
Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

About to build housing right up to the other side of the road from vc cooke

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? Fumes, smell,

global warming

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

No, vc cooke are buch of half arsed so and sos that won't follow the rules

Q5

Respondent skipped this question

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient?

Please clarify:

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

This would be far too close to the town of beccles worlingham and barnby

Q1

No

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons no

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

I have no concerns.

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations? No

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

No

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

I support this project.

Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

Worlingham Primary School

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

I think that there is a significant health risk of having an incinerator near a primary school. I also feel strongly that this would be negative for the health of people in the nearby area, there are many houses nearby and this includes my home. We do not feel comfortable being polluted by an incinerator.

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

I feel that the incinerator should not be within this local area. It should be moved to an area that does not have houses, eating establishments and schools nearby that can be impacted by the pollution.

Respondent skipped this question

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

Respondent skipped this question

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

Q1**Yes**

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

Apart from the pollution impact on farmland there are schools and a proposed enormous housing estate planned in tge immediate vicinity.

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

However monitored the pollution levels are agriculture from surrounding fields will be adversely affected and should the new housing estate come to fruition housing would be most unappealing in tge shadow of the enormous chimney.

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

Maximum utilisation of waste reduction, reuse, recycling and composting to change the characteristics of the incinerated materials.

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

No

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

The general area in question already has a crematorium and biogas plant exuding noxious particles into the environment. I believe the proposed area does not require any extra environmental pollutant industry. We cannot blight this beautiful area by placing all undesirable industries in one small area.

Q1**Yes**

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

Sensitive areas or communities are subjective as any area where residents live, work or educated would be considered sensitive. The question is obtuse.

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

Beccles is a market town and businesses like this simply industrialised the whole area. Like anything once Suffolk CC allow this, what stops any other atmosphere fouling industries to set up shop?

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

Move it to Lowestoft near the sea. Preferably near Birds Eye who will be providing some of the waste. No abatement methods would be enough for Beccles.

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

The information submitted is subjective depending on whether you are a resident or the owner of this For Profit Company. I have been stonewalled each time an objection has been raised.

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

CSS Renewables caused great concern at the last public meeting by claiming the 2008 Climate Change Act was obsolete. If the supplier of the American Incinerator is making these claims, what hope is there for any truth and integrity in this project? This does not benefit the people of Beccles only the profits of VC Cooke and the associated suppliers. Councils are lawfully bound to the people not individual businesses.

Q1

No

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

There are no issues with any areas near the site. The plans are very robust.

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

None.

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

The pollution control is industry standard and follows BREF / BAT. We are very happy with the plans. Much better than landfill and HGV vehicles on local roads.

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

Not that we can see.

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

The scheme is a great way to deal with waste and generate clean electricity.

Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

No

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? No

concerns

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations? No

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify: None

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

Is good for environment

Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

No

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? No

concerns

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations? No

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify: None

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

Think this would be a good thing as would be better for the environment.

Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

No

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? None

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations? No

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

No

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

This is better for the environment than landfill

Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

No

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? No

concerns

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations? None

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify: N/a

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

More should be built to deal with the dreadful waste that is filling our land and exposes us to toxic methane gas!!

Q1

No

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

No all areas have been considered as part of the attached documents

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? None

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

No I think it is a great use of waste which is currently being directed to landfill which will cause further environmental issues further down the line

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

No

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

I think it is a great idea to ensure local energy security whilst reducing landfill and the future effects of landfill on the area. In addition it will also provide source of energy for the garden village which is being built.

Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

None

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? None

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations? None

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

No

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

None

Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

NONE

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

I have read the planning reports and visited the public meeting by VC Cooke and they have answered all my concerns.

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

It all looks very professional to me.

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

Not that I can see.

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

Its about time someone did something better with waste than dumping it in the ground. Fair play to VC Cooke.

Q1

No

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

Not in my opinion. The planning process seemed very thorough.

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

I have no concerns.

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

Having looked at the plans and compared to those on the internet the project looks very professional.

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

No, not that I can see.

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

I am glad someone is doing something about landfill in our area.

Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

No

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? No

concerns

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations? No

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

No

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

None

Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

NO

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

I have no concerns; the technical reports on the proposal indicate insignificant levels of impact.

Q4

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations? No

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

No

Q6

Do you have any other comments?

Impact assessments are thorough and there can be no grounds for objecting to this proposal

Q1

Yes

Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments)

Q2

Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

storage of the ash at Ley Plant as this is closer to the Worlingham Estates - if left outside, this could lead to air pollution as this blows into the housing areas.

Q3

What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

air pollution, water course pollution and noise pollution.

Real concerns about noise and air/smells as I live in the Worlingham estates [REDACTED]

What noise and air filtration systems will be in place to ensure environmental impact and impact on daily lives is minimised?

Will the system be running overnight as currently the area is very quiet even after the bypass opened, so this needs to remain the same.

Q4

Respondent skipped this question

Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

Q5

Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

how is the emitted gases scrubbed to reduce odours?

Q6

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any other comments?

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

Cucumber Lane, Church Road (Ellough), site of 1400 potential properties to the north of the development site next to the Southern Relief Road

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

Agricultural land affected for food quality, hi density of future human population in the near environs, further detrimental development of the area/site for non-housing or non-agricultural use.

Also the impact of the odour from the site - as per the AD plant at Ello9ugh - whilst the output does not smell, the storage of the waste does... mitigation required to reduce the overall affect on the locus

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

More mitigation in terms of burn, times, data available to locals, "green impact" levy of some description - planting of more trees/woodland to benefit the local area

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

Insufficient in impact of the stored materials prior to the burning and the time of the spent waste at the end of the burning process being in place - "wetting down" systems to reduce dust and odour put in place etc as not clarified in the plans

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

This is a little too close to proposed development of housing, schools and shops for the future growth of Beccles, Worlingham and Ellough as well as the increased perception that this industrial site is ready for growth from this. A better site for this would be on the South Lowestoft Industrial Estate close to the existing SCC / FCC MRF - transportation of waste inland and away from main transportation routes seems a little short-sighted. Beccles and Worlingham as a community has limited direction to geographically grow and expand - South and East are the primary options and eventually this estate will be in the centre of residential development with an 80m chimney and the odour of stored and burning waste to contend with. There is seemingly no reference to the lifespan of the plant, the sharing of data by the plant regards environmental impact (once open), safeguards in place for events where burns exceed environmental controls, whether the local authority will have the ability to stop the site if environmental controls are not met, whether this will be the maximum permitted EFW facility being able to operate from this site, whether the site currently has enough waste presently entering the site to keep it functioning, whether the waste will be local to the area or shipped in from further afield (outside East Suffolk boundaries) and the impact of the smell of stored waste prior to burning.

The River Hundred is within 1km of the development, woodland and farming is a part of the local vernacular, kites, deer and other impacted wildlife need to be safeguarded. Distribution of the heat and electricity has not been discussed - will there need to be a transfer station, transponders, pylons, underground cables...

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

What about the proposed 1500 homes to be built in close proximity to the incinerator.

Surely this has been considered during the application process.

It was only recently 2020/2021 that there was a large fire at the same site.

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

Proposed construction of the 1500 houses

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

Site it elsewhere, by the biofuel site or somewhere away from any residential property.

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify: Unsure

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

None

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

Not to my knowledge

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

No guarantee that inappropriate materials won't be incinerated.

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

Not enough consideration has been given to where the fumes from this plant will spread to.

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

No

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

Wrong place and don't trust V.C.Cooke to operate this plant appropriately.

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

SSSIs RAMSAR sites North Cove Reserve, Barnby Broad, Castle Marsh, Carlton Marsh, Sprat's Water within 4 Km of prevailing S westerly wind. Fog and mists trapping emissions from stack not been considered

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

Build up of toxic pollutants in air, on land and in water courses on Ellough moor draining down into SSSIs, Ramsar sites and also on residents and schools in the surrounding local areas

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

Don't issue an environmental permit which would be against cleaner air and toxins would build up on surrounding land where crops are grown and animals graze and parks where children play

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

Yes emissions from stack. effect on the health of the environment (State of Nature report 2023) ignored. Health of residents especially the vulnerable including children in the surrounding schools with asthma and already using inhalers

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

Do not issue an environmental permit

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

There was a lot of hot air at the recent public meeting, where some people just behaved appallingly. The VC Cooke site is in an industrial area, dealing with waste and it has done for years. Anyone who knows the area knows it is up there. I have looked at the planning files and had some questions about noise and dust but they were answered in full to my mind. The new garden village, if that ever actually gets built (pie in the sky project) will need heat and power so across the road looks like a good place to start.

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

None. It is already an industrial area and its not the fault of the company if they now want to build houses up there. There is already a solar farm and business units up there. Its not as though you will see much change apart from a stack that will be painted grey.

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

Again a lot of hot air from the meeting. If you actually can be bothered to look at the proposal, rather than bluster, you can see that they are required, by LAW, to treat the emissions properly, its not like they can just burn anything they like - is it?

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

I listened to the bloke from CSS, when it was possible for him to get a word in, and then followed up looking at the planning files. It looks like a very thorough project to my eyes. Half the mob round here couldn't be bothered to look at the reports. I hear they got people from miles away to complain.

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

Doing something with local waste is better than shipping it miles away with HGV's. There will be less of those and landfill is just not great is it?

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) No

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

No as the VC Cooke site is already in an industrial area up in Ellough.

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

None - at all. The planning reports covered all the areas in good detail - still not enough for the NIMBY crowd though. They object to everything.

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

None. Looks a clever piece of kit.

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

None. The company who prepped the pack look competent.

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

It's about time we just get things done around here. Too much getting blocked - like the future. It's all well and good for retired folks to complain but younger people need to get on with it.

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) No

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

children

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? My concerns are the environment generally

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

Alternatives to incineration - better recycling/composting in the first instance. Also, consideration of the use of wax worms as an environmentally friendly way of dealing with plastic waste

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify: Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Do you have any other comments? Respondent skipped this question

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

Local schools and planned housing adjacent to the new road

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? Respondent skipped this question

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations? That the incinerator is moved elsewhere

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

The impact on the local area appears to be quite limited - There are a number of houses listed as part of the environmental study which is by no means comprehensive.

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

- The incinerator will be another addition to the air pollution in the local area (considering we have the bio-fuel and crematorium locally already). We also have multiple businesses in the industrial area in Ellough - exacerbating the traffic problem still further.

- Although the planning application was granted, I'm not satisfied that the level of consultation was sufficient. If it had been a small extension to a house or something similar, the usual notices would probably have been sufficient, but as this is something quite significant so I believe the initial planning application should have been more widely publicised. I only found out about this several months later via the local news on the BBC news app. The significance of this is that the ability to reject the licence is much less than what would have been available than during the planning application. This means that local views are less likely to have been taken into consideration (although I appreciate this may meet the consultation requirements, it doesn't really meet with the spirit of the requirements, especially considering the significance)

- In their licence application, VC Cooke state that they wish to incinerate 24/7 - while they have said it will be only on-site waste so there will be no additional traffic, I'm not confident that this will be the case in reality. As a business, I'm sure it will wish to operate as much as possible so if there's insufficient waste to burn of their own, I'm sure they will take it from elsewhere too. If this additional traffic is coming from Lowestoft, it's likely that they'll bring it via Hulver rather than use the new road.

-- There are a significant volume of houses planned to be built adjacent to the new road. Having an incinerator on their doorstep can't be conducive to health (even if there are various filters to minimise the impact of the toxic output). There are also local schools which will be exposed to the toxic output.

- We are now only able to object based on the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 - under Part B, Pollution causing offence to a human sense. There is likely to be both noise and light pollution, together with whatever toxic output we end up breathing in, which I believe must meet the requirements of causing offence to human sense.

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

There are many businesses in close proximity who have invested millions expanding their operations creating jobs for local people who need "quiet" and "fresh", "clean" air in their business premises and don't need anything to detract from the massive investments they have already made.

I would like to point out there was a major fire in August 2020 at VC Cooke which burnt out the main process building where 19 fire appliances and 60 fire fighters from all over Norfolk and Suffolk attended and found stacks of RDF all over the place blocking their ability to fire fight in fact employees of VC Cooke were called in to operate diggers to clear the waste out of the way to enable the fire to be brought under control this is most unsatisfactory and concerning? has the company an adequate Fire Policy in action now?

Should you be granting this company an Environmental Permit.

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

Beccles and the surrounding areas are part of the Broads with several important sites within the 2km zone and several SSSI sites a little further away. The immediate proposed site for the Beccles & Worlingham Neighbourhood Garden Development is right opposite the proposed incinerator this site has outline planning for 1250 houses and a new school the noise and smell and particulates emitted 24 hours a day are not going to be attractive to house developers and the likelihood of this scheme ever being built will be put in great jeopardy by granting the applicant an Environmental Permit.

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

The Noise receptors appear to be located along from the facility.

I understand that at December 2022 there were 57 incinerators in operation with a further 18 under construction increasing the capacity from 17.52 Million Tonnes to 23.24 Million Tonnes in the year end 2020/2021 only 12.5 Million Tonnes of RDF was burnt which means we already have an oversupply of incinerators. Why grant another in these circumstances especially as there is so much public opposition?

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

Lorry movements not declared assumed with 2,730 tonnes of ash p.a. this will require approx three lorries a week but the RDF waste refuse lorries coming in approx 24,369 tonnes p.a. which will equate to say 19 lorries a week is 4 lorries a day in total realistic or does waste water need to be removed from site etc?

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

I do not support the granting of an environmental licence

Reasons being Incinerators are in complete contravention to the Government Green targets to reduce CO2 emissions, we need to move away from burning and releasing CO2. It should be noted burning one tonne of hard plastic emits 3.667 tonnes of carbon dioxide CO2.

I understand that at December 2022 there were 57 incinerators in operation with a further 18 under construction increasing the capacity from 17.52 Million Tonnes to 23.24 Million Tonnes in the year end 2020/2021 only 12.5 Million Tonnes of RDF was burnt which means we already have an oversupply of incinerators. Why grant another in these circumstances especially as there is so much public opposition?

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2-Q6 Respondent skipped this question

Page 1

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons Respondent skipped this question

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land? Respondent skipped this question

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations? Respondent skipped this question

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify: Respondent skipped this question

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

There is increasing concern about the health risks from small particulates of size PM 2.5. These are a risk to health because being so small, they can easily get into the lungs and bloodstream. It is concern about PM 2.5 particulates that has led to recent restrictions on wood burning stoves.

We asked the EHOs at the consultation session about these particulates, and they said, if I understood them correctly, that the current regulations under which they will consider the licence application is concerned with PM 10 particulates and it is these which will be monitored. We asked what could be done, and they said contact DEFRA. While this may be accurate, it seems to me that to consider a licence under regulations which are known to be out of date in an important respect may be bureaucratically correct, but may be putting local populations at risk.

We are also concerned about monitoring of the 'Refuse Derived Fuel' which will be used by the incinerator. Unfortunately the EHO at the consultation meeting was unable to tell us anything about what this RDF actually contains. Moreover, the monitoring of the sorting of waste we were told is the responsibility of the Environment Agency, who were not present at the meeting.

It would seem that the regulations which you as ESC administer are out of date compared to those used by your colleagues in Government, DEFRA in particular.

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) No

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

Surrounding agricultural land and environmentally sensitive wildlife sites. It has been proposed that East Anglian wetlands become a UNESCO world heritage site as part of the East Atlantic flyway. Local housing and schools, the plans for the new Garden neighbourhood next to the site. There has been work on Ella's law in the UK regarding the right to breathe clean air and the UN a have declared that a clean healthy and sustainable environment is a human right. Road congestion in the area with the biodigester vehicles is already problematic.

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

The surrounding agricultural land could result in pollutants entering the food chain. Local wetlands support a number of endangered highly sensitive species that could be adversely affected. Residents and school children on adjacent land are likely to have less healthy air.

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

That there is at least a full public enquiry with detailed environmental impact assessments on agriculture, wildlife and local residents.

That the local authorities look at better, waste reductions refuse management and recycling schemes.

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

I feel there needs to be more detail on the monitoring processes both by the company and the council, to ensure that monitoring is frequent, robust and action taken promptly if concerns.

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

Elough is not the right location for an incineration facility as road connections are poor and surrounding residential, airport, wildlife and agriculture too close.

The initial planning consent process was poorly publicised.

We would hope our local and county councils would wish to develop an environment for it's residents and visitors that prioritises clean air, reduces waste and promotes sustainable living.

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

All local residents

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

See all replies from residents - especially those with detailed technical knowledge - noise is a significant concern as is traffic movements and air quality . None of which have been verified by ESC through independent means

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

That ESC commissions its own independent professional research prior to considering the licence

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify: Insufficient around noise , air quality , and traffic

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

ESC should commission fully independent research on the areas of concern voiced by residents

Q1 Do you live in the Beccles area? (Please note, this does not exclude anyone from providing comments) Yes

Q2 Are there any sensitive areas or communities near to the application site that have not been considered in the submitted documents? Please state location and reasons

Yes several residential estates and surrounding villages including Worlingham, North Cove and Barnby. Also surrounding farm land, water courses and marshes within a mile.

Q3 What, if any, are your concerns about the impact on the use of the surrounding land?

There is nothing listed as to how the odour from the proposed plant will be dealt with which no one knows will impact on residents (especially summer months) and how this may affect house prices. The plan also does not bring anything to the local area other than more hazardous waste.

Q4 Having assessed the suggested abatement methods, do you have any further recommendations?

A baseline assessment must be completed on the contamination levels of the surrounding areas up to a mile from the site (including North Cove and Barnby). If the permit is granted the monitoring should continue to be completed on a regular basis to compare with the baseline assessment.

Q5 Is any of the information submitted incorrect or insufficient? Please clarify:

There is a statement that says there will be odours from the site but not how they will deal with this issue. Also it does not explain why such a large plant is required that can process ~ 3 tons of waste an hour but will only process less than 30 tons per year approximately only working 10 hours per year. Is there plans to significantly increase processing after the plant is built which will change the planning and permit required.

Q6 Do you have any other comments?

Please reconsider not building this plant at this location, Ellough is already becoming a dumping ground for every ones waste and the impact on the locals is not acceptable and against our wellbeing.

I was in Vienna a few years ago and had the opportunity of seeing (in the City) the Spittelau incineration plant which incinerated everything. It is fantastic.

I have no objection to such incinerators in England.

We are writing to voice our objections to the new incinerator planned at Ellough by V C Cooke. We are concerned about the following:

- Air quality and air pollution in the neighbourhood (We live in [REDACTED] Worlingham close to the incinerator's proposed site.)
- There is proposed housing and business developments already agreed or in the local plan which will be built very close to the proposed site.
- The airfield is active and used daily - has an impact survey been fully carried out to ensure this will not cause disruption to the air traffic through air quality and visibility? Also, parachutists, may have their existing business ruined.
- carbon emissions, what about the increased volume of traffic to the incinerator and the impact environmentally of this on the air quality and also local wildlife (we have bats in our garden)?
- What economic benefit will it bring to the area for the residents?
- What is being done to prevent noise pollution, bearing in mind we can already hear noise from Ellough industrial estate early in the morning from reversing beepers. What is the proposed hours of operation and will HGVs be also attending the site in all hours?
- What will done to negate fire risks bearing in mind a substantial fire took hold of the business premises V C Cooke in the past 2 years.
- Will this development devalue properties and businesses within the local area?

Further to raising points, please provide us evidence of environmental impact assessments, cost benefits analysis for the local area, traffic impact assessments and co2 omissions.

I am strongly against issuing a permit to v.e.cook.

The implication of pollution from the plant affects air quality and pollutes the air surrounding the plant. Wildlife will be at risk. Our children attending nearby schools will be at risk.

Pollution seeps into the surrounding land affecting plant life and local waterways.

The local area of Beccles prides itself in its local waterways and wildlife and its a wonderful place to get fresh air and exercise.

This will not be the case should v.e Cook be granted their permit.

No, in a word, we dont want anything else polluting our area. Most of us have terrible coughs here and that is because of that anaerobic digester that we have put up with , along with the disgusting smell that emanates from the plant. The dust in the atmosphere is awful. We certainly dont want anymore of it.

We are writing regarding the decision to approve a waste incinerator within the premises of V.C Cooke site.

In our opinion, this application has been approved without any consideration to the residents who reside in this area, to any future residents, nor too all the surrounding town and villages.

With building permission already in hand for further houses, schools, doctor surgery and shops to built at the top end of Ellough Road, surely the Incinerator should not be improved?

What about health risk the incinerator will cause? Already there is plenty of adults living with respiratory and heart problems. Children with asthma having to using inhalers. People living with Mental Health who may be affected by this. What about about the 'unknown' medical conditions that this incinerator may cause. How will you protect the residents from coming in contact with any pollution or contamination?

Looking at the wider picture, Companies such as M&H Plastics who make plastic containers will not be able to produce their products due to air pollutants and contamination. The garages, Recycling Centre, Beccles Gymnastics, Office Blocks which will be affected by this build going ahead. I know certain areas are not considered when considering the decision but the lorries and trucks which will be added traffic to an already busy road, should be a cause of concern. with it entrance to the site being close to a roundabout, Let alone the mist, fogs and pollutants which will be pumped out into the air affecting the grasses, crop field, water courses and live stock. Who and how will this be monitored?

We already are subject to extremely unpleasant smells and humming noises from the Bio Plant which is situation on the land next to where the incinerator is planned to be built. Please lets not add too it.

We would therefore suggest that this application is rejected on the basis of risk to the environment and to the public health.

I live in worlingham not far from where they want to put the new insinuator. We are not happy about it we have enough bad smells coming of the biocal plant on the ellough estate. I have a breathing disorder and have lots of allergies. I have complained about the biocal place lots of times and nothing is done, they just keep being fined and paying the fines . There are going to be new houses built across from the proposed site this will bring the prices of those houses and the houses in worlingham down. who wants to live here with a continuous smell .in the summer it will smell even worse

I would like to draw your attention to this parliament report which highlights the danger of cancers from the dioxins emitted by incinerators

<https://committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/11356/html/>

I would also make the following points having been through this process in Basingstoke - which prompted my move to Beccles, (at one point Basingstoke had the highest rate of lung cancer in the country).

- a) The residue is a toxic dioxin ash with no known safe way to dispose of.
- b) Monitoring is pointless unless 24x7 .
- c) Inspections are pointless as the waste companies are forewarned and always keep a skip of "clean" waste to burn when being inspected.
- d) Fields downwind will become covered in toxins which can enter the food chain by animals or crops.
- e) Water courses will become toxic with run-off. As an allegedly Green party I find it hard to believe permission for such a site could even be remotely considered.

Hopefully not a soon to be ex-Beccles resident

With many years involvement in modelling of environmental effects of the dispersion of contaminants, I was interested to read the VC Cooke AQ assessment.

My first observation is that there is the odd typo.

There is no such place as “Worlington CEVC Primary School” in Worlingham (e.g., table 40 and several other places) In section 7, abbreviations Ti is the symbol for titanium, Tl is for Thallium.

I am a little concerned about the presentation of the data on Cr in table 43. The predicted values are 0 but the % values are over 250%. This makes little sense until you look at table 44 which gives predicted concentration as 0.00000045. Is the model really so accurate that it can quote values to 8 decimal places? I have my doubts that any environmental model can do this given the errors inherent in input data. And I suspect the high % in table 43 is the result of dividing one small number by another small number. To me this indicates a lack of appreciation by the modelling team of the limits of their model. This smacks of model being treated as a black box and the results being used without a critical appreciation of what the outputs mean.

Going back to Figure 4 the meteorological data wind roses. These are interesting. Are they only using wind data? Surely rainfall affects the washout of contaminants from the emergent plume. Take, for example, when the Chernobyl plume crossed the UK there heavy rain in Wales which meant Cs127 was washed out and it contaminated the grass and sheep accumulated a body load which made them unsaleable for many years. They had to be brought down from the hills onto uncontaminated pasture to reduce their body load.

Also, thermal stratification of the atmosphere impacts the dispersion of the plume. I remember driving along the A1 seeing the plumes rising from cooling towers being trapped by an inversion layer and the plume spreading horizontally rather than simply rising in the air. Was there any vertical thermal data used in the model? If not would not this limit the applicability of the findings, perhaps under-estimating concentrations predicted.

And finally, the feed stock for the the plant is by definition of unknown composition. From what I understand, it will be what currently goes to landfill because it cannot be recycled. In which case I do not see how the diagram in Appendix A can give percentages in the flue gases.

Bearing this in mind, I think the regulators needs to convince themselves of the reliability of the work done to support the licence application.

We are now looking at the Council wanting to improve the quality of AIR.

However, this is not going to increase the air quality , but it will pollute the air quality.

Sixty ton wagons / using our small inadequate roads , puffing out large amounts of toxic fumes, plus the horrific smell of the rubbish that they are carrying, also leaking toxic waste from the wagons ! This is what will happen.

This is not only from this area, but from many other surrounding areas and towns.

An incinerator of this nature will need to be running at full capacity to make it viable to operate.

Many wagons with their full loads will be dumping their rubbish at the site, thus adding smelly, toxic fumes.

The air quality will decrease.

ALSO the waste product will have to be removed , by polluting vehicles.

Where does this waste product end up ? On a field, thus being blown about into the air.

Many people, like us , have numerous health problems, and have chosen to live in this beautiful rural area. To inflict such an evil smelling monstrosity on such people is sheer stupidity and GREED.

To give this incinerator a license to distribute such poisonous toxic waste is a criminal act to inflict on the environment and public.

How can you justify this site with a license to poison the air.

I am not a person to normally stress my views, but I am very concerned about this incinerator going ahead. My main concerns are that I live, and the school at Barnby is directly inline with the incinerator and the common wind direction. If the gasses from this incinerator are environmentally friendly and harmless why does the chimney have to be so tall. I would like my strong rejection for this project too go ahead to be noted.

I wish to strongly oppose an environmental permit being granted for the above plant.

The reason for my opposition is because I suffer from a serious lung condition and my specialist doctor in London strongly advised me to leave a heavily congested part of London and move my home to a less polluted area in the UK. I heeded his advice and moved to North Cove, Beccles, Suffolk, in September 2015.

It is my belief that operating the above incinerator plant will lead to an increase in air pollution within this area and my health along with many others will seriously be put at unnecessary risk.

We are totally against having a Incinerator plant in Ellough. Why. We are told to think about climate change not to have bonfires burning garden waste and yet the Council has given permission for a Incinerator to burn whatever throwing out pollution what incentive does that give us to do our bit.Having the Digester plant is bad enough with the smell and flies that we get from that. Also our roads can not cope now with all the tractors with trailers and lorries going up to the digester, the Incinerator will bring more it will be terrible.We are eighty years old not in 100%health please do not let them take what little clean air we have away from us. They intend to build more houses in Worlingham there are schools in the area and also many units on the industrial site,with lots of people breathing that polluted air day in day out.Please do not give them a Permit

Re above application for a proposed waste incinerator plant at Ellough by V C Cooke Ltd.

Whilst there has been much understandable comment and discussion regarding the possible harmful emissions from this plant particularly due to its location being so close to local residents and in particular the new proposed significant housing development that is going to be built literally meters away from the site, not much discussion has taken place on noise.

The noise I am concerned about is not so much increased traffic from on site handling equipment eg fork lift trucks etc my main concern is possible intrusive noise levels from the plant itself.

The detailed technical specifications of the plant except the boiler (and even then there are a number of different designs using this model number ie to burn different materials) is lacking detailed design details.

However, I fail to see how a generation plant which its design is in effect a small chain grate miniature power station can claim to make a noise level of 70 db (the noise rating of my washing machine!) when the installation rated works power ie electricity used by the auxiliary plant is 1.5MW. This is the power required to run pumps, fans, conveyors and compressors etc. Noting that the plant is housed in the existing thin metal clad shed.

This is apart from the electrical noise that will be made by the electrical generator and associated transformers (whine and hum) which output is estimated to be 2.5MW. In addition, inevitably noisy steam leaks will arise from the plant as well as monitoring alarms etc.

Having had 45 years Power Station engineering experience including coal, oil, gas turbine and finally Nuclear powered generating plant, I consider that this new plant will represent a high risk of being a significant noise issue for local residents and more specifically for the new housing development being built alongside VC Cooke Ltd site.

Please would you consider the above concerns during your assessment.

In the matter of the Environmental Permit Application by V.C.Cooke to East Suffolk Council and the soliciting of public responses to the application.

Summary:

The application should fail for the following reasons:

- The original application for construction of this facility was systemically flawed in that the case presented in support of the application Reference Number SCC/0063/22W did not comply with the following criteria. The limited, biased and apparent suppression of the true facts and information provided by Suffolk County Council (SCC) in support of this Waste Incinerator should not form the basis of any decision by East Suffolk Council in the matter of an application for an Environmental Permit. There is nothing in the limited information supplied by SCC and V.C. Cooke (VCC) that in any way explains or even suggests the serious health hazards and potential Environmental damage associated with Waste Incinerators via Atmospheric Emissions, Waste Ashes or contaminated water.
- There was no significant public consultation.
- The information supplied to the public did not describe the actual facts associated with such a construction and subsequent operation.
- The information supplied by Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke totally failed to describe the potential health hazards that may be associated with the operation of such a facility.
- No Health Impact Assessment was carried out.
- No Environmental Impact Assessment was carried out.
- No consideration was given to the negative health impact potential on the local and wider community.
- The known negative health impact of emissions on the health of humans, are well known, yet at no time were references made to these.
- No Groundwater Exposure Assessment was produced. (Percolation through the soil to aquifers from where water is extracted for domestic purposes).
- In this case there may be irreparable damage to the Sites of Scientific Interest (SSIs) and Ramsar sites that include Barnby Broad and Marshes, North Cove nature reserve, and Carlton Marshes. The internationally important Ramsar site on these marshes is for migratory wetland birds, and very important on their migratory route.

- There is no indication or specific report of any liaison between SCC/VCC and the Environment Agency on the subject of checks for Protected Sites and Species. (As above)
- No mention of long-term monitoring of soils, farmland and crops.
- No mention of checks on crops grown or milk production at areas within the stack emission zone and wider areas.
- The complete process (or lack of due process) was carried out in a very unprofessional manner and prime facie it would appear that an attempt was made to mislead the community as to the actual facts associated with Waste Incinerators. (Toxic Emissions and Toxic Ash).
- There is no reference of any liaison with East Suffolk Water who are constructing a new water treatment plant at Barnby; and such a facility may be negatively impacted by airborne PM2.5 (Particulate Matter), Heavy metals, benzenes etc. (Will this plant be monitoring for the chemicals mentioned, and if it is the case of identified pollution, have the facility to remove these?)
- There was no Air Pollution Exposure Assessment.
- No information on the volume (believed to be approximately 8000 tonnes) and stabilisation method of the toxic waste ashes that, it is understood will be processed at an adjacent facility for the purpose of mixing with cement to form building materials. Interestingly, the question of the compressive strength of such material has recently been raised. In view of the recent discovery of the failures of RADA (Aerated Concrete) in UK schools, questions need to be raised with regard to the compressive strength of cement blocks formed by Toxic Ash mixed with cement. This is a point of conjecture, and no doubt SCC has this information to hand?
- No references to Epidemiological studies on any future health complications within the local and wider community.
- There was no indication of any liaison with the developers of the new housing project in the area and SCC. Residents of properties in this development will, due to location, be directly exposed long-term to emissions from the facility. (Will their health be monitored?)
- SCC should know how, and the reasons why, exposure assessments should be made. Of course, if truth be known, they would prefer not to know, and of greater concern, is that they would prefer the public not to know.

It would appear that SCC and VCC have learned nothing about conducting exposure assessments for health and environmental risk assessments (and epidemiological studies). The question must be asked why they have failed in this responsibility. All waste incinerators are waste generators – incineration of waste results in an output of waste products. This is because physical matter cannot actually be destroyed, but it can only be transformed into new forms. Thus when things are burned, they do not disappear as is the common perception, but merely change their form. As previously stated, waste products resulting from incineration take the form of stack gas emissions to the atmosphere, bottom ashes (slag) and fly ashes (caught in the ‘filters’ in the incinerator stack). Where water is used for cleaning processes in an incinerator, there are also releases of waste products. Simply, a waste incinerator takes mainly inert material and converts it into highly toxic waste. This is totally contrary to what should be happening – which is converting toxic waste to essentially inert material. The process is not Clean – Green – Renewable, unless waste is considered renewable; in which case, why burn it?

Why then is Suffolk County Council, by ignoring these facts and encouraging a local council (East Suffolk Council) to approve the operation of an Energy through Waste Incinerator, in full knowledge that such a facility will be a significant contributor to localised

toxic air, ground and water pollution; creating a potentially hazardous environment for humans, animals, rivers, and consequently, fish.

There is a direct connection between atmospheric air pollution and health; pretending that it is not there, is not a solution to the problem. Ingestion of pollutants through breathing, the food chain and drinking water can cause major debilitating health problems. (For the purpose of this paper it is thought prudent not to mention all of these; however there are many available scientific references to disease directly caused by exposure to incinerator emissions).

There is also the serious matter of potential degradation of the Sites of Scientific Interest (SSIs) and also Radnar Sites. These are internationally protected Wetland areas located in close proximity to the proposed facility. The impact of toxic Particulate Matter and polluted water could be disastrous to these areas.

As I stated in my summary, this whole process has been systemically flawed, and the local community has been marginalised, ignored and treated with little more than contempt by Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke. I would ask that East Suffolk Council, when considering this application, takes a wider, realistic, more intelligent and understanding view, and realise that this form of Waste Incineration is of no benefit to the local community, and subjecting the community to the toxic emissions (Stack and Ash) would be wrong. Condemning the community to potential major health problems; some of which may be generational would be morally unacceptable, and possibly, legally questionable.

The amount of electricity claimed to be generated by the plant is not really significant – Waste incinerators are thermally inefficient and the heat requirement per megawatt generates more CO₂ and other pollution than other types of fuel.

What may be expected from Emissions and Ashes?

- It is an irrefutable scientific fact that Waste Incinerators produce as stack emissions the following; - (the list is not exhaustive).
- Particulate Matter 2.5 and PM1.0 highly toxic compounds that cannot be effectively 'filtered' out. There is no safe limit to exposure in humans. The proliferation of PM2.5s is recorded worldwide and these are considered to be one of the most dangerous threats to human health.
- Dioxins and Dioxin-like compounds.
- Persistent Organic Pollutants.
- Heavy Metals, including Mercury.
- Benzene.
- Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH). Comprise the largest group of cancer causing chemicals and are ranked 9th amongst chemical compounds threatening to humans. Many of these compounds are genotoxic, mutagenic, teratogenic and carcinogenic.
- CO₂. (Carbon Dioxide). As Energy through Waste Incinerators are thermally inefficient, they will produce more CO₂ than standard Gas, Oil or Coal plants. CO₂ releases to atmosphere from waste incinerator plants (accepted as base-line international criteria) are approximately between 0.70 and 1.70 tonnes of CO₂ per tonne of waste incinerated. This means that maximum emissions from this plant could be a maximum of 49,000 tonnes and minimum 20,300, the mean being 34,650 tonnes. The UK is committed to reducing CO₂ emissions, so why permit such plants, whose emissions are contrary to those ambitions? The list of emissions is not exhaustive.

- In 2022 the United Nations General Assembly declared that everyone has a right to a healthy environment, including clean air. That it has taken until 2022 for the right to clean air to be officially declared a human right, is evidence in itself of how far we have allowed our own health to fall down the list of priorities. Every day we breathe polluted air with little questioning or concern. As a society we seem to have come to accept pollution as a consequence of modern life, but accepting polluted air [as is being offered by the emissions from this Waste Incinerator], is accepting the possibility of thousands of children being admitted to hospital with asthma and lung infections.
- High levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM_{1.0}) can damage the human respiratory tract and increase a person's vulnerability to respiratory infections and asthma. Exposure to air pollution increases the risk of respiratory and cardiovascular disease, lung cancer, diabetes, neurological and adverse pregnancy outcomes. Research has shown a direct link between increasing levels of pollution in the air and GP appointments for respiratory symptoms and asthma. Exposure to pollution increases the likelihood of having multiple long-term physical and possible mental health problems.
- Despite this knowledge, the current targets for limiting air pollution in England would see the country aiming to double the current WHO minimum standard by 2040. That means that a child born today would still be breathing polluted air by the age of 16. It also means that our stretched health service, already struggling to meet patient demand, is facing decades of hospital admissions and GP visits from the thousands of people whose health will be impacted by poor air quality. Should we really be considering the siting of a Waste Incinerator in this area? The answer must be NO!
- Incinerators can never comply with the zero emissions strategy or be classed as a clean production technology. This old, dirty technology is not in agreement with sustainable development or political commitments already made within Europe.

Any claims that the compounds described in this paper are neither produced, emitted or are completely 'filtered' out have no scientific standing, and in fact are terminologically inexact. There is no indication in the application that there is any requirement to monitor for these, contrary to UK and international law. It won't surprise you to hear that companies do not make money from waste reduction, but there is plenty of profit from incineration. Unlike landfill, incineration operators pay no tax either as a waste disposal route or as a major CO₂ emitter, unlike other fossil fuel power stations burning coal or gas. There are no carbon emissions targets or requirements to reduce CO₂ emissions over time.

I would urge East Suffolk Council to refuse this application, and the result, should the application wish to be continued, should progress and be more competently addressed at a Public Inquiry.

A Public Inquiry is necessary in order that the matter may be more open, and that in-depth discussion of the true facts and the concerns of the community are addressed. I am not persuaded that a decision on something of such magnitude should be left to a group of councillors who may not be versed in the complexities of incineration, atmospheric pollution, and significant health issues associated with such a facility, and using, in my opinion, incomplete and misleading advice from council officers; whose grasp, based on the information supplied (and that not supplied) on the subject of the relationship between atmospheric pollution and the negative impacts on human health, would appear to be remarkably limited, or deliberately suppressed.

I would sincerely ask that the committee considering this application make a decision based on the actual facts, and not on claims made by both Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke, that contradict scientific facts and appear to be motivated by desperation to impose this facility on the local and wider population, whatever the cost.

Listen to the community. It is not wanted.

Within 4 km of the proposed incinerator, down prevailing south westerly winds, lie the SSSIs and Ramsar sites of North Cove Reserve, Castle Marsh, Barnby Broad, Carlton Marsh and Sprat's Water. Emissions from the stack will blow onto these areas or fall on the land and water courses on Ellough Moor, which drain down into these protected areas via the Hundred Drain which runs between North Cove and Barnby and described as part of a main river drainage system in the letter (15/09/2015) by Andrew Hunter Sustainable Planning Advisor, Environment Agency. They put on hold the building site at the Bottom of the Hill Barnby.

Temperature inversions occur on the moor where the incinerator is sited, where a layer of warmer air over colder mist and fog acts like a lid trapping the emissions from the stack and causing them to build up making the air which rolls down into the lower areas even more polluted. Additionally research by the University of Iowa State University (Integrated Crop management report) has shown that in still misty conditions pesticides travel well out of the spray area on the water droplets. Toxic emissions from the stack would travel in the same way falling onto the valuable protected SSSI and Ramsar sites of the reserves.

This incinerator will damage these protected sites. Did either the original planning application (SCC/0063/22W) or this current permit application check for the serious environmental damage that will occur through the incineration of waste in the V C Cooke location? To use meteorological data from Norwich airport 21 km away and label the proposal, small scale so that only residences within 300 metres (the proposed Worlingham Garden Village) are consulted is surely going against National and Local Planning Guidance. This proposal is devastating for our valuable environmental sites and residents over a wide area.

You will off course be aware of the recent State of Nature Report 2023, the product of a collaboration of NGOs (non-government organisations), academic organisations and government agencies including Natural England. This report shows that the abundance of species studied in the UK has declined by 19% on average since records began in 1970. But while the most important natural habitats are in poor condition WORK TO PROTECT LANDSCAPES HAS CLEAR BENEFITS FOR NATURE, PEOPLE AND CLIMATE. 15% of species within the UK are threatened with extinction. And since 1970 the abundance of UK priority species has declined by 60%. The Natural History Museum has observed that when compared to the other G7 countries the UK is at the very bottom in terms of how much biodiversity survives,

Biodiversity in the UK: bloom or bust? – State of Nature Report Summary

This is a House of Commons Committee report with recommendations to the Government. The Government has two months to respond

'Nature is not adequately being factored into government decision making. We recommend the Government identify and reform subsidies harmful to biodiversity, redirecting money to nature conservation. We recommend the Government set a target to reduce the UK's global environmental footprint.'

'Damaging changes in the planet's biodiversity are not being treated with the same urgency and ambition as changes in the planet's climate. This is unacceptable. Measures to counter the collapse in biodiversity must be raised up the political agenda: each Government department must consider the potential impact of its actions on biodiversity, and such considerations must be factored into decision-making across the public and private sector. We have seen a shift towards this with climate change: the same is possible for biodiversity. To prevent biodiversity collapse becoming a global crisis, action must be taken now.'

To Issue an Environmental Permit would indeed be unacceptable East Suffolk, such would be the Environmental and Health damage. Few of the 2.5pm and virtually none on the pm1s can be filtered out. They carry the most horrendous pollutants (e.g. dioxins, furans heavy metals etc.) on them which would contaminate North East Suffolk's valuable Reserves seriously affecting the health of the environment and the health of residents over a wide area now and in the future.

I am writing about the proposed waste incinerator at Ellough. Wherever & whenever such things are proposed they will, quite naturally, be opposed but they are necessary. They must be sited somewhere so I do not wish to be counted as someone to oppose its construction.

Having read V.C.Cooke's application and their 69 page document Ref : CRM.0157.003 AQ.R.001 on

Air Quality Assessment provided by their MD Darren Walker he advises that:

Quote

Post commissioning we carry out air quality testing by a company, who will be based in Suffolk, to test receptors to ensure the levels are as we designed. We typically carry this out at least 3 times. Unquote

The air quality report is based on a computer model and there is no proposal other than the above monitoring to conduct these 3 tests beyond the first year at a time of their choosing as far as I can see.

Could it not be a condition of the licence(if Granted) that V.C. Cooke pay for continuous monitoring at points to be agreed selected from their own computer monitor throughout the 5 years of the licence. This way there would be no extra cost to Suffolk Council and us as rate payers, to give peace of mind that the site was being managed corrected to agreed standards. Results could be open , transparent and published providing the environment agency with the means to monitor emissions to ensure they were operating within the law.

Given these measures were in place as a condition of the licence I am broadly in favour of the scheme. I regret I will not be available on the 17th and 18th Oct to attend the drop in and therefore submit this in its place .

Objection to the Environmental Permit Application Reference Number 23/04688/PPCAPP

I would not like to inhale unhealthy toxins and damage my lungs. I am a musician who cares deeply about their lungs/voice and this could alter my future if my vocals are affected by the chemicals released. I want to be able to sing to the best of my ability, I can not do this if you chose to go forward with your decision to build the new incinerator and issue a permit to operate.

In the matter of the Environmental Permit Application by V.C.Cooke to East Suffolk Council and the soliciting of public responses to the application.

Summary:

The application should fail for the following reasons:

- The original application for construction of this facility was systemically flawed in that the case presented in support of the application Reference Number SCC/0063/22W did not comply with the following criteria. The limited, biased and apparent suppression of the true facts and information provided by Suffolk County Council (SCC) in support of this Waste Incinerator should

not form the basis of any decision by East Suffolk Council in the matter of an application for an Environmental Permit. There is nothing in the limited information supplied by SCC and V.C. Cooke (VCC) that in any way explains or even suggests the serious health hazards and potential Environmental damage associated with Waste Incinerators via Atmospheric Emissions, Waste Ashes or contaminated water.

- There was no significant public consultation.
- The information supplied to the public did not describe the actual facts associated with such a construction and subsequent operation.
- The information supplied by Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke totally failed to describe the potential health hazards that may be associated with the operation of such a facility.
- No Health Impact Assessment was carried out.
- No Environmental Impact Assessment was carried out.
- No consideration was given to the negative health impact potential on the local and wider community.
- The known negative health impact of emissions on the health of humans, are well known, yet at no time were references made to these.
- No Groundwater Exposure Assessment was produced. (Percolation through the soil to aquifers from where water is extracted for domestic purposes).
- In this case there may be irreparable damage to the Sites of Scientific Interest (SSIs) and Ramsar sites that include Barnby Broad and Marshes, North Cove nature reserve, and Carlton Marshes. The internationally important Ramsar site on these marshes is for migratory wetland birds, and very important on their migratory route. `
- There is no indication or specific report of any liaison between SCC/VCC and the Environment Agency on the subject of checks for Protected Sites and Species. (As above)
- No mention of long-term monitoring of soils, farmland and crops.
- No mention of checks on crops grown or milk production at areas within the stack emission zone and wider areas.
- The complete process (or lack of due process) was carried out in a very unprofessional manner and prime facie it would appear that an attempt was made to mislead the community as to the actual facts associated with Waste Incinerators. (Toxic Emissions and Toxic Ash).
- There is no reference of any liaison with East Suffolk Water who are constructing a new water treatment plant at Barnby; and such a facility may be negatively impacted by airborne PM2.5 (Particulate Matter), Heavy metals, benzenes etc. (Will this plant be monitoring for the chemicals mentioned, and if it is the case of identified pollution, have the facility to remove these?)
- There was no Air Pollution Exposure Assessment.
- No information on the volume (believed to be approximately 8000 tonnes) and stabilisation method of the toxic waste ashes that, it is understood will be processed at an adjacent facility for the purpose of mixing with cement to form building materials. Interestingly, the question of the compressive strength of such material has recently been raised. In view of the recent discovery of the failures of RADA (Aerated Concrete) in UK schools, questions need to be raised with regard to the compressive strength of

cement blocks formed by Toxic Ash mixed with cement. This is a point of conjecture, and no doubt SCC has this information to hand?

- No references to Epidemiological studies on any future health complications within the local and wider community.
- There was no indication of any liaison with the developers of the new housing project in the area and SCC. Residents of properties in this development will, due to location, be directly exposed long-term to emissions from the facility. (Will their health be monitored?)
- SCC should know how, and the reasons why, exposure assessments should be made. Of course, if truth be known, they would prefer not to know, and of greater concern, is that they would prefer the public not to know.

It would appear that SCC and VCC have learned nothing about conducting exposure assessments for health and environmental risk assessments (and epidemiological studies). The question must be asked why they have failed in this responsibility. All waste incinerators are waste generators – incineration of waste results in an output of waste products. This is because physical matter cannot actually be destroyed, but it can only be transformed into new forms. Thus when things are burned, they do not disappear as is the common perception, but merely change their form. As previously stated, waste products resulting from incineration take the form of stack gas emissions to the atmosphere, bottom ashes (slag) and fly ashes (caught in the ‘filters’ in the incinerator stack). Where water is used for cleaning processes in an incinerator, there are also releases of waste products. Simply, a waste incinerator takes mainly inert material and converts it into highly toxic waste. This is totally contrary to what should be happening – which is converting toxic waste to essentially inert material. The process is not Clean – Green – Renewable, unless waste is considered renewable; in which case, why burn it?

Why then is Suffolk County Council, by ignoring these facts and encouraging a local council (East Suffolk Council) to approve the operation of an Energy through Waste Incinerator, in full knowledge that such a facility will be a significant contributor to localised toxic air, ground and water pollution; creating a potentially hazardous environment for humans, animals, rivers, and consequently, fish.

There is a direct connection between atmospheric air pollution and health; pretending that it is not there, is not a solution to the problem. Ingestion of pollutants through breathing, the food chain and drinking water can cause major debilitating health problems. (For the purpose of this paper it is thought prudent not to mention all of these; however there are many available scientific references to disease directly caused by exposure to incinerator emissions).

There is also the serious matter of potential degradation of the Sites of Scientific Interest (SSIs) and also Radnar Sites. These are internationally protected Wetland areas located in close proximity to the proposed facility. The impact of toxic Particulate Matter and polluted water could be disastrous to these areas.

As I stated in my summary, this whole process has been systemically flawed, and the local community has been marginalised, ignored and treated with little more than contempt by Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke. I would ask that East Suffolk Council, when considering this application, takes a wider, realistic, more intelligent and understanding view, and realise that this form of Waste Incineration is of no benefit to the local community, and subjecting the community to the toxic emissions (Stack and Ash) would be wrong. Condemning the community to potential major health problems; some of which may be generational would be morally unacceptable, and possibly, legally questionable.

The amount of electricity claimed to be generated by the plant is not really significant – Waste incinerators are thermally inefficient and the heat requirement per megawatt generates more CO₂ and other pollution than other types of fuel.

What may be expected from Emissions and Ashes?

- It is an irrefutable scientific fact that Waste Incinerators produce as stack emissions the following; - (the list is not exhaustive).
- Particulate Matter 2.5 and PM1.0 highly toxic compounds that cannot be effectively 'filtered' out. There is no safe limit to exposure in humans. The proliferation of PM2.5s is recorded worldwide and these are considered to be one of the most dangerous threats to human health.
- Dioxins and Dioxin-like compounds.
- Persistent Organic Pollutants.
- Heavy Metals, including Mercury.
- Benzene.
- Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH). Comprise the largest group of cancer causing chemicals and are ranked 9th amongst chemical compounds threatening to humans. Many of these compounds are genotoxic, mutagenic, teratogenic and carcinogenic.
- CO₂. (Carbon Dioxide). As Energy through Waste Incinerators are thermally inefficient, they will produce more CO₂ than standard Gas, Oil or Coal plants. CO₂ releases to atmosphere from waste incinerator plants (accepted as base-line international criteria) are approximately between 0.70 and 1.70 tonnes of CO₂ per tonne of waste incinerated. This means that maximum emissions from this plant could be a maximum of 49,000 tonnes and minimum 20,300, the mean being 34,650 tonnes. The UK is committed to reducing CO₂ emissions, so why permit such plants, whose emissions are contrary to those ambitions? The list of emissions is not exhaustive.
- In 2022 the United Nations General Assembly declared that everyone has a right to a healthy environment, including clean air. That it has taken until 2022 for the right to clean air to be officially declared a human right, is evidence in itself of how far we have allowed our own health to fall down the list of priorities. Every day we breathe polluted air with little questioning or concern. As a society we seem to have come to accept pollution as a consequence of modern life, but accepting polluted air [as is being offered by the emissions from this Waste Incinerator], is accepting the possibility of thousands of children being admitted to hospital with asthma and lung infections.
- High levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM_{1.0}) can damage the human respiratory tract and increase a person's vulnerability to respiratory infections and asthma. Exposure to air pollution increases the risk of respiratory and cardiovascular disease, lung cancer, diabetes, neurological and adverse pregnancy outcomes. Research has shown a direct link between increasing levels of pollution in the air and GP appointments for respiratory symptoms and asthma. Exposure to pollution increases the likelihood of having multiple long-term physical and possible mental health problems.
- Despite this knowledge, the current targets for limiting air pollution in England would see the country aiming to double the current WHO minimum standard by 2040. That means that a child born today would still be breathing polluted air by the age of 16. It also means that our stretched health service, already struggling to meet patient demand, is facing decades of hospital admissions and GP visits from the thousands of people whose health will be impacted by poor air quality. Should we really be considering the siting of a Waste Incinerator in this area? The answer must be NO!
- Incinerators can never comply with the zero emissions strategy or be classed as a clean production technology. This old, dirty technology is not in agreement with sustainable development or political commitments already made within Europe.

Any claims that the compounds described in this paper are neither produced, emitted or are completely 'filtered' out have no scientific standing, and in fact are terminologically inexact. There is no indication in the application that there is any requirement to monitor for these, contrary to UK and international law. It won't surprise you to hear that companies do not make money from

waste reduction, but there is plenty of profit from incineration. Unlike landfill, incineration operators pay no tax either as a waste disposal route or as a major CO2 emitter, unlike other fossil fuel power stations burning coal or gas. There are no carbon emissions targets or requirements to reduce CO2 emissions over time.

I would urge East Suffolk Council to refuse this application, and the result, should the application wish to be continued, should progress and be more competently addressed at a Public Inquiry.

A Public Inquiry is necessary in order that the matter may be more open, and that in-depth discussion of the true facts and the concerns of the community are addressed. I am not persuaded that a decision on something of such magnitude should be left to a group of councillors who may not be versed in the complexities of incineration, atmospheric pollution, and significant health issues associated with such a facility, and using, in my opinion, incomplete and misleading advice from council officers; whose grasp, based on the information supplied (and that not supplied) on the subject of the relationship between atmospheric pollution and the negative impacts on human health, would appear to be remarkably limited, or deliberately suppressed.

I would sincerely ask that the committee considering this application make a decision based on the actual facts, and not on claims made by both Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke, that contradict scientific facts and appear to be motivated by desperation to impose this facility on the local and wider population, whatever the cost.

Listen to the community. It is not wanted.

Objection to the Environmental Permit Application Reference Number 23/04688/PPCAPP

I strongly object to the VC Cooke permit application.

Objection to the Environmental Permit Application Reference Number 23/04688/PPCAPP

In the matter of the Environmental Permit Application by V.C.Cooke to East Suffolk Council and the soliciting of public responses to the application.

Summary:

The application should fail for the following reasons:

- The original application for construction of this facility was systemically flawed in that the case presented in support of the application Reference Number SCC/0063/22W did not comply with the following criteria. The limited, biased and apparent suppression of the true facts and information provided by Suffolk County Council (SCC) in support of this Waste Incinerator should not form the basis of any decision by East Suffolk Council in the matter of an application for an Environmental Permit. There is nothing in the limited information supplied by SCC and V.C. Cooke (VCC) that in any way explains or even suggests the serious health hazards and potential Environmental damage associated with Waste Incinerators via Atmospheric Emissions, Waste Ashes or contaminated water.
- There was no significant public consultation.
- The information supplied to the public did not describe the actual facts associated with such a construction and subsequent operation.
- The information supplied by Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke totally failed to describe the potential health hazards that may be associated with the operation of such a facility.
- No Health Impact Assessment was carried out.

- No Environmental Impact Assessment was carried out.
- No consideration was given to the negative health impact potential on the local and wider community.
- The known negative health impact of emissions on the health of humans, are well known, yet at no time were references made to these.
- No Groundwater Exposure Assessment was produced. (Percolation through the soil to aquifers from where water is extracted for domestic purposes).
- In this case there may be irreparable damage to the Sites of Scientific Interest (SSIs) and Ramsar sites that include Barnby Broad and Marshes, North Cove nature reserve, and Carlton Marshes. The internationally important Ramsar site on these marshes is for migratory wetland birds, and very important on their migratory route. `
- There is no indication or specific report of any liaison between SCC/VCC and the Environment Agency on the subject of checks for Protected Sites and Species. (As above)
- No mention of long-term monitoring of soils, farmland and crops.
- No mention of checks on crops grown or milk production at areas within the stack emission zone and wider areas.
- The complete process (or lack of due process) was carried out in a very unprofessional manner and prime facie it would appear that an attempt was made to mislead the community as to the actual facts associated with Waste Incinerators. (Toxic Emissions and Toxic Ash).
- There is no reference of any liaison with East Suffolk Water who are constructing a new water treatment plant at Barnby; and such a facility may be negatively impacted by airborne PM2.5 (Particulate Matter), Heavy metals, benzenes etc. (Will this plant be monitoring for the chemicals mentioned, and if it is the case of identified pollution, have the facility to remove these?)
- There was no Air Pollution Exposure Assessment.
- No information on the volume (believed to be approximately 8000 tonnes) and stabilisation method of the toxic waste ashes that, it is understood will be processed at an adjacent facility for the purpose of mixing with cement to form building materials. Interestingly, the question of the compressive strength of such material has recently been raised. In view of the recent discovery of the failures of RADA (Aerated Concrete) in UK schools, questions need to be raised with regard to the compressive strength of cement blocks formed by Toxic Ash mixed with cement. This is a point of conjecture, and no doubt SCC has this information to hand?
- No references to Epidemiological studies on any future health complications within the local and wider community.
- There was no indication of any liaison with the developers of the new housing project in the area and SCC. Residents of properties in this development will, due to location, be directly exposed long-term to emissions from the facility. (Will their health be monitored?)
- SCC should know how, and the reasons why, exposure assessments should be made. Of course, if truth be known, they would prefer not to know, and of greater concern, is that they would prefer the public not to know.

It would appear that SCC and VCC have learned nothing about conducting exposure assessments for health and environmental risk assessments (and epidemiological studies). The question must be asked why they have failed in this responsibility. All waste incinerators are waste generators – incineration of waste results in an output of waste products. This is because physical matter

cannot actually be destroyed, but it can only be transformed into new forms. Thus when things are burned, they do not disappear as is the common perception, but merely change their form. As previously stated, waste products resulting from incineration take the form of stack gas emissions to the atmosphere, bottom ashes (slag) and fly ashes (caught in the 'filters' in the incinerator stack). Where water is used for cleaning processes in an incinerator, there are also releases of waste products. Simply, a waste incinerator takes mainly inert material and converts it into highly toxic waste. This is totally contrary to what should be happening – which is converting toxic waste to essentially inert material. The process is not Clean – Green – Renewable, unless waste is considered renewable; in which case, why burn it?

Why then is Suffolk County Council, by ignoring these facts and encouraging a local council (East Suffolk Council) to approve the operation of an Energy through Waste Incinerator, in full knowledge that such a facility will be a significant contributor to localised toxic air, ground and water pollution; creating a potentially hazardous environment for humans, animals, rivers, and consequently, fish.

There is a direct connection between atmospheric air pollution and health; pretending that it is not there, is not a solution to the problem. Ingestion of pollutants through breathing, the food chain and drinking water can cause major debilitating health problems. (For the purpose of this paper it is thought prudent not to mention all of these; however there are many available scientific references to disease directly caused by exposure to incinerator emissions).

There is also the serious matter of potential degradation of the Sites of Scientific Interest (SSIs) and also Radnar Sites. These are internationally protected Wetland areas located in close proximity to the proposed facility. The impact of toxic Particulate Matter and polluted water could be disastrous to these areas.

As I stated in my summary, this whole process has been systemically flawed, and the local community has been marginalised, ignored and treated with little more than contempt by Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke. I would ask that East Suffolk Council, when considering this application, takes a wider, realistic, more intelligent and understanding view, and realise that this form of Waste Incineration is of no benefit to the local community, and subjecting the community to the toxic emissions (Stack and Ash) would be wrong. Condemning the community to potential major health problems; some of which may be generational would be morally unacceptable, and possibly, legally questionable.

The amount of electricity claimed to be generated by the plant is not really significant – Waste incinerators are thermally inefficient and the heat requirement per megawatt generates more CO₂ and other pollution than other types of fuel.

What may be expected from Emissions and Ashes?

- It is an irrefutable scientific fact that Waste Incinerators produce as stack emissions the following; - (the list is not exhaustive).
- Particulate Matter 2.5 and PM1.0 highly toxic compounds that cannot be effectively 'filtered' out. There is no safe limit to exposure in humans. The proliferation of PM2.5s is recorded worldwide and these are considered to be one of the most dangerous threats to human health.
- Dioxins and Dioxin-like compounds.
- Persistent Organic Pollutants.
- Heavy Metals, including Mercury.
- Benzene.
- Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH). Comprise the largest group of cancer causing chemicals and are ranked 9th amongst chemical compounds threatening to humans. Many of these compounds are genotoxic, mutagenic, teratogenic and carcinogenic.

- CO₂. (Carbon Dioxide). As Energy through Waste Incinerators are thermally inefficient, they will produce more CO₂ than standard Gas, Oil or Coal plants. CO₂ releases to atmosphere from waste incinerator plants (accepted as base-line international criteria) are approximately between 0.70 and 1.70 tonnes of CO₂ per tonne of waste incinerated. This means that maximum emissions from this plant could be a maximum of 49,000 tonnes and minimum 20,300, the mean being 34,650 tonnes. The UK is committed to reducing CO₂ emissions, so why permit such plants, whose emissions are contrary to those ambitions? The list of emissions is not exhaustive.
- In 2022 the United Nations General Assembly declared that everyone has a right to a healthy environment, including clean air. That it has taken until 2022 for the right to clean air to be officially declared a human right, is evidence in itself of how far we have allowed our own health to fall down the list of priorities. Every day we breathe polluted air with little questioning or concern. As a society we seem to have come to accept pollution as a consequence of modern life, but accepting polluted air [as is being offered by the emissions from this Waste Incinerator], is accepting the possibility of thousands of children being admitted to hospital with asthma and lung infections.
- High levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM_{1.0}) can damage the human respiratory tract and increase a person's vulnerability to respiratory infections and asthma. Exposure to air pollution increases the risk of respiratory and cardiovascular disease, lung cancer, diabetes, neurological and adverse pregnancy outcomes. Research has shown a direct link between increasing levels of pollution in the air and GP appointments for respiratory symptoms and asthma. Exposure to pollution increases the likelihood of having multiple long-term physical and possible mental health problems.
- Despite this knowledge, the current targets for limiting air pollution in England would see the country aiming to double the current WHO minimum standard by 2040. That means that a child born today would still be breathing polluted air by the age of 16. It also means that our stretched health service, already struggling to meet patient demand, is facing decades of hospital admissions and GP visits from the thousands of people whose health will be impacted by poor air quality. Should we really be considering the siting of a Waste Incinerator in this area? The answer must be NO!
- Incinerators can never comply with the zero emissions strategy or be classed as a clean production technology. This old, dirty technology is not in agreement with sustainable development or political commitments already made within Europe.

Any claims that the compounds described in this paper are neither produced, emitted or are completely 'filtered' out have no scientific standing, and in fact are terminologically inexact. There is no indication in the application that there is any requirement to monitor for these, contrary to UK and international law. It won't surprise you to hear that companies do not make money from waste reduction, but there is plenty of profit from incineration. Unlike landfill, incineration operators pay no tax either as a waste disposal route or as a major CO₂ emitter, unlike other fossil fuel power stations burning coal or gas. There are no carbon emissions targets or requirements to reduce CO₂ emissions over time.

I would urge East Suffolk Council to refuse this application, and the result, should the application wish to be continued, should progress and be more competently addressed at a Public Inquiry.

A Public Inquiry is necessary in order that the matter may be more open, and that in-depth discussion of the true facts and the concerns of the community are addressed. I am not persuaded that a decision on something of such magnitude should be left to a group of councillors who may not be versed in the complexities of incineration, atmospheric pollution, and significant health issues associated with such a facility, and using, in my opinion, incomplete and misleading advice from council officers; whose grasp, based on the information supplied (and that not supplied) on the subject of the relationship between atmospheric pollution and the negative impacts on human health, would appear to be remarkably limited, or deliberately suppressed.

I would sincerely ask that the committee considering this application make a decision based on the actual facts, and not on claims made by both Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke, that contradict scientific facts and appear to be motivated by desperation to impose this facility on the local and wider population, whatever the cost.

Listen to the community. It is not wanted.

Objection to the Environmental Permit Application Reference Number 23/04688/PPCAPP

In the matter of the Environmental Permit Application by V.C.Cooke to East Suffolk Council and the soliciting of public responses to the application.

Summary:

The application should fail for the following reasons:

- The original application for construction of this facility was systemically flawed in that the case presented in support of the application Reference Number SCC/0063/22W did not comply with the following criteria. The limited, biased and apparent suppression of the true facts and information provided by Suffolk County Council (SCC) in support of this Waste Incinerator should not form the basis of any decision by East Suffolk Council in the matter of an application for an Environmental Permit. There is nothing in the limited information supplied by SCC and V.C. Cooke (VCC) that in any way explains or even suggests the serious health hazards and potential Environmental damage associated with Waste Incinerators via Atmospheric Emissions, Waste Ashes or contaminated water.
- There was no significant public consultation.
- The information supplied to the public did not describe the actual facts associated with such a construction and subsequent operation.
- The information supplied by Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke totally failed to describe the potential health hazards that may be associated with the operation of such a facility.
- No Health Impact Assessment was carried out.
- No Environmental Impact Assessment was carried out.
- No consideration was given to the negative health impact potential on the local and wider community.
- The known negative health impact of emissions on the health of humans, are well known, yet at no time were references made to these.
- No Groundwater Exposure Assessment was produced. (Percolation through the soil to aquifers from where water is extracted for domestic purposes).
- In this case there may be irreparable damage to the Sites of Scientific Interest (SSIs) and Ramsar sites that include Barnby Broad and Marshes, North Cove nature reserve, and Carlton Marshes. The internationally important Ramsar site on these marshes is for migratory wetland birds, and very important on their migratory route. `
- There is no indication or specific report of any liaison between SCC/VCC and the Environment Agency on the subject of checks for Protected Sites and Species. (As above)
- No mention of long-term monitoring of soils, farmland and crops.

- No mention of checks on crops grown or milk production at areas within the stack emission zone and wider areas.
- The complete process (or lack of due process) was carried out in a very unprofessional manner and prime facie it would appear that an attempt was made to mislead the community as to the actual facts associated with Waste Incinerators. (Toxic Emissions and Toxic Ash).
- There is no reference of any liaison with East Suffolk Water who are constructing a new water treatment plant at Barnby; and such a facility may be negatively impacted by airborne PM2.5 (Particulate Matter), Heavy metals, benzenes etc. (Will this plant be monitoring for the chemicals mentioned, and if it is the case of identified pollution, have the facility to remove these?)
- There was no Air Pollution Exposure Assessment.
- No information on the volume (believed to be approximately 8000 tonnes) and stabilisation method of the toxic waste ashes that, it is understood will be processed at an adjacent facility for the purpose of mixing with cement to form building materials. Interestingly, the question of the compressive strength of such material has recently been raised. In view of the recent discovery of the failures of RADA (Aerated Concrete) in UK schools, questions need to be raised with regard to the compressive strength of cement blocks formed by Toxic Ash mixed with cement. This is a point of conjecture, and no doubt SCC has this information to hand?
- No references to Epidemiological studies on any future health complications within the local and wider community.
- There was no indication of any liaison with the developers of the new housing project in the area and SCC. Residents of properties in this development will, due to location, be directly exposed long-term to emissions from the facility. (Will their health be monitored?)
- SCC should know how, and the reasons why, exposure assessments should be made. Of course, if truth be known, they would prefer not to know, and of greater concern, is that they would prefer the public not to know.

It would appear that SCC and VCC have learned nothing about conducting exposure assessments for health and environmental risk assessments (and epidemiological studies). The question must be asked why they have failed in this responsibility. All waste incinerators are waste generators – incineration of waste results in an output of waste products. This is because physical matter cannot actually be destroyed, but it can only transformed into new forms. Thus when things are burned, they do not disappear as is the common perception, but merely change their form. As previously stated, waste products resulting from incineration take the form of stack gas emissions to the atmosphere, bottom ashes (slag) and fly ashes (caught in the ‘filters’ in the incinerator stack). Where water is used for cleaning processes in an incinerator, there are also releases of waste products. Simply, a waste incinerator takes mainly inert material and converts it into highly toxic waste. This is totally contrary to what should be happening – which is converting toxic waste to essentially inert material. The process is not Clean – Green – Renewable, unless waste is considered renewable; in which case, why burn it?

Why then is Suffolk County Council, by ignoring these facts and encouraging a local council (East Suffolk Council) to approve the operation of an Energy through Waste Incinerator, in full knowledge that such a facility will be a significant contributor to localised toxic air, ground and water pollution; creating a potentially hazardous environment for humans, animals, rivers, and consequently, fish.

There is a direct connection between atmospheric air pollution and health; pretending that it is not there, is not a solution to the problem. Ingestion of pollutants through breathing, the food chain and drinking water can cause major debilitating health problems. (For the purpose of this paper it is thought prudent not to mention all of these; however there are many available scientific references to disease directly caused by exposure to incinerator emissions).

There is also the serious matter of potential degradation of the Sites of Scientific Interest (SSIs) and also Radnar Sites. These are internationally protected Wetland areas located in close proximity to the proposed facility. The impact of toxic Particulate Matter and polluted water could be disastrous to these areas.

As I stated in my summary, this whole process has been systemically flawed, and the local community has been marginalised, ignored and treated with little more than contempt by Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke. I would ask that East Suffolk Council, when considering this application, takes a wider, realistic, more intelligent and understanding view, and realise that this form of Waste Incineration is of no benefit to the local community, and subjecting the community to the toxic emissions (Stack and Ash) would be wrong. Condemning the community to potential major health problems; some of which may be generational would be morally unacceptable, and possibly, legally questionable.

The amount of electricity claimed to be generated by the plant is not really significant – Waste incinerators are thermally inefficient and the heat requirement per megawatt generates more CO₂ and other pollution than other types of fuel.

What may be expected from Emissions and Ashes?

- It is an irrefutable scientific fact that Waste Incinerators produce as stack emissions the following; - (the list is not exhaustive).
- Particulate Matter 2.5 and PM1.0 highly toxic compounds that cannot be effectively 'filtered' out. There is no safe limit to exposure in humans. The proliferation of PM2.5s is recorded worldwide and these are considered to be one of the most dangerous threats to human health.
- Dioxins and Dioxin-like compounds.
- Persistent Organic Pollutants.
- Heavy Metals, including Mercury.
- Benzene.
- Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH). Comprise the largest group of cancer causing chemicals and are ranked 9th amongst chemical compounds threatening to humans. Many of these compounds are genotoxic, mutagenic, teratogenic and carcinogenic.
- CO₂. (Carbon Dioxide). As Energy through Waste Incinerators are thermally inefficient, they will produce more CO₂ than standard Gas, Oil or Coal plants. CO₂ releases to atmosphere from waste incinerator plants (accepted as base-line international criteria) are approximately between 0.70 and 1.70 tonnes of CO₂ per tonne of waste incinerated. This means that maximum emissions from this plant could be a maximum of 49,000 tonnes and minimum 20,300, the mean being 34,650 tonnes. The UK is committed to reducing CO₂ emissions, so why permit such plants, whose emissions are contrary to those ambitions? The list of emissions is not exhaustive.
- In 2022 the United Nations General Assembly declared that everyone has a right to a healthy environment, including clean air. That it has taken until 2022 for the right to clean air to be officially declared a human right, is evidence in itself of how far we have allowed our own health to fall down the list of priorities. Every day we breathe polluted air with little questioning or concern. As a society we seem to have come to accept pollution as a consequence of modern life, but accepting polluted air [as is being offered by the emissions from this Waste Incinerator], is accepting the possibility of thousands of children being admitted to hospital with asthma and lung infections.
- High levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM1.0) can damage the human respiratory tract and increase a person's vulnerability to respiratory infections and asthma. Exposure to air pollution increases the risk of respiratory and cardiovascular disease, lung cancer, diabetes, neurological and adverse pregnancy outcomes. Research has shown a direct link

between increasing levels of pollution in the air and GP appointments for respiratory symptoms and asthma. Exposure to pollution increases the likelihood of having multiple long-term physical and possible mental health problems.

- Despite this knowledge, the current targets for limiting air pollution in England would see the country aiming to double the current WHO minimum standard by 2040. That means that a child born today would still be breathing polluted air by the age of 16. It also means that our stretched health service, already struggling to meet patient demand, is facing decades of hospital admissions and GP visits from the thousands of people whose health will be impacted by poor air quality. Should we really be considering the siting of a Waste Incinerator in this area? The answer must be NO!
- Incinerators can never comply with the zero emissions strategy or be classed as a clean production technology. This old, dirty technology is not in agreement with sustainable development or political commitments already made within Europe.

Any claims that the compounds described in this paper are neither produced, emitted or are completely 'filtered' out have no scientific standing, and in fact are terminologically inexact. There is no indication in the application that there is any requirement to monitor for these, contrary to UK and international law. It won't surprise you to hear that companies do not make money from waste reduction, but there is plenty of profit from incineration. Unlike landfill, incineration operators pay no tax either as a waste disposal route or as a major CO2 emitter, unlike other fossil fuel power stations burning coal or gas. There are no carbon emissions targets or requirements to reduce CO2 emissions over time.

I would urge East Suffolk Council to refuse this application, and the result, should the application wish to be continued, should progress and be more competently addressed at a Public Inquiry.

A Public Inquiry is necessary in order that the matter may be more open, and that in-depth discussion of the true facts and the concerns of the community are addressed. I am not persuaded that a decision on something of such magnitude should be left to a group of councillors who may not be versed in the complexities of incineration, atmospheric pollution, and significant health issues associated with such a facility, and using, in my opinion, incomplete and misleading advice from council officers; whose grasp, based on the information supplied (and that not supplied) on the subject of the relationship between atmospheric pollution and the negative impacts on human health, would appear to be remarkably limited, or deliberately suppressed.

I would sincerely ask that the committee considering this application make a decision based on the actual facts, and not on claims made by both Suffolk County Council and V.C. Cooke, that contradict scientific facts and appear to be motivated by desperation to impose this facility on the local and wider population, whatever the cost.

Listen to the community. It is not wanted.

You no doubt remember that from May 2023 onwards many Beccles people have been very worried and concerned about this... Much time and effort has been expended trying to convey this concern to whosoever is seemingly condoning the building and operation of an incinerator in such a position above the Waveney Valley..with the obvious connotations of inversion conditions and air pollution over the immediate surrounding area.

I am sorry to say that although correspondence has been sent to yourself and Peter Aldous not much help has been forthcoming. as it is continually repeated that ,planning has already been passed. This planning consent was carried out without the knowledge of adjoining business owners and residents, and hearsay in Beccles gives the impression that it was hurried and passed by two members of the planning committee with the chairperson giving the passing vote. What qualifications did these three persons have to pass this technical and difficult decision?

Yesterday I attended the "East Suffolk Environmental Protection Team Drop in Session" in Beccles. This has been advertised (in the Beccles and Bungay Journal with your picture) as urging people to have their say on an environmental permit being allowed. This turned out to be absolute farce and waste of time. It was held in a room suitable for about six people by two ladies and a young girl with a laptop. The public were told after a queue that it was a question and an answer session. This turned out to be several people all speaking at once to these ladies who did not seem to be knowledgeable (or qualified) on the subject and indeed gave different answers to the same questions during the course of the session. There was no taking of our names, numbers of dissenters no minutes taken and no suggestions as to recourse on the Environmental decision apart from being told this "was law". They stated yet again that "planning is already passed" and they could not stop the incinerator being built. This then raised the question...if the environmental permit was not given would the incinerator be built or would it be built on the expectation of a permit being given in the future.? Also smell: the written description of the incinerator promised absolutely no smell and that no complaints had ever been made to VC Cookes to date. This was disputed by residents at the meeting (no names taken) as being wrong as they had many times put in complaints of bad odours. Also the Environmental lady tried to explain how the sorting of the full skips arriving at the plant would be sorted. This sounded quite impossible with 8 workers being employed as she read out such a long list of varying items ie asbestos, plastics etc. being removed and the remains being burnt. I asked what if this consisted of brick rubble etc. but was told this would burn!

People attending the meeting said we all know how easy it is to put the wrong items in the recycling bin and this seemed too glib. The Environmental lady tried to say the plant would stop working if wrong items were included but obviously this would not be immediate and poor air would result. Also policing the plant was discussed and this was also not ascertained as very often or efficient.

I see that comment should be emailed to Environmental Protection Riverside Canning Road Lowestoft and would ask you to pass on my email with your own remarks.

Thank you for the opportunity to attend the drop-in session at Beccles last Tuesday, October 17th, re V C Cooke Ltd's plans to build a Small Waste Incineration Plant in Ellough.

I attended because, with two young grandchildren living in Worlingham, one of whom attends Worlingham Primary School, I am concerned about potential air quality problems in the area. The impression I took away from the session was that, in the light of increasing knowledge of the damage some particulates can do to our lungs, the monitoring measures proposed may not prove sufficient for the task.

A copy of ~~the~~ Eastern Daily Press ^{has} wandered some fair distance OUT OF East Anglia Ditto far beyond West Anglia into my letter box today.

We have an incinerator here in the waste recovery plant at Wolberton. It's heat drives a steam turbine - dynamo - electricity which is fed into the National Grid.

I hope that that in Messrs SV Cooke does the same; if it does then there should be no worries to affect local residents.

I'm writing regarding V.C. Cooke's application for an Environmental Permit for a Small Waste Incineration Plant on the Ellough Industrial estate.

While I understand that the pollution from the incineration plant will be monitored, I believe its construction will still greatly impact air quality in our area. This is of special concern since there are numerous schools and nurseries within just a few kilometres of the proposed site.

As a resident with a young family in the area, I strongly urge you not to grant V. C. Cooke the required Environmental Permit to operate in East Suffolk.

I'm a resident of Ellough and have attended your permit consultation, it was encouraging to listen to the concern there is within the surrounding community.

The residents of Ellough and many of the businesses on Ellough airfield are extremely concerned at the prospect of a waste incinerator working 24 hours a day 7 days a week at 140 degrees centigrade adding to our atmospheric pollutants.

We are extremely hurt that planning permission has been granted without the concerns as expressed by most parish councils and the town of Beccles getting a fair airing.

Our lifeline now is to prevent the granting of a permit to operate on Environmental grounds.

Ellough sits beside the Waveney valley and one of the best wildlife corridors within east Anglia including a number of triple SSSI and wetland habitats of extreme importance to our insects, butterflies, and all of our wild bird population.

To the south lies the northern most Suffolk river valley again lined with environmentally sensitive areas and providing much wildlife habitat and our council considers it as a suitable site to incinerate our public's waste materials from an unknown area within our overcrowded country.

Please think again before granting an environmental permit and allowing the construction of a plant that must have more suitable sites.

I am against this proposal there are lots of houses in this area don't think there should be an incinerator in a place where there are schools ,house and lots of families ,these incinerators should be in middle of nowhere causing no harm to anyone

I am aware that Suffolk County Council recently narrowly passed plans by VC Cooke to build an incinerator at their premises on Ellough Moor.

I read recently that incinerators in the UK emitted more than 14million tonnes of CO2 last year, with about half of this coming from burning plastics, much of which could have been recycled. These operators cannot be relied upon to keep to the rules so it is highly likely the incinerator could put the health of local people and the environment at risk.

Please do not give V.C. Cooke permission to start burning rubbish on Ellough Moore because it will produce very toxic, dangerous emissions and will produce highly poisonous and dangerous fly and bottom ash.

I must insist that a full Environmental Impact Assessment and a full Health Impact Assessment is carried out first before this project proceeds any further.

The operators state that they can remove the toxic pollution from and the emissions using scrubbers in the chimney but they will never be able to remove much more than 30% of the contaminates. This means that the other 70% will be released into the atmosphere pollution the surrounding area especially as Ellough Moore is subject to temperature inversion which will carry the poisonous emissions a considerable distances from the actual site. The area around the proposed site is farmland where food stuff is grown, cattle, sheep and poultry are reared and it is also very close to three schools, a large number of houses, a proposed new housing estate, an industrial estate where a number of people work and also Barnby Broads, Castle Marshes and the Suffolk Wildlife Trust Reserve.

It is not right that the people living in this area should be allowed to live in an environment that could seriously damage their health and I am sure that the Environmental Impact Assessment and the Health Impart Assessments will prove that this site is not suitable for such an operation.

I live and farm in North Cove. I am deeply concerned about the waste incinerator proposed for the VC Cooke site at Ellough and I hope that you will, on behalf of all residents in the Beccles area:

- do all within your power to stop this, or if it must now proceed

- ensure that very thorough investigations are carried out so that any operating permit is issued subject to suitable and rigorous conditions that can and will be properly monitored and enforced.

I attended the chaotic and frankly useless public "consultation" meeting at Beccles public hall. All that I took from it was that the people behind this project appeared to have little knowledge of what they are doing and that they have no respect whatsoever either for the local community or the environment. For me this just emphasised that they have not given adequate consideration to the harm this will do in this area. Whilst I acknowledge the need to deal with our waste there seems to be no evidence that this is either an appropriate location or an appropriate method of disposal.

I write to strongly object to the granting of an environmental permit for a small waste incineration plant at V C Cooke.

There has not been a Health Impact Assessment and there are many studies, for example one by Public Health Scotland which show an increase in cancer and birth defects especially as incinerators age and become less efficient. The emissions are not considered significant but nor was smoking thought to be bad for health years ago. New standards of monitoring in the future may well show the emissions to be more harmful than predicted. There is a growing population near to the incinerator site with

another 900 houses planned across Benacre Road beside it, There are also several primary schools very close. There are many bungalows in Worlingham, mostly occupied by elderly people who are more vulnerable to bad air quality.

There are numerous SSSI sites including Barnby Broad, Sotterley Park and of particular concern, the river Hundred. When VC Cooke had a fire in 2020 huge amounts of soot and effluent came down into the river and although precautions are in place, accidents will always happen.

Elough Business Park is a thriving growing place providing many local jobs; if this incinerator is built it may well stop future development and the creation of more employment. And even cause some businesses to relocate.

To the south of the plant is farmland growing food crops and grazing marshes for cattle. Modern farming methods try to reduce the use of chemicals so to have more pollution in the air would be detrimental.

As regards the reports such as the Environmental Risk Assessment, while I do not have the knowledge to dispute the figures, there are some very basic mistakes. I.e. Worlington School instead of Worlingham, Wagg Motors instead of Wigg, Also some places are not in the stated direction of the plant, i.e. Ellough Hall is not NW but SE! These errors might lead one to question the scientific data! The meteorological data came from Norwich Airport which is 20 miles away and unlikely to have the same climate conditions as Ellough.

In conclusion, incineration does not remove waste only converts it into ash and emissions, i.e. 100 tons of waste burnt produces 30 tons of toxic ash! And although landfill is not ideal either it would appear to be the safer option for our country at present.

Therefore I ask you to refuse the Environmental Permit for this application.

Apologies for this blanket email but I have been made aware of a potential plan to grant a permit for a waste incinerator in Beccles.

As someone whose asthma is so bad that I can't even go near a BBQ or open fire I am greatly alarmed. I moved from the city to this location to improve my health and breathing, as well as that of my family. To discover that there is now a possibility that a waste incinerator is being considered nearby is personally distressing.

Have full, independent environmental and health assessments taken place regarding the impact?

The health of our local population needs to be the priority; potential air pollution, contamination of the environment and further water toxicity would be a very real possibility should this incinerator go ahead.

If we want to establish Beccles as a desirable location for residents, tourists and the resulting investment into the town then I would hope that our local politicians, representing our needs, are looking at the bigger picture and will not grant a permit to operate.

We request that you note the following:

We believe the incinerator burning waste would be detrimental to the health of local residents and the impact on the local (and wider environment) will be considerable.

A full impact assessment needs to be carried out before an operating permit is issued

and if a decision is made to progress further, a full public enquiry should be carried out.

May I add my voice to all those who are very concerned about the proposed incinerator at Ellough. It seems that more and more evidence for its polluting effects on both human and environmental health will be very detrimental.

Please carry out a full environmental and a full health assessment. If the decision is made to progress the operating permit, a public enquiry would be in order.

East Suffolk 4 themes of their vision (09/23)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

sustainable housing (refer to flooding in area which this impact and will create more of and also needs to be reassessed in line with current guidelines)

Tackling inequalities

Thriving ECONOMY.

To give a permit to this incinerator would destroy these 4 aims with the permit if allowed and not being the right decision for our safety and well being.....

Incineration in the guise of creating power for local housing will require more and more to be burnt creating more and more pollution... Already a badly smelling bio cow cannot be controlled.. Incineration is highly polluting and inefficient and will only benefit the owners.

With the chemicals put into manufacturing many years ago... Many hazardous when burnt and even now there is no control over what will be pushed into the air

Therefore In respect of the incinerator which VC Cook are planning to put on what might aswell be my doorstep I request to see evidence of

The full environmental Assessment... If not completed the date this will be carried out?

The full Health & Safety Assessment ... If not completed the date it will be carried out?

If the decision is wrongly taken to progress the operating permit then a public enquiry is carried out.

Please respond with the details as requested

I would like to put my personal objection forward to the grant of an environmental permit for the above SWIP.

I have lived in Beccles for much of my life and I, along with many others in the local community, feel very concerned for the effect which the SWIP will have on the health of those living in this area. At a time when a number of large cities are taking strong steps to improve the air quality for their inhabitants, it seems amazing that here we are going in the opposite direction. At the end of the day we all rely on clean air, food and water for our existence and this application detrimentally affects all three of these.

The planning application should in my view have been deferred by Suffolk County Council to enable much wider local consultation to take place as public health is at issue. Most people only knew of the application when it was granted.

There are many scientific and technical reasons why any incinerator should not be permitted to operate and I am aware that others more proficient in these fields have and will put their views forward. Experience shows that things which are brought out

and said to be entirely safe are in due course found to be anything but safe. I believe that already incinerators are being revealed as unsafe from a scientific perspective.

I am concerned about bringing into the area large amounts of uncategorised waste to keep the incinerator constantly burning. I am even more concerned about what the incinerator produces in terms of harmful chemicals, such as dioxins, furans and heavy metals. I am also concerned about the disposal of fly and bottom ash and how this gets into the air and watercourses. The plant is on the edge of Beccles and Worlingham and with the wind effect, many villages and towns including Lowestoft may be affected as well.

The All Party Parliamentary Select Committee has realised the danger that incinerators have on public health, particularly children and they have called for a halt in their proliferation. Filtration systems seem not to be sufficiently advanced as yet to give the public confidence that incinerators are safe. Surely carbon capture technology should be a mandatory requirement before such plants are allowed to operate. A full public health impact assessment should be instituted before a permit is granted.

There is also the effect on crops and livestock bearing in mind this is an agricultural area. I read of horror stories concerning chickens and eggs and other items which are part of the food chain.

The area is important in environmental terms, being located at the southern extent of the Norfolk Broads National Park. I am very concerned that no meteorological account has been taken of the effect of temperature inversion in a river valley environment and instead meteorological data from Norwich, 29 kilometres away, has been used. I live next to a river and watch mists forming over the marshes regularly. What impact will the emissions from the incinerator have on this environment when there is little or no wind? A full environmental and wildlife impact assessment should be required before a permit is granted. Wildlife is already struggling in this area and this SWIP will only make things worse.

Although VCC are claiming that there are benefits for the community these seem to be mainly illusory and misleading. This is largely a commercial venture for profit on the part of VCC and should not be permitted if it will have a detrimental effect on public health. It also seems very strange that no assessment has been made on the impact which the incinerator will have on other businesses situated at Ellough and nearby. If businesses move away or fail to set up here because of the incinerator then there will be harm to the local economy and jobs. Why were not other businesses consulted?

All of this suggests to me that there should be a full and open public enquiry into every aspect of the SWIP before it is allowed to operate

We are writing to request that as the incinerator burning waste would be so detrimental to the health of residents and the environment over a wide area that: a full Environmental Impact Assessment is carried out

a full Health Impact Assessment is carried out

and that if the decision is taken to progress the operating permit that a public enquiry is carried out. My husband and I strongly object to the V C Cooke Incinerator.

Please be mindful of the traffic impact on the local area and to make use of the adjacent road network. to limit the use of the B1127 and primarily using the by-passes available. London Road and copland way

Whatever madness has the planning department at East Suffolk done to grant planning permission for such an environment contaminator on our doorstep. With many residential properties, small businesses, and large agricultural areas in the surrounding

area it seems a very unwise action to build an incinerator close by, which would contaminate everything and cause numerous health problems to the residents, animals, crops, gardens etc.. With more properties due to be erected in the area it is just another bit of insanity to be taken into consideration which the planning department must have been aware of at the time when granting permission for the building of this structure. The extra traffic involved in delivering bulk to be incinerated would just add to the pollution. The infrastructure cannot cope with the health issues at the moment, let alone an increase in chest and heart disease also cancer so why add to the problem when it is quite unnecessary? Perhaps those involved in granting permission would like to live on the doorstep and breath in all the toxic emissions and see their pets and gardens deteriorate over time!

A most unhappy local resident

As local residents, we feel that the above mentioned waste incinerator, could have a very serious impact upon the health of locals and cause damage to the local environment. Rather than discover this at a later date when the damage has been done, we respectfully ask that; A full Environmental impact assessment is carried out.

A full health impact assessment is carried out.

If the decision is taken to progress, then a public enquiry is carried out.

This email is written, not to be a NIMBY, but to ensure all of the health and environmental impacts are assessed, prior to any final decision being made.

From our prospective, the future needs of the ever growing population and housing projects need to be taken into account also.

Ultimately, we as residents would like assurances that every aspect has been researched, prior to any irreversible damage could be caused.

We are writing to you to express our concern at the proposal to issue an environmental certificate to V C Cooke to operate a waste incinerator on Ellough Moor.

We strongly object to this proposal that would be so detrimental to the health of residents And to the wider environment. We are requesting that this proposal is halted until; A full environmental impact assessment is carried out A full health assessment is carried out And that if the decision is taken to progress the operating permit that a public enquiry is carried out.

We are aware that the incineration industry faces the possibility of continuing to lose access to renewable energy subsidies but this should NOT be a consideration when deciding on the proposed waste incinerator at Ellough.

We are writing to object to, and stop, the issuing of an Environmental permit for the waste incinerator at Ellough Moor to V C Cooke.

East Suffolk Council air quality strategy 2021 makes it absolutely clear that clean air should be “a fundamental right to all residents” and that the council protecting the environment holds ‘individuals and institutions to account’ which means that if the permit is granted then East Suffolk as well as V C Cooke must be held to account when our health and the environment suffers because of the toxic emissions from the plant

Some PPC functions should trap 5-30% of the coarse particulate matter but the PM2.5 is basically a highly poisonous cocktail of dioxins, furans, heavy metals, PAHs etc which when breathed in, penetrate deeply into the human respiratory system.

These pollutants will build up on land and in water. The temperature inversions experienced from up on Ellough Moor, flowing downwind with the prevailing south-westerlies to the lower areas will affect protected SSSI and Ramsar sites such as Castle Marsh, North Cove Reserve, Barnby Broad and SWT Carlton Marshes. The environmental damage will be serious, and extremely harmful for the children, elderly and all residents and businesses over a wide area.

If a permit is issued, will data be available for public review on a regular basis for carbon monoxide, NOx, SOx and particle matter?

Will the stack have sample points for monitoring the contaminants, as previously named? Will the monitoring standards of EN 15259 be met?

We request a Full Environmental Impact Assessment is carried out, and a Full Health Impact Assessment is carried out. A public enquiry must be carried out, if the permit is granted.

I am very concerned about the intention of a Waste Incinerator plant being given permission to operate in Beccles. The poisonous emissions from the stack would impact our whole lives and the surrounding land would be contaminated.

We were led to believe at a meeting in Beccles that every load of waste is checked and only the non-toxic waste is burned. When challenged as to what sort of things would be burned one of the things we were told, was fabric. I find it extremely hard to believe that a complete separation of toxic and non-toxic waste can happen. Many things have toxic substances in them, eg lots of clothes are made from plastic, are they classed as toxic or non-toxic? We all know that plastic is not supposed to be burned because of its toxicity.

As for the temperature inversions, we have experienced that personally from another stack, despite being told at the meeting that it generally doesn't happen.

A member of my family cannot walk behind a person who is smoking a cigarette because it chokes him. He can move away from that but if this incinerator is emitting toxicity and contaminating our air continuously, it will no doubt affect not only him but lots of people who have breathing problems.

We already have bad odours from the Bio plant at Beccles and the sewage plant at Worlingham. What we do not want is an environmental hazard from this waste incinerator. Perhaps it would be prudent to have an Environmental Impact Assessment and Health Impact Assessment carried out.

I do hope that you will reflect on your decision very carefully.

If the decision is taken to progress the operating permit, a public enquiry should be carried out

I only found out today that the deadline for getting this protest in is today, so sorry if it is not more professionally written.

My first objection is that our roads cannot cope with additional heavy lorries that would come with this incinerator if it goes ahead. It is already difficult and dangerous to get out of North Cove onto the A146 going towards Beccles due to the fact they built the roundabout at the bottom of Copeland way to only connect to the old road which has very little traffic instead of connecting to the road coming out of North Cove. So traffic coming down the new southern bypass then down Copeland way and round the roundabout holds up traffic coming from Beccles on the A146. So when there is a break in traffic from Copeland way the traffic held up at the roundabout is released, meaning that at busy times there is almost a continuous stream of traffic coming past the North Cove junction so nobody can get out. It is already dangerous and any extra traffic will make it more dangerous. Before ANY further development is allowed the road needs sorting out. Suffolk council has allowed building to take place in North Cove but not upgraded the road to cope with it. Already the tractors and trailers going to the digester is causing problems with queues building up behind them along the bypass, and some of them are coming from the other direction along the little country lanes.

It is not environmentally justifiable to cart all of the rubbish from places like Ipswich all the way up here to rural areas and infrastructure to incinerate here. If the incinerators are as safe and environmentally friendly as they say, the obvious place to build and operate it is close to the built up areas creating the waste. The reality is that they know perfectly well that they are not clean and safe and that is why they want it as far away from themselves as they can get it. If this is built and operated what is the road

network they will use to get the rubbish from Ipswich to this rural proposed site. A complete network would need to be built at this end before they even start thinking about building the incinerator. There is not even any decent rail infrastructure that could be used.

From all the studies and reports quoted in the letter I received it is perfectly clear that an incinerator is not a nice or safe thing to have anywhere near where people are living and working. The people making the decision should have seen all this information and stop this from happening in this area. If they have seen these reports they would not be looking after the best interests of the people they are representing if they allow it. And if they haven't seen these reports they should not be making the decisions anyway.

We are emailing to ask East Suffolk not to issue an Environmental Operating permit to V C Cooke. We are in a world where we are struggling to avoid a future climate/environmental catastrophe we were very surprised and disappointed to hear Suffolk County Council passed this type of application. We understand that much needed houses are likely to be built on land the Ellough end of Worlingham sometime in the future. Who would want to build or live so close to this Incinerator!

As a resident of Barnby I am writing to object to the proposal regarding issuing an Environmental Permit to V C Cooke :

I have severe reservations about the impact on public health due to health harming toxins.

There will also be the impact of greater volumes of traffic and emissions in the local area, I am also concerned by the large area over which the toxic emissions from the stack will continuously disperse, residents for miles around will be affected by ground level pollutants depending on wind direction.

I also object to the impact that the chimney stack will have on the aesthetic and character of our local community/area. Our local area is an area of beauty and an enormous chimney stack belching pollutants into the air will mar the beauty significantly.

I request that:

A full Environmental impact Assessment is carried out

A full Health Impact Assessment is carried out.

And that if the decision is taken to progress the operating permit that a public enquiry is carried out

I am writing regarding the proposed incinerator at Ellough, Beccles for which SCC permission has been granted,.However, it still requires an Environmental Operating Permit from East Suffolk Council.

I live in Barnby and am extremely concerned about the potential contamination and air pollution that will occur as a result of this development.

During the SCC planning hearing the wind rose diagrams showing likely fallout distribution were brushed over when they were presented. I am not sure that the Councillors understood their significance.

It is likely that not only will the air quality immediately around the facility deteriorate, but that the chimney will carry airborne deposits and contaminants further towards other settlements and into the wider countryside.

I am deeply concerned about human induced climate change (Suffolk County Council declared a Climate Emergency in 2019), the impact on air quality (Ella's Law was raised at the hearing) and the potential contamination of the surroundings by toxic compounds. I also feel that waste should be reduced through less packaging and tackling consumer culture, not by burning it.

A full and detailed Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out, along with a complete Health Impact Assessment. If the decision to progress the operating permit then I feel a public enquiry would be appropriate.

Dr Dominic Hogg, author of the all party parliamentary group paper (Dec 21) stated " energy from waste (is) no longer justifiable" , concluding "hundreds of different pollutants come out of an incinerator when it burns waste. We barely know what is in waste most of the time but we always know what is coming out of the stack.

Filters only remove 5 to 30 percent of fine particulates. These particulates may carry dioxins heavy metals and other toxins which could lead to numerous health problems including cancer, respiratory problems, heart disease etc, Such toxins also build up in soil leading to contamination issues for future generations.

I am writing with regards to the proposed incinerator at Ellough, Beccles for which SCC permission has been granted, however, it still requires an Environmental Operating Permit from East Suffolk Council.

I live in Barnby and am very concerned about the potential contamination that may occur as a result of this development.

During the SCC planning hearing the wind rose diagrams were brushed over when they were presented. I am not sure that the Councillors understood their significance. It is likely that not only will the air quality immediately around the facility be an issue, but that the tall chimney will carry the air and deposits further towards other settlements and into the wider countryside.

I like other objectors am concerned about climate change (Suffolk County Council declared a Climate Emergency in 2019), the impact on air quality (Ella's Law was raised at the hearing) and the potential contamination of the surroundings. I also feel that waste should be reduced through less packaging and tackling consumer culture, not by burning it.

I therefore feel that a full Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out, along with a full Health Impact Assessment. If the decision to progress the operating permit then I feel a public enquiry would be appropriate.

Please, I beg you, do not issue a permit to allow V C Cooke to operate an incinerator at their site in Ellough - Beccles. I understand permission has been granted to build it but as yet not to operate it.

I live with my wife in Barnby, we are already downwind on most days of the Bio plant at Ellough, we were given to understand that we would not be able to smell the stench that site creates but that was incorrect, we can smell it and it is not nice.

The incinerator will no doubt be as bad if not worse because of the particulates it will eject into the atmosphere.

The incinerator will be a commercial operation and I do not believe that the operator will not be offering a service to burn rubbish bought into the area for profit.

Traffic from the many tractors crawling along our roads to get to the Bio plant is already unbearable and surely the recipe for a serious accident soon. Add to this the many HGV's bringing rubbish to this incinerator and traffic hold ups will go from bad to worse, not to mention the destruction of our already poorly maintained roads.

The parachute club and airfield have been a fixture of this area for generations, thermals, stench and smoke from the incinerator will impact the airfield immensely, and for what purpose, to line V C Cooks pockets?

Above all please consider this, our NHS service is struggling already, people are dying because they cannot receive the medical attention they need fast enough, the country is in crisis, only today it was announced that patients could be shipped out to other far reaching hospitals to help reduce the backlog.

Do you all honestly think that this incinerator will improve matters or are you realistic and honest and accept that it will only make matter worse?

Which is it to be?

Please let us know so that we can consider your opinion when you next ask us to vote for you.

A full environmental impact assessment must be carried out A full health impact assessment must be carried out And after that if you are misguided enough to grant an operating permit then a full public enquiry must be carried out.

This area is suffering enough, what with Sizewell and bringing cables ashore from wind farms and stinking bio plants, we don't need an incinerator as well.

Thank you for your undemanding, please make the right and honest decision.

I write to object to the proposal to issue an Environmental Operating Permit to VC Cooke for the proposed waste incinerator on their Benacre Road site at Ellough, Beccles.

The risks to health and to the environment have been clearly expressed by others. My objection is based these and on the following additional factors

- The proximity to the planned Garden Village housing development makes this site particularly unsuitable
- Trucks bringing waste to the site would not only cause an increase of pollution due to vehicle emissions but also add to traffic congestion in the area.
- The micro climate on Ellough which can give rise to temperature inversions will increase the risk of pollutants (possibly toxic pollutants) becoming trapped and causing local damage no matter how high the stack is built.
- Although V C Cooke has a long history in waste management, as far as I am aware they have no experience in operating this kind of plant.
- The health risks which are likely to be significant are likely to have an impact on the general health of the local population thus putting even more pressure on the already stretched Beccles health centre.

For the sake of the health of local residents and for the wider environment, I submit that East Suffolk Council should not give this proposal a permit to operate.

If a decision is taken to progress the project then both full environmental and health impact assessments must be carried out and a public enquiry should be held.

Could I add my objections to the proposed waste disposal incinerator proposed for Ellough.

I believe that this facility would be detrimental to the health of residents and to the environment in general.

From the research I have seen, it is clear that residents in other areas where incinerators are sited have frequently complained about smells and sounds coming from incinerators. As temperatures rise in the summer, the smell often gets worse, forcing people to close their windows and avoid sitting outside.

I would ask that East Suffolk District Council consider all of the main Material considerations which can include:

- Traffic - Areas with incinerators also experience greater vehicle traffic, with trucks bringing rubbish from other boroughs or counties. This, in turn will lead to issues around Highway safety.

- Design, appearance and materials. I can't imagine that this will be anything other than an eyesore in a prominent location.
- Public Health, Nature Conservation and Noise are key concerns and I would ask that an environmental impact assessment is carried out to assess the implications in respect of these areas.
- Effect on listed building and conservation area. Many of the buildings in the surrounding areas are extremely old. Is there evidence that emissions will not affect the fabric of these buildings?

You will also be aware of the All Party Parliamentary Group paper (2001) written by Dr Dominic Hogg who states:

"Energy from waste (is) no longer justifiable" He also states that "Hundreds of different pollutants come out of an incinerator when it burns waste. It is barely known what is in waste most of the time.

The filters in the stack will only remove 5-30% of the fine particulates and virtually none of the ultrafine particles. It is on these particulates that dioxins, furans, heavy metals, PAHs etc, are carried, increasing the risk of cancer, birth defects, respiratory problems, heart problems, immune system problems etc".

Another consideration is the location on Ellough Moor which is subject to temperature inversions which, in some conditions, will cause emissions to roll down to lower areas -ie Beccles and Worlingham.

I cannot see any benefit that this proposal will bring to Beccles and the surrounding area.

Residents in Beccles are already putting up with the obnoxious fumes from other facilities on Ellough and we do not want more.

I suffer from heart disease and my wife is asthmatic. We would therefore ask that this application is not supported.

I understand that the decision to proceed was on the narrowest of margins which itself is a recipe for alarm in that there is obviously a considerable argument against the environmental permit being issued to V C Cooke to build an incinerator ie; toxic emissions affecting people and wild life. Filtration can only eliminate a small number of these and it cant be disputed that there must be a risk to residents, especially children of Beccles and surrounding area heightened in certain weather conditions; the advent of ULEZ in London considers only car emissions whereas here we have a host of unknown and known poisons.

Equally worrying is the lack of arguments for the incinerator by the business concerned which has not been widely publicized ,knowing the movement against it there should be at least some reassurance provided by the protagonists to local residents and I haven't seen any which suggests to me a possible underhand rubber-stamping of a decision to proceed could occur.

Proceeding with the plan would I believe have a very negative impact on physical and mental health over a wide area , not to mention the impact of increased lorry traffic on roads that already are in a poor state .

I therefore believe that the plan should not progress without a full environmental impact assessment and health likewise. I believe if the decision to proceed is made a public enquiry should be carried out.

I believe that the proposed Waste incinerator on Ellough Moor, would be detrimental to the health of residents and the environment over a wide area.

I would like to request that a full Environmental impact Assessment as well as a full Health impact assessment be carried out to highlight why a permit should not be granted.

I am concerned about the proposed waste incinerator at the V.C. Cooke premises. I have read in-depth about the incinerator and I don't wish it to go ahead to the detriment of the wonderful Suffolk countryside, local towns, villages and residents' health.

My other concern is what developer would want to build near the incinerator when their sole aim is to make a reasonable profit especially due to the high costs to buy land and build. In this economic climate those same companies are closing offices and making persons redundant. To have an incinerator built nearby will just be a negative impact for them.

Before any permit is approved I wish for the following:-

- A full environmental Impact Assessment to be carried out
- A full Health Impact assessment to be carried out
- If the decision is taken to progress the operating permit that a public enquiry is carried out.

We wish to object to the granting of an Environmental Permit to V C Cooke for the creation of a Waste Incinerator at Ellough.

I feel very strongly that the health and well being of local people is being ignored if a permit to V C Cook for a waste incinerator is given to operate. I urge East Suffolk not to be complicit in allowing pollutants to be released into the atmosphere. Fresh air is vital to health. It is on this premise that I insist that a full environmental impact assessment is necessary as is a full assessment of health impact before any decision is made. In the name of human need do not agree to allowing a project with such scant regard for health and the environment to go ahead. You as a council are morally bound and should support your constituents without question so please make the right decision and say no. If you don't you will be responsible for your families and friends suffering the consequences.

I am very much against the incinerator being built at Elough.

I have lung problems and am concerned the emissions will affect me seriously. Having lived in North Cove for 52 years, I would not want to move to somewhere else with cleaner air.

During lockdown I was on the Clinically Extremely Vulnerable list due to my lung problem, and had to stay indoors for 3months.

I feel very worried how this incinerator will affect me.

I write regarding the permit for the Incinerator plant by V. C. Cooke Ltd.

I live in Worlingham at a distance of 0.8 miles from the proposed site. I have strong concerns for health and safety reasons for the health and welfare of the people of Worlingham who live just this short distance from the proposed site. Worlingham has an elderly demographic with over 70% of its residents aged over 65 and many with health issues. The granting of a permit for this incinerator placed so close to the village could cause additional health issues to people who already suffer with asthma and other breathing issues. East Suffolk council has a duty of care to its residents and failure to take this into account could exacerbate health problems and cause other issues. The permit for the incinerator at this site should not be granted for these reasons. Indeed, consideration should be taken of the health conditions of the population of Worlingham through a feasibility study of its patients at Beccles Medical Centre. This has not been done.

Additionally, Worlingham Primary School is just 0.7 miles from the proposed site of the incinerator and this does not appear to have been considered in the planning proposals. Granting a permit at this site could have a detrimental effect on the safety and welfare of the children of this school and it should not be granted.

Furthermore, the residents of Worlingham which is the nearest village to the proposed site for the incinerator, were not informed or consulted about the planning of the incinerator of this site which would appear to be a breach of the consultation process.

I strongly oppose the granting of a permit for the incinerator at this site for the above reasons and implore East Suffolk council to exercise its duty of care to the residents of Worlingham for health reasons.

We request that as the incinerator burning waste would be so detrimental to the health of residents and the environment over a wide area that

1. A full Environmental impact Assessment is Carried out
 2. A full Health Impact Assessment is carried out.
 3. Also that if the decision is taken to progress the operating permit that a public enquiry is carried out.
-

We are very concerned about the plans of V.C.Cooke to build an incinerator near us at Ellough. We often have to put up with foul smells from the bio-digester sited nearby, which is supposed to be odour free, so it's a certainty that the toxic fumes from the incinerator will also reach us.

With the growth in traffic noise and pollution since we moved here 44 years ago the last thing we need are toxic emissions from such a plant. There are also many houses and schools in the vicinity too and the health of young children would be badly affected by these emissions.

We would question how planning permission was attained for this, without consultation, as so many local people knew nothing about it until after it had been passed by Suffolk County Council. Surely this can't be allowed to happen?

We would also like to know how, if it proceeds, it will be financed. Are CSS Technologies or V.C.Cooke contributing or is it being paid for by us, the taxpayer?

We understand that they need a permit to operate this unhealthy scheme and we strongly believe that this should be refused.

Before this project proceeds any further we ask that completely independent assessments into the impact on health and the environment are carried out forthwith.

This is a real contradiction of Council planning policy. Planning should not have been granted but you have the moral obligation not to grant a permit.

Ref: CORE Waste Strategy...ambition to achieve 70% recycling or composting of all waste by 2025?

Have you really factored in the impact on our highways? HGV's lead to congestion, noise pollution and more fatalities. (evidence show fatalities are higher when involved with HGV's.

The Sinfon incinerator in Derby have increased noise, smell and impact on health ex. COPD

Fun fact: Incinerators produce ASH , METALS and TOXINS which is found up to 10 kilometres from the site.

Do the right thing and deny the permit for the sake of all human beings in this community.

No one should have the freedom for profit on the backs of humanities health.

I am very much against this incinerator being built especially as there has not been a full Environmental Survey done on the project.

Also everyone is on about the fumes being very dangerous but there has been no mention of the fact that this will involve building a chimney which will be 36 meters high in very close proximity of Beccles airfield. Hundreds of people a year go skydiving and light aircraft use this airfield many times every day whenever the conditions are suitable throughout the whole year.

It cannot be right to build such a tall chimney in a location where it would clearly be a hazard both to the aircraft and the sky divers. It is clearly very wrong to imperil life and limb of the hundreds of people who take part in this sport every year.

Please do everything in your power to prevent this incinerator being built and being put into operation.

 has a number of concerns which are as follows:-

We are concerned that this project could be producing toxic discharge into the atmosphere as Barnby Parish is directly down wind. We expect a legally binding assurance that if this incinerator is brought into use, then it is subject to a frequent and thorough independent monitoring procedure, open to independent inspection, and that in the event of there being any discrepancies, shortfalls or readings which fall outside the environmental requirements, then the incinerator can be shut down by an appropriate independent authority until it is proven by independent inspection to be within requirements. In terms of monitoring potential toxic output, appropriate air monitoring should be taken as baseline data prior to the facility becoming operational and this should be at least 4 equidistant compass points to account for wind directions. Ongoing monitoring should take place from those same locations to ensure ongoing safe operation and the data available in a format suitable for the general population. The auditing of information provided by the operators should fall within the relevant British or International Standards Organisation standard requirements, and to be regularly audited to ensure that it remains within the required standards, such audits that are conducted by Lloyds Register Quality Assurance teams, so that in the event of the operation failing to comply with these standards, the incinerator is shut down and not restarted until it is compliant with the instructions of these, or other inspection organisations. a totally independent party would be responsible for the calibration and control of the stack shutting down before any toxic discharge.

We would not want to see any more than the quoted 24,000 tonnes pa into this facility. Creating additional traffic from further distance than those already would negate any benefits from the reduction in vehicular traffic. The site currently seems to be continuously advertising for staff, with roles paid at £10.50an hour; this would be a concern if the site was to be doing more responsible work than it is already.

We are pleased to see the reduction in vehicular traffic this project predicts to deliver and welcome the possibility of generating electricity.

Please have the care for our health and the environment in our part of East Suffolk. We do not relish toxic fumes being in our atmosphere. We came to live in a green and pleasant part of East Anglia and allowing this waste incinerator on Ellough will be a disaster for all our local residents.

We therefore request before this burning of waste[who knows what it contains] that we are permitted

A full Environmental impact assessment being carried out; A full health impact assessment be carried out and if this decision is to progress the operation of such an incineration plant, that a FULL Public Enquiry be done beforehand.

Thank you for your interest in local people and their welfare

██████████ has significant concerns with regard to the above application and wishes to put forward its opposition to V.C.Cooke Ltd's (VCC) application for the granting of an environmental permit for a Small Waste Incinerator Plant (SWIP) at their site at Ellough.

It is understood that planning permission has been obtained from Suffolk County Council for a SWIP at Ellough, but there is a strong local feeling that the consultation process was inadequate and that any development which could have a detrimental impact on public health, should have been more widely publicised. Many local people knew nothing about this application until it was granted.

██████████ and its constitution states that its purpose is *"To Benefit, Profit and Support the Common Utility and the Inhabitants of Beccles"*. Income derived by the charity from its investments are applied to support people and organisations in the town of Beccles.

There are eleven Trustees known as Feoffees and they are selected according to their knowledge of the town and people of Beccles. At a recent meeting of the charity the Feoffees agreed to oppose the granting of an environmental permit for the incinerator. Three Feoffees were selected to comprise a sub-committee to draft this letter, which has now been approved by all the Feoffees. Of the three, one is a GP ██████████ (who have not been directly consulted in relation to the incinerator). The other two are a businessman with a shop in the town and a retired solicitor. All three have lived in the town for many years.

Amongst the wider body of the Feoffees, two are directors of a major business in the area with premises across the roundabout from V.C.Cooke's site. Surprisingly they were not consulted to see what impact the operation of an incinerator would have on their manufacturing process.

The charity has a further interest in this application as the owner of 52.88 acres of land earmarked for development within the Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood Scheme, which has been included in the East Suffolk Council 2019 Local Plan for development. The entire scheme comprises 220 acres and is a mixed use development. The scheme envisages approximately 1250 homes, a primary school, shops, a community centre, a country park, sports facilities, allotments and an employment area. It is hoped that an application for outline planning permission will be submitted early next year. We are currently talking to developers, who may be put off by the proximity of the incinerator. As can be seen people may be living very close to the incinerator soon and this seems to be a factor which has not been properly considered so far. The charity also owns farmland to the south of the southern bypass which will be used for ecological enhancement for the residential development in the future. In the meantime there is the possibility that the quality of the land for agricultural purposes may be affected.

The charity is unhappy that VCC have wrongly tried to use the proposed development as a justification for the need for the incinerator. In publicity circulated in the Beccles and Worlingham area by VCC have said:-

"The Worlingham Garden plan needs both electricity and heat. New gas connections have been banned from 2025. The site cannot be connected to the national grid until 2032 and we are in talks to supply 1mwe of electricity or 1000 homes. Without additional power being locally produced the site cannot be built which will deprive local people the chance of new homes in the area."

Our land agent, who is handling development matters on our behalf, tells us that there has been no approach in this respect to either himself or the agent acting for an adjoining landowner by VCC.

Neither we nor our agent were consulted in relation to the application for planning permission and it seems that the impact that the incinerator would have upon this development was not properly considered when permission was given.

Local Population and Sensitive Sites

Beccles and Worlingham have a combined population of 14,591 according to the 2021 census. These residents will all be living within a mile or so of the incinerator. With the wind factored in many more people could be affected by the incinerator including the 71,327 population of Lowestoft, taking the SW prevailing wind into consideration. Within the locality we have the market towns of Southwold, Halesworth and Bungay and in total there are 59 towns, villages and civil parishes in the Waveney area. In addition to the above Beccles and Worlingham have 7 schools within their boundaries and will have a further school if the development goes ahead. A considerable number of children are brought in by buses to attend these schools from other areas. We understand that there are calls for a public enquiry into the whole matter and we would like to add our voice in support.

Land around the site and impact of the incinerator

Beccles is at the southern extent of the Broads National Park, a unique and protected wetland environment. Beccles lies beside the river Waveney and much of the town lies within the Waveney valley. The situation of the town calls into question the value of meteorological data based on the Norwich Meteorological Station 29kms away. On the basis of the Norwich data VCC claims the incinerator will cause “no acid rain, mist or fog”. This in our view cannot be relied upon, without specific local meteorological data. The river valley regularly produces cool mists, fogs and generally damp conditions. A temperature inversion occurs when cool air is trapped at ground level under a layer of warmer air. This is something that can occur in the area and would have a detrimental effect on the predicted dispersal of pollutants, causing the same to remain in the Beccles and Worlingham locality.

It is understood that the proposed chimney stack at 36m is relatively low and perhaps a higher stack is needed if the incinerator is to operate safely to take pollutants above local damp conditions.

Much of the land in the area is used for agricultural purposes. Poultry and egg producing factories are prevalent and provide many jobs within the community. In a recent Facebook post, VCC circulated an article from waste-management-world.com headed “Waste to Energy in a Circular Economy. Friend or Foe?” there is the following comment:-

“Yes the technology is good, but many locations are not measured. So I would not recommend eating chicken eggs close to an incinerator retorts Janek Vank, Climate, Energy and Air Pollution Programme Coordinator of the NGO Zero Waste Europe, adding “Waste-to-energy is a strategy to manage residual waste but the current incineration approach is no longer fit for circularity. The goal is to achieve net zero but the incinerations only add to the emissions.”

We also read that the All Party Parliamentary group on Air Pollution in December called for a moratorium on all new incinerators as research shows that eggs, 10 kms away from incinerators have been found to contain dioxins from incinerators. Incineration material has been found in children’s toenails and associated with childhood leukemia. This is a concern with a number of poultry related outlets in the area. There must be concerns for the health of the general public as well.

Government Uncertainty

Recent announcements by the Government’s own Chief Infrastructure Advisor suggests a ban on new incinerators that do not capture their carbon emissions. In fact the National Infrastructure Commission called for a ban on future facilities not equipped with carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology which would include the proposed Ellough incinerator as there are no carbon storage facilities yet built in the UK. The

commission has said that any incinerator projects not yet in the national planning system should be halted until they have feasible plans for CCS and councils should not sign or renew any long-term contracts with waste companies that could not meet the conditions with immediate effect. The government advisory body has said that recycling more and burning less would help the UK reach net zero as incinerators accounted for about 25% of the waste sector's carbon emissions in 2021 and 1.4% of the total emissions. The Scottish Government in 2022 called for a cap on incinerator plants as too many in operation would lead to lower recycling rates.

Transport Issues

Traffic and congestion are already issues in Beccles and Worlingham. Anything which adds to the problem should be avoided or mitigated. The incinerator as we understand it will operate for 24 hours a day 7 days a week and there will be a considerable number of lorry movements to facilitate this. Inevitably some of this will come through the town and add to the congestion. Unfortunately those designing the southern bypass decided to construct it on a high embankment, so traffic using that will be a visual intrusion particularly for the newly constructed homes on the development.

Conclusion

We were pleased to learn at the drop-in consultation held in Beccles recently that East Suffolk Council will commission an in-depth report from an expert before issuing a permit. It is hoped that this will reveal the safeness or otherwise of the operation of an incinerator so close to major centres of population. We also hope that a full Environmental Impact Assessment will be undertaken.

Whilst an incinerator may possibly be a good idea, it is our view that this one is situated in the wrong location and as a result no environmental permit should be issued.

Ref: V C Cooke Waste Incineration.

Please could I request, that as the requested Incineration unit burning waste could be so detrimental to the health of residents and the environment over a wide area that...

1. A full environmental impact assessment is carried out.
2. A full impact assessment is carried out
3. If the decision is taken to progress the operating permit that a public enquiry is carried out.

I write with deep concern regarding the possible granting to V C Cooke of a permit to operate the incinerator at Ellough Moor, Beccles. Although our useless and corrupt central government don't care about the environment, I would like to think that local government is a little more caring about these issues.

As this incinerator is likely to be detrimental to the health of residents and the environment over a wide area, I hope that all those copied in to this message will insist that:

1. A full environmental impact assessment is carried out before any permit is granted.
2. A full health impact assessment is carried out before any permit is granted.
3. If the decision is taken to progress the operating permit, that a public enquiry is carried out before any permit is granted.

This Council strongly objects to the granting of an environmental permit for a small waste incineration plant at V C Cooke.

There has been no a Health Impact Assessment and there are many studies, for example one by Public Health Scotland which show an increase in cancer and birth defects especially as incinerators age and become less efficient. The emissions are not considered significant but nor was smoking thought to be bad for health years ago. New standards of monitoring in the future may well show the emissions to be more harmful than predicted. There is a growing population near to the incinerator site with another 900 houses planned nearby with several primary schools very close.

There are numerous SSSI sites including Barnby Broad, Sotterley Park and of particular concern the river Hundred. When VC Cooke had a fire in 2020 huge amounts of soot and effluent came down into the river and although precautions are in place, accidents will always happen.

Ellough Business Park is a thriving growing place providing many local jobs; if this incinerator is built it may well stop future development and the creation of more employment and may cause some businesses to relocate.

To the south of the plant is farmland growing food crops and grazing marshes for cattle. Modern farming methods try to reduce the use of chemicals so to have more pollution in the air would be detrimental.

As regards the reports such as the Environmental Risk Assessment, while we do not have the knowledge to dispute the figures, there are some very basic mistakes: Worlington School instead of Worlingham, Wagg Motors instead of Wigg and some places are not in the stated direction of the plant, i.e. Ellough Hall is not NE but SE! These errors might lead one to question the scientific data! The meteorological date came from Norwich Airport, 20 miles away and unlikely to have the same climate conditions as Ellough.

We urge you to refuse an environmental permit for this purpose.

This email, is to support not giving V.C. Cooke an Environmental Permit, for waste incineration on Ellough Moor Beccles. For all the reasons given in a leaflet I received on 1/11/ 2023. My wife suffers from asthma and has an ongoing lung complaint.If this development goes ahead, her health will be in danger, she has already been in hospital five times in the last ten years because of breathing difficulties.

We are writing to you because we are concerned that the case for East Suffolk granting the Ellough Incinerator a permit should be properly considered.

We are not convinced that Suffolk County Council fully took into account the impact that this project will have upon local residents' health. While much of the wind is from the South West, it is the case that the Waveney Valley gets a substantial East wind from the coast. This will move the output of the incinerator directly over Beccles. We request that a full Health Impact Assessment is carried out to address this and the other emissions related concerns.

It is also the case that all incoming waste would be by road. The local road system is entirely single carriageway. We request and urge that an Environmental Impact Assessment is carried out.

We do not believe that Ellough is the best place for such a project. There are several sites that are better served by infrastructure - the coastal area east of Leiston immediately comes to mind.

This is such a serious matter that we think that, should the permit be granted, a public enquiry should be carried out.

I wish to object to the granting of a permit for the proposed incinerator at Ellough Moor.

Whilst, in principle, the burning of waste appears to be part of the solution to waste disposal, this would only be so were there no detrimental externalities.

I therefore request that a full environmental impact assessment be carried out with evidence that there would be no noxious emissions or pollution to the immediate and wider area, including water courses and soil; and that a full assessment of the possible health impacts of the burning of waste might have on people, wildlife and livestock.

I am writing to oppose the granting of a permit for the waste incineration plant on the following grounds:

1. The plant will burn material from builder's skips sourced locally. These will contain a wide mix of plastics, foam, polystyrene, nylon and other petroleum derived materials. The operators list the materials as
 - a. Plastic film 6-10%
 - b. Hard plastics 15-22%
 - c. Wood/plant material 55-60%
2. When these are burnt at high temperatures they produce a wide mix of toxic gases which will be released through a 30m high stack. The Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA) does not provide sufficient information on the amounts of these highly toxic emissions for the licencing authority to make a sound judgement of risk.
3. The ERA lists emissions of HF which are flue gases from wastes containing fluorinated plastics or fluorinated textiles and HCL which are the gases from wastes containing chlorinated organic compounds. Both of these will be present when mixed plastics are burnt. Again the ERA fails to provide sufficient information on the amounts of these highly toxic emissions for the licencing authority to make a sound judgement of risk.
4. According to the Environment Agency (Ref 1), waste flue gases will also contain dioxins and furans both highly toxic and persistent environmental pollutants. Neither of these appear to be considered in the scope of the ERA. This alone is sufficient to refuse a permit.
5. Wood makes up 55-60% of the material to be burnt. Much of the wood will be painted or chemically treated with fungicides. In older wood the paint is likely to contain lead. When these substances are burnt, they create further highly toxic fumes. None of these are considered in the ERA.
6. The ERA lists key sensitive receptors (people and buildings likely to be affected by flue gases) within a radius of 2km from the incinerator. This may be satisfactory in relation to fine particulate material but toxic gases will be expected to affect a much wider area. Had they used 3-4km the incinerator would have affected a much large number of residents as well as schools and medical facilities. This must be considered as part of any permit.
7. The Operational Techniques and Monitoring Plan (CRM 0157 001 PE R 006) states that in some circumstances when the boiler loses combustion, there could be "dangerous blowback and cause damage to the boiler equipment and anyone within close proximity". Even though potentially very serious the risk management under Accidents (Table 6, p27) does not refer to injury to staff or how the potential additional contamination to the local environment would be dealt with.

In view of all these failures, it is strongly recommended that the permit should be refused.

As I'm sure you are aware, the Incinerater that's planned for Ellough will undeniably impact local resident's health, as well as the environment. I beg you to please do everything within your power to stop this happening.

Poisons WILL be in our air if this Incinerater goes ahead. Our families will be posioned. This sounds dramatic and alarmist but it is not. It will not happen over night. It will happen slowly, bit by bit , which unfortunately is how many atrocities in this world are allowed to happen. If the consequences aren't felt immediately and tangibly it's much easier to turn a blind eye, and think the

day will never come when we have to face the consequences. But it will, and like many things, we will turn around and say ' How did this happen? Why was nothing done? '. We simply MUST look ahead to our future and act now.

The particles that will be released are dangerous and toxic, and I feel utterly let down that this has been considered . There simply must be a better solution.

I request

1. A full environmental impact assessment is carried out
2. A full health impact assessment is carried out
3. And that if the decision is taken to progress the operating permit that a public enquiry is carried out

I am very much against this incinerator being built especially as there has not been a full Environmental Survey done on the project.

Also everyone is on about the fumes being very dangerous but there has been little or no mention of the fact that this will involve building a chimney which will be 36 meters high in very close proximity of Beccles airfield. Hundreds of people a year go skydiving and light aircraft use this airfield many times every day whenever the conditions are suitable throughout the whole year.

It cannot be right to build such a tall chimney in a location where it would clearly be a hazard both to the aircraft and the sky divers and it is clearly very wrong to imperil life and limb of the hundreds of people who take part in this sport every year.

Please do everything in your power to prevent this incinerator being built and being put into operation.

This is to register our strong objection to the granting of an Environmental Permit for the proposed incinerator on Ellough Moor.

To grant such a permit would be in clear contradiction of E Suffolk Council's stated vision in relation to safeguarding the environment and the potential unfavourable consequences such a scheme would have on the health and well being of the local community.

We trust that the Council's decision will faithfully reflect these concerns.

shares the concerns raised by residents of all parishes concerning this application .

Comments have been made by many who have professional backgrounds / knowledge within the sector.

would like to understand what professional independent technical advice has been taken by ESC prior to making a decision on this application - specifically on noise , air quality and traffic movements

The parish council concerns include those on noise levels , air quality , traffic movements and effect on surrounds including the proposed new garden village .

I must strongly object to the granting of an operating permit to VCCooke for the new proposed waste incinerator at Ellough Moor.

I am 79 year old and suffer from coronary heart, disease and asthma. I am a resident of Barnby . and I live very close to the local school.

I attended the presentation at Beccles, Public Hall and have read the relevant literature regarding the operational health hazards that all local residence will be exposed to in the surrounding area The operation of this proposed toxic incinerator will not help my health condition nor thousands of other people in the area with similar conditions Toxic fumes in the air affect children, elderly and future generations, alike not to mention the impact it will have on the waterways crops, nature parks, gardens and playing fields alike.

Suffolk County Council must refuse the issuing of the permit and consider the health implications that all of the residence in the area will be exposed to continuously.

This toxic incinerator will be operating every hour of every day of every year in the future if granted.

This must not happen! and Suffolk County Council must protect the public they represent by refusing the operational permit to V C Cooke.

Also I feel a full health impact assessment is needed. along with a public enquiry.

I would like to express my strong concerns about the proposed Incinerator at Ellough Industrial Estate.

From what I have researched the consequences for local residents are often likely to cause health issues.

One has to be suspicious about any proposed Planning Application when it is applied for with as few notifications to nearby residents as is legally required.

Thank you for your attention,

Ref. Public Consultation as part of the application process for Environmental Permit for proposal to build and operate a waste incineration plant in Beccles SCC/0063/22W.

I am writing as [REDACTED] to strongly oppose the above application. I have reviewed the information logged by the local community and professional representatives and feel strongly that there are too many questions outstanding for a license to be even considered. I will not detail all the aforementioned environmental and health concerns as I will simply be repeating information articulately positioned by Peter Aldous MP. I attach a copy of his correspondence which for the record [REDACTED] supports in full & especially in calling for a full public enquiry.

[REDACTED] is situated on Ellough Road, Beccles approximately 300 yards across the road and roundabout to the VC Cooke premises. We currently employ 160 localised staff many with specialised training in the design & manufacture of machinery for the medical sector. We work extensively with the major medical device and pharmaceutical companies such as Medtronic, Boston Scientific & Pfizer to name but a few (the full list of our client base can be found at [REDACTED]). Our premises and surrounding area are subject to an annual audit by these multi-nationals and whilst I cannot categorically say this will cause our clients to move their business elsewhere it cannot be denied that when it comes to equipment manufacture for wound care, catheters & intraocular lenses it will be black mark for [REDACTED] & the local area.

[REDACTED] has been recognised with the Queens Award for Export in 2021 and the inaugural Kings Award for Innovation in 2023. As one of only a hundred companies in the UK to be invited onto the governments scale up program, we are on course to bring an additional 300 jobs to the area in the next 5 years. We understand only too well the need for recycling and considerate waste disposal, but common sense must surely prevail that the risk to health, environmental concerns, and potential business downturn any application should be denied.

Further to the application details posted on the East Suffolk portal, would like to make the following observations:

- The Environmental risk assessments carried out for the site and including air, water and solid waste emission and streams are thorough and aligned with the required legislation. However, the modelling uses impact data from other sites which do not necessarily compare or are relevant for the site being considered. The applicant should demonstrate that the use of these proxy sites is appropriate for Ellough. Thus, the overall conclusion that the operation of the site offers minimal impact to human health, or the natural environment must be considered questionable.
- The assessment of the key areas fails to look to the west of the site and the potential impact on food crops grown in the close vicinity of the proposed site. The report for air pollutants preferring to align with the prevailing weather patterns for the dispersal potential of gaseous emissions. For those pollutants which have the potential to be retained within the local environment, particulates that settle to crop / soil surfaces or Dioxins / Furans that bio-accumulate, the expectation would be real-time data to assess the real impact.

- The ash/char represents a highly concentrated toxin mix and its handling at site and transport should be closely monitored to prevent environmental release either through airborne dust or into the water courses. Ellough industrial area already shows that local environmental conditions disperse local emissions.

We rely on East Suffolk as regulator to aid and oversee the minimisation of any pollutant threat to the local environment, if the permit is granted. This would be through proper oversight of the site design, specifically operational management and in the event of failure to comply with the emission limits, the cessation of operations until a robust mitigation plan is instigated (and proven).
