Cory Riverside Energy Park Consultation
25th May 2018 Belvedere Community Centre

The consultation for the above I attended at 11am and departed at 12.30pm. It consisted of 2 video presentations that were available to review. One videos already available on the Cory website and the other the new proposals. There were several information pull down sheets on display. However, there was no new information on these that added to or supplemented the presentations on the Cory website.

The website presentations offered the following assertions:

* A low carbon energy park. There is no assertion of carbon negative or carbon neutral provision.

* A “Black Bin” waste usage providing green energy during peak usage. This is purported to to offer cheap heating to local housing. Although quite how that will be provided or what constitutes cheap heating is not clarified.

* It is asserted that the site would generate 96 Megawatts of low carbon renewable electricity at peak times. It does not say what provision is made for off peak time, it is therefore to be presumed that the battery storage referenced would be how this is addressed.

* 72 megawatts of electricity to power circa 300,000 homes

* To take an additional 650,000 tonnes of residual waste away from landfill. Saving an alleged 130,000 tonnes of CO2 per year. The residual waste is an additional amount to that already being processed by the current Cory site. The CO2 savings are not fully explained other than the three elements of river transportation rather than truck, no landfill usage and the recycling of the ash to provide for breeze block production.

*. It is stated there is a potential for 30 Megawatts of affordable heat to local housing. However, the definition of affordable and to whom is not extrapolated.

* It is stated that there will be 175,000 tonnes of building material for home construction.

*. It is anticipated that there will be 6000 plus construction workers used over the course of the projected build.

*. The aim is to create 100 full time local jobs including some (not specified) apprenticeships.

Cory Riverside Energy Park Consultation
25th May 2018 Belvedere Community Centre

The Questions to be answered.

1. With the waste coming by boat / barge what happens to waste transportation if the boat service or jetty has an issue or failure ?

2. What are the contingency plans?

3. How will this impact the local residents ?

4. With the previous Cory proposal now in situ there were local concerns regarding the release of waste in the form of particulates, soot and dioxins. What health impact assessment has been proposed or considered for these latest proposals?

5. Are there any health enquiries being undertaken ?

6. Has there been any increase in detrimental health outcomes since the current plant was built and is there any prospect for further concerns with the new proposals ?

7. The Cory site currently operating was subject to Public Enquiries in 2003 and 2005. Have the lessons been learnt from these and will the local residents be more fully engaged with and their concerns properly and fully addressed ?

8. In 2012 on opening the Belvedere Energy Waste Plant there were substantial falls in re cycling rates in Lambeth,Wandsworth, Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea provided to the Western Riverside Waste Authority. As had the rates for the Sutton waste recycling site servicing Croydon, Kingston Upon Thames, Merton and Sutton. What are the comparator sustainable recycling rates volumes between 2012 and 2018 ?

9. What are the costs of household waste when landfilled compared to incineration ? These comparators should include consideration for re cycled, co mingled and re cycled from segregated collections?

10. What is the process undertaken to ensure good air quality is achieved in the surrounding residential and industrial areas ?

11. In 2015 the European Union Commission estimated that their Clean Air package would save £31- £110 billion and prevent 58,000 premature deaths from Air pollution by 2030. Will the Cory development be applying these processes to its site (due to be complete currently in 2024) or will Brexit have a detrimental impact on such considerations?

12. The EU Circular Economy package would have created 580,000 jobs at an alleged saving of £475 billion. Has this been abandoned under Brexit ?

AIR QUALITY IN LB BEXLEY

13. What is the cost of poor air quality ?

14. What are the health implications of poor air quality ?

15. How many premature deaths occur as a consequence of poor air quality ?

16. How many vulnerable groups would be detrimentally impacted by poor air quality ?

17. What responsibilities has LBB imposed upon this project regarding Air Quality ?

18. What responsibilities has LBB imposed upon this project regarding the:

Cory Riverside Energy Park Consultation
25th May 2018 Belvedere Community Centre

sustainability issue

Energy provision (referencing Hi and Lo peak supply)

Health monitoring ?

Recycling?

Dioxin exhaust

19. Would Belvedere, Thamesmead, Erith, Slade Green and Barkingside qualify post construction as ULEZ (Ultra Low Emission Zones) having this industrial activity in its immediate vicinity ?

20. Where are all the data sets derived from as shown on the Cory website ?

21. How accurate is it to assert that 1,000,000 tonnes of waste as proposed to be transported by river barge saves 100,000 lorry journeys ?

22. How can / could members of the public monitor / review the correct application of environmental permits ?

23. What evidence is there to support the assertion by Cory of "No waste " by 2030 ?

23. What is the projected increased waste tonnage to be processed year on year ?

24. Is the river traffic sufficiently low volume that such increased volume tonnage could still be transported in this manner ?

25. The South East of UK is now becoming the most arid area of Europe, what will the water usage be of this plant be year on year ?

26. The local planning for the cabling from this plant to the proposed Littlebrook substation in Dartford would require between 10 and 13 kilometres of road works dependent upon routes determined as optimal. How long would such impacts take to complete bearing in mind that Bexley has had to endure travel disruptions because of both London Bridge train station upgrades and Crossrail over several years. This now offers traffic disruptions of similar magnitude ?

27. What environmental impacts such as noise and dust would there be and what actions to mitigate it have been considered ?

My initial questions above, may or may not be relevant and possibly superseded by events or Cory declarations But hopefully they may offer the opportunity to begin the discussion within the Labour Party and then with the local residents of all areas to be impacted by this proposed development.

There is a provision to respond to the consultation by e mail or document handed out at the event. However, before such responses are supplied to Cory it may be useful to have a meeting with our residents to ascertain what their views are on both the proposal and their concerns as a consequence.

I am sure that much more considered and insightful views will be forthcoming once all parties have had the opportunity to digest this and further consultations.

Cory Riverside Energy Park Consultation
25th May 2018 Belvedere Community Centre

It is clear, that with China's ending of its waste processing that each country will have to solve its waste issues and find the most economically viable means to do so. To convert it to energy offers one of many solutions. I look forward to seeing the alternate views that will proceed from this initial consultation.

I hope that this assists in offering a start to reviewing the Cory proposals and then advancing to engaging with our residents to provide them with answers too.

Dave Putson
Councillor LB Bexley

25th May 2018

Key findings

- **Despite efforts to cut waste and increase recycling, more than half of London's waste ends up being incinerated. The amount of waste sent for incineration (known as "Energy from Waste") has more than doubled in the last decade, reaching nearly two million tonnes in 2017.**

- **Burning waste takes materials out of the circular economy, releases carbon into the atmosphere and may have negative health effects.**

- **But it also generates electricity, can provide heat for local homes and businesses, and reduces the amount of waste sent to landfill.**

- **Energy from waste technology (EfW) is here to stay, at least in the medium term.**

- **But while London has the EfW capacity to meet demand, it currently exports approximately over half a million tonnes of waste for incineration a year.**

- **London needs to become self-sufficient in managing the waste it generates, reducing waste sent to EfW as population grows.**

- **The Mayor intends to regulate London's energy from waste sector by limiting its carbon emissions and maximising the**

energy benefits it can generate.

- **London must begin to limit not only the amount but also the type of waste it sends to EfW. As London strives to be greener, there are further steps the Mayor should take to manage the environmental impact of EfW in the short term.**

Cory are returning to the size of incineration plant that they first applied for in the 1980's.They got half and this is their continuing attempt to achieve the full 1980's application. Sadly, I am opposed as I believe that incineration is not the answer. We need to be recycling, re using and reducing our waste not burning it.
Despite their vastly improved scrubbing of waste from their chimney, they still are unable to answer the serious question of ultra fine particulates which are released and are a dangerous health concern for local residents. LBB when asked were completely flummoxed by this question.
Incineration is an old technology that works for providing energy and in some instances heating, but it fails dramatically on carbon reduction.On one consultation I asked about carbon usage by Cory and I received three different answers from three different personnel, Low Carbon, Carbon Neutral AND Carbon Negative. Clearly it cannot be all three and I still await the answer I was promised from Cory.
There is Crossness Nature reserve immediately adjacent to the proposed development and the artificial lighting that will surround the proposed new site will have a serious and adverse impact on the migration birds and other wildlife that flock to, and nest, at this special reserve.Despite this being an area of Metropolitan Open Land and Green Belt there appears to be a burgeoning planning and build ethos detrimentally impacting this Nature reserve.

EXTRACT FROM EVIDENCE GIVEN TO INQUIRY 2003

Primary particles are those emitted directly into the atmosphere from traffic, combustion sources and windblown dust. Secondary particles are formed in the atmosphere by chemical reactions, mainly through the oxidation of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide, to sulphate and nitrate particles. Clearly, a waste incinerator would be producing both types.

To appreciate more fully the nature of the particulates being discussed, 1600 PM_{10} particles would fit on the dot of the letter i in normal print. For $PM_{2.5}$ the figure would be 25,600 particles. In the case of ultra-fine particles, 0.001 micrometers or one nanometer, it takes 160 billion to cover the dot of the i.[1]

The process of incineration turns solids and liquids partly into gases and partly into tiny particles of soot or ash. The resulting particles are exceedingly small when they are emitted to the environment. Scientists who study particles make a distinction between coarse and fine particles. Fine particles behave entirely differently from coarse particles and are much more dangerous to humans. Fine particles are much more difficult and expensive to control and are also invisible. Incinerators emit large numbers of particles, despite the best control technology. Half of all the particles emitted will have a diameter of less than 2 micrometers and the majority of those will have a diameter of 0.3 micrometers. **Each pound of fine particles emitted from an incinerator will consist of 140 quadrillion individual particles.** (A quadrillion is 1000 trillion). Over a year, an incinerator meeting US federal standards will legally emit anywhere from ten to one thousand tons of fine particles depending on the size of the incinerator.[2]

The human body has evolved to cope with its environment and has mechanisms capable of dealing with coarse particles. The membranes of the nose, throat and lungs help to trap dust. The deepest region of the lungs, the alveoli, where oxygen passes into the blood, should be protected from airborne particles. But we have not evolved sufficiently to deal with fine particles and once these reach the alveoli there is no clearance mechnism to remove them. Once lodged in the lung, fine particles, with their enormous surface area enriched with toxics, provide an efficient means of delivering metals and organic pollutants directly into the bloodstream. Those which are not soluble are retained in the deep lung for long periods (months or years).

Recent research suggests that certain spots in the lungs may accumulate far more cancer-causing airborne particles than was previously thought. A new computer model suggests that cells on the spurs between airways in the lungs build up inhaled carcinogens to concentrations at least a hundred times higher than elsewhere in the lungs, according to Thomas Heistracher of the Polytechnical University of Salzburg in Austria.[3] Current pollution regulations ignore such buildups but it means that allowable concentrations should be reduced.. Further experiments are to be carried out.

[1] Montague, Peter, "The Holy Grail of scientific certainty"
Rachel's Environment & Health Weekly No.440 4.5.95

2 Montague, Peter "Fine particles; the danger of incineration"
Rachel's Hazardous Waste News No 131 30.5.89
Download from website www.enviroweb.org/publications/rachel on 25.03.99

3 "Hot spots in lungs collect pollution" The Guardian, 24.4.03, Life Section, p7