

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Riverside Energy Park](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: EN010093 - Riverside Energy Park Project. At Belvedere. Our Ref: 20022234
Date: 03 October 2019 12:57:10

EN010093 - Riverside Energy Park Project. At Belvedere. Our Ref: 20022234

FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE NEXT PLANNING SESSION

Dear Inspector,

You have already received from myself and colleagues at the Greenwich-Bexley Environment Alliance detailed submissions on our reasons for objecting to the construction of a further incinerator in Belvedere.

I suspect that the majority of the evidence you are evaluating is based on past or present circumstances, much of it empirical and validated. If you recommend the project should proceed then the likely completion date will be c 5 years into the future. Therefore, I believe your judgement should be based on the legal, scientific, environmental and public health framework appertaining from c2024 onward.

LEGISLATION

The trend is towards greener government policies from all political parties. Higher environmental standards are likely as new policies take regard of the younger voters who as we know are becoming increasing aware of global warming and the detrimental effects of pollution. Environmental legislation will be tougher on the polluters and global warmers as we see tighter controls on toxic emissions as further and more sophisticated pollution monitors are in place. We should see legislation that more closely protects endangered habitats, fauna and flora eg The Crossness Nature Reserve.

SCIENCE

The scientific community is ahead of the general population in understanding the effects of pollution and global warming. Almost daily, new empirical evidence is published as long-term studies reveal increasing concerns about the future of the planet. We are witnessing evidence that human health is in danger as pollution creeps menacingly forward. The evidence reveals that the effects of pollution and global warming is exponential and unless action is taken now will continue to be so. The critical date when it is deemed "To late" is being increasingly brought forward ie closer to 2024.

ENVIRONMENT

The cleaning of the River Thames has widely contributed to the increasing numbers of species coming back to London, as evidence from the Crossness Nature Reserve testifies. How wider a variety and numbers would we see if the air around the site were cleaner? To further reduce pollution will take time and much effort, any further pollution will slow down, if not stop progress. Belvedere is downwind from Central London's pollution, is under the flight path of the City Airport, is the site of one of the UKs biggest incinerators and it is probably to become the site of London's largest re-cycling centre. I suggest that a further incinerator will stop any environmental improvements that may accrue over the next five years.

As an infrastructure project please consider the need in five years for further incinerators.:

Re-cycling is rapidly increasing as more councils are at last embracing the economic and environmental benefits. The number of single use plastic is diminishing following the successful reduction of plastic bags. Manufactures are looking at ways of reducing plastic packaging. More products are being produced from re-cycled materials. Supermarkets are encouraging customers to provide their own re-usable food containers.

How much further progress could there be in in the next five years as our incinerated rubbish diminishes. Will we need another incinerator to dispose of our trash?

HEALTH

In my original submission I indicated the probable correlation of COPD related deaths and the siting of incinerators. If this is proven, then the siting of a further incinerator can only add to the ratio of deaths. Over time that death ratio *Incinerators/COPD* could increase dramatically as up to 20,000 new dwellings are planned within 1.5km of the Cory site, many within 500 metres. The building work has already started and will be much advanced within five years. Where else in the UK could be found such an alignment of housing to existing and further pollution? The effects are likely to hit the poorest in low rent accommodation, as who is going to pay premium prices to live close to two incinerators?

LOCAL RESIDENTS

Over 750 people have signed an online petition see:

<https://www.change.org/p/secretary-of-state-for-business-energy-and-industrial-strategy-stop-a-2nd-waste-incinerator-on-one-site> :

This is in addition to the petition organised by MP John Cruddas and those signatures collected by us locally. I trust you will take this into consideration when making your judgement, copies of the petition can be forwarded to you if required. Further reading re our concerns can be found on our web site at: www.naiib.org

CONCLUSIONS

Having attended two of the planning sessions I can see that your task seems almost overwhelming. However, please look to the future when making your decision, it is what will be appropriate from 2024 onward not what has gone before, where generally judgments concerning the environment have been proved to be unsound.

Thank you for reading and best wishes in your endeavors.

Yours sincerely

Tony Fairbairn

On behalf of the Greenwich-Bexley Environment Alliance