste management options Anaerobic MTB is the most beneficial for the environment even though it would involve a small percentage of residual waste going to landfill (which would reduce over years) as more things can be recycled.</p>
Pub 099	PFI/ 296	14	<p>It is not too late for you to change the county's waste strategy and direction. I strongly believe on the evidence I have seen that incineration is clearly not a technology of tomorrow and mechanical biological treatment is now the technology to use. I ask you to reject the current proposals in favour of a more radical waste strategy based on waste reduction and increasing recycling rates to at least 70% by 2020, including more emphasis on anaerobic digestion, which would deliver better environmental and financial outcomes.</p> <p>I realise you are not my county councillor, but I have sought to provide you with information from a local perspective, which I hope will give you enough information to reject this proposed waste strategy and support a different waste strategy outlined here.</p>
Pub 002	PFI/ 297	01	<p>Why is it that a Conservative council is attempting to push through this contract in the month prior to the introduction to the House of Commons the new strategy for waste that the Party has been developing and that may be in conflict with the said strategy?</p>
Pub 002	PFI/ 297	02	<p>In the Knaresborough Post Mr Jarvis of AmeyCespa is reported as saying that AmeyCespa were only requested to tender an incineration solution for the NYCC waste disposal contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is this correct? Were any other solutions considered and/or tenders requested? If not, why not?
Pub 002	PFI/ 297	03	<p>In a report prepared by the Parish Council of Marton-cum-Grafton (hereinafter referred to as "Marton"), it was shown that the figures used to prepare the request for tender are significantly incorrect.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Are the NYCC or the Marton figures correct? If the NYCC figures are correct, which of the various sets of figures put forward by NYCC do you say are correct since NYCC appear to have been using different sets of figures at different times at in different presentations and how are they substantiated? If the Marton figures are correct, the basic business case for the contract is clearly flawed and, as such, the terms of the contract need to be re-negotiated so that the facilities created are more appropriate for dealing with the revised level of waste. Is this occurring and if not, why not

Pub 002	PFI/ 297	04	Bearing in mind the technological developments currently taking place, especially in relation to, inter alia, the extraction of oil from plastic, it appears that to lock into a 25 year contract relating to technology that will be, by the time that the plant is built be dated, with no realistic break clause is commercially unacceptable. How does NYCC justify this?
Pub 002	PFI/ 297	05	I have been unable to access any data or information that indicates that AmeyCespa has a adequate experience or a proven track record within the business. Perhaps you would be kind enough to let me know how they justified their tender in this respect.
Pub 002	PFI/ 297	06	There is considerable concern over the Ferrovia SA connection because: a. It has an unsustainable debt: equity ratio (in excess of 500%); b. It has incurred the very substantial losses made in 2008, 2009 and 2010 (to date) c. It is currently trying to sell 10% of its stake in BAA so as to pay down a very small part of its debt but more importantly in order to justify the carrying value of the remainder of its stake in BAA which, if it fails will result in further write-offs
Pub 002	PFI/ 297	07	All of these imply that it is likely to breach its banking covenants. Per se this will not impact NYCC although the existence of a contract for in excess of £1 billion makes the joint venture a likely candidate for early sale. Have terms been written into the contract under which termination of the contract can be triggered in the event of a change in beneficial ownership in order to protect NYCC's interest?
Com 007	PFI/ 298	01	We would like to update our website with details of this project for our subscribers. Please can you confirm when financial close for the authority and Amey/Cespa consortium is due? Also, please can you confirm the names of the legal, technical and financial advisers assisting North Yorkshire County Council on the project?
Pub 127	PFI/ 299	01	Could you please send me by email a copy of the working group report on this subject which I understand is now available for public inspection.
Pub 128	PFI/ 300	01	I understand that this report is now available. Could you please send me 1 hard copy a.s.a.p.
Pub 113	PFI/ 301	01	If you could clarify please, does this mean that if councillors approve the contract, work starts straight away or are the planning issue to still then to be resolved?
Pub 113	PFI/ 301	02	Also you make no mention about the comparison in height between Knabbs Ridge Wind Farm and the proposed chimney height. Surely a better comparison would be the physical height of the chimney compared with each other notable structures in the region... York Minster come to mind, or maybe graphic impressions of the views of the chimney with the billowing smoke from different areas around the County...ie the top of Sutton Bank as well as local views.

Pub 113	PFI/ 301a	01	<p>I would be pleased if you would forward my concerns to them. (Re PFI301). Re the planning and my concerns re conflict of interest - are any of the members who vote for or against this contract being awarded also representatives on the NYCC Planning Committee?</p>
Pub 129	PFI/ 302	01	<p>Comment received relating to the proposed North Selby mine Development referencing Allerton Park (Planning permission is being sought by a Joint Venture (UK Coal, Peel Group and Science City, York) for a plant that burns commercial and industrial waste in order to produce electricity and steam):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Coal has put in an application for the North Selby Site to be used as an 'Energy from Waste' site and claims it has the support of York City Council. Why then has both York City Council and North Yorkshire Council chosen an old quarry site on the A1 at Allerton Park and are currently proceeding towards their preferred location for an 'Energy from Waste' operation, which they say will divert 230,000 tonnes away from landfill which is 90% of that currently sent to landfill. Where therefore is the 190,000 tonnes of waste referred to in this Joint Venture proposal coming from? • York City and North Yorkshire Councils should talk to Drax again about taking the Region's waste via train to meet N. Yorks landfill targets. There is also a site at Seal Sands for the North of the Region. The expertise is already there at those locations. To allow new incineration plants to be installed anywhere by anyone is irresponsible. We have a beautiful City and County let us keep it that way. • The financial incentive for the installation of incinerators as in this case is clear. These projects will give a very high return on investment virtually guaranteed by Government. They therefore can be put anywhere suitable. We as home owners will still be paying for them in the form of higher electricity costs and higher disposal costs.

Pub 129	PFI/ 302a	01	<p><u>Ref: Allerton Park Waste Recovery Plant</u></p> <p>An article in the Darlington and Stockton newspaper on 25/11/2010 said that the Council would save a huge sum of money by allowing this plant to be built.</p> <p>The landfill tax was introduced to divert waste from landfill but the incinerator companies (see WRAP report of July 2010 on gate fees) charge in all cases more than the £70 (includes landfill tax at £48 per tonne) for your size of plant: 230,000 tonnes. So basically instead of the Government getting the landfill tax the private owner effectively receives a sum equal to it. This is of the order of £11 million per year lost tax.</p> <p>Secondly, the government subsidies result in higher electricity costs (from your proposal the private company will receive about £35 per MW-hr more than the current wholesale price) so this gives a further £11 million per year to the private Company from us.</p> <p>Thirdly the EU is currently deciding the carbon tax to be levied on carbon dioxide emissions of which this plant will emit more than 420,000 tonnes. The private company will no doubt charge us for this burden also.</p> <p>In short you will be costing us a lot more for our waste disposal by incineration (unless you have negotiated gate fees of only £22 /tonne).</p>