

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Boston Alternative Energy Facility](#)  
**Subject:** Request to be heard orally at the Preliminary Meeting Part 1  
**Date:** 13 September 2021 17:16:57

---

## To Whom It May Concern

I write on behalf of the United Kingdom Without Incineration Network (UKWIN) to request to be heard orally at the Preliminary Meeting Part 1 to be held virtually on Tuesday 28th September.

Myself and/or my UKWIN colleague Josh Downen wish to speak in relation to Item 3 of the Agenda (Initial Assessment of Principal Issues).

In particular UKWIN wishes to raise the following questions for consideration and clarification by the ExA:

- With respect to the climate change impacts of the proposed incinerator, UKWIN is not clear about the extent to which this matter will be considered as part of Principle Issue 4 (Design, layout and visibility) and/or Principle Issue 1 (Air quality). For example, Issue 4 includes a bullet point for the climate impacts of the proposed incinerator, but those impacts depend not only on the design of the facility but also on feedstock composition. Similarly, the air quality issue includes a bullet point on 'emissions', but air emissions include CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gasses that impact on climate change but not necessarily on air quality. So, we seek clarity about whether the impacts associated with the anticipated feedstock composition will be covered by Issue 1 and/or Issue 4, or if they instead deemed only relevant to Issue 11 on Planning Policy. Our preference would probably be for these matters to be included within Issue 1, but it might be helpful for climate change (and potentially 'technology choice') to then be explicitly added to the title of Issue 1 for the avoidance of doubt.
- Where do emissions from traffic to and from the incinerator sit, e.g. Issue 1 ('Air quality') and/or issue 12 ('Transport and traffic')? Our view is that if traffic emissions are intended to be considered as part of the project's air quality impacts (e.g. as part of the cumulative impacts considered in Issue 1), then it makes sense to consider this within Issue 1.
- Does accordance with the waste hierarchy, including potential adverse impacts on recycling rates, fall to be considered only within issue 11 (planning policy), or is it also considered to fall within the scope of Issue 4 ('Design, layout and visibility')?

Thank you for this opportunity to raise these questions.

Kind regards,  
Shlomo Downen  
National Coordinator, United Kingdom Without Incineration Network (UKWIN)  
Unique Reference: 20028052