

Response to Documents 9.86 & 9.90 / REP8-015 & REP8-017

UKWIN'S D9 COMMENTS ON APPLICANT'S WITHOUT PREJUDICE 'IN-PRINCIPLE' ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS CASE & FOURTH REPORT ON OUTSTANDING SUBMISSIONS

Proposed Development:

Boston Alternative Energy Facility (BAEF)

Proposed Location:

Nursery Road, Boston, Lincolnshire

Applicant:

Alternative Use Boston Projects Limited

Planning Inspectorate Ref:

EN010095

Registration Identification Ref:

20028052

MARCH 2022



COMMENTS ON THE APPLICANT'S WITHOUT PREJUDICE 'IN-PRINCIPLE' ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS CASE (DOCUMENT 9.86 / REP8-015)

Issue	Applicant position	UKWIN position
<p>Area of search (Step 1 of the Applicant's methodology)</p>	<p>Consider only areas 'readily accessible by sea'.</p>	<p>Considering only areas 'readily accessible by sea' is an overly narrow approach to identifying potentially suitable alternative locations for the proposed incineration capacity. Some or all of the proposed capacity could be located in land.</p> <p>UKWIN notes the Applicant's (paragraph 3.1.1) claim that: "...<i>Within England, the highest levels of waste inputs to landfill and potentially combustible waste inputs to landfill originate from the East of England and the South East</i>".</p> <p>UKWIN would therefore expect the Applicant to have at least considered building two incinerators with half the capacity proposed for Boston – one in the East of England and one in the South East, at the most suitable locations within each of these regions, not limited by accessibility to the sea.</p>
<p>Basis for scoping locations out (Step 3 of the Applicant's methodology)</p>	<p>Unallocated sites are routinely scoped out, without the need to provide a detailed explanation.</p>	<p>The scoping out of virtually all unallocated does not accord with real world practice. Waste Authorities are free to support residual waste treatment facilities on land that is not allocated for employment purposes wherever such sites are consistent with the relevant waste strategies / plans when these strategies and plans are considered as a whole.</p> <p>The Boston Applicant's assessment often makes vague claims that the Boston proposal would be contrary to policies in local plans without clearly explaining the basis for such conclusions. Many of the policies cited by the Applicant allow for developments outside of allocated sites when the need and benefit have been demonstrated.</p>

Issue	Applicant position	UKWIN position
		<p>If the Applicant's position is that the proposed 1.2 million tonnes of capacity would fail to meet a requirement to demonstrate need / benefit, then it is curious why they are also arguing that there are imperative reasons to allow that same capacity to go ahead in Boston, given the environmental constraints associated with the Port of Boston site.</p> <p>For example, in several instances the Applicant states that: "development proposals within the Green Belt need to demonstrate very special circumstances which presents a significant risk in planning terms". It would be useful to receive an explanation from the Applicant as to why they are not confident that they would be able to demonstrate 'very special circumstances' for this capacity given that they are making an IROPI case for Boston.</p> <p>It is also unclear from this assessment whether any of the conclusions regarding unacceptability related to the scale of the development, and therefore whether or not the capacity could be located at any of these locations if it were to be split in two.</p>
<p>Consistency of the shortlist options assessment (Step 4 of the Applicant's methodology)</p>	<p>The potential impact for disturbance to protected species is grounds for scoping out sites.</p>	<p>It is unclear the extent to which the Applicant has assessed its ability to mitigate and compensate for any such adverse impacts with respect to sites other than the Port of Boston. If the Applicant's position is that the mere potential for harm to biodiversity provides grounds for the site to be scoped out, then it is curious indeed that the Applicant is making an IROPI case to allow for such harm to take place around the Port of Boston.</p>

COMMENTS ON SECTION 2.5 OF THE APPLCIANT'S FOURTH REPORT ON OUTSTANDING SUBMISSIONS (DOCUMENT 9.90 / REP8-017)

UKWIN Comments on the Applicant's REP8-017 Response to UKWIN's REP7-035 Deadline 7 Comments on the Applicant's REP6-032 second report on outstanding submissions

Para	Applicant comment	UKWIN response
Comments on National Policy Statements		
1-15		We note that the Applicant has not responded to UKWIN's comments on the National Policy Statements.
Comments on The Applicant's Need Assessments / Isochrone assumptions / waste plans		
16-18	The Applicant has requested in 'The Applicant's Response to United Kingdom Without Incineration Network (UKWIN) Deadline 6 Submission' (document reference 9.79, REP7-011) that UKWIN confirms its assumptions on the starting point for C&I recycling rates for its increases of 100%, 50% and 33% that were used in its outline modelling. The Applicant assumes that UKWIN considers the UK to not recycle any C&I waste if it then considers a scenario of increasing the rate by 100%...	<p>The Applicant has completely misunderstood the methodology applied by UKWIN for calculating the impact of improvements in C&I recycling rates on the amount of residual waste that would be available as potential feedstock for the Boston plant.</p> <p>As clearly set out in REP8-030 pages 2-4, UKWIN's approach was to assume an equivalent level of improvement for the respective proportion of the residual C&I waste, i.e. equivalent to the improvement in household recycling assumed by the Applicant. In line with this approach, '100%' does not assume increasing C&I recycling by 100%, but rather that C&I would achieve a 1:1 equivalent of the level of improvement anticipated by the Applicant for household waste, prorated to the equivalent starting amount of C&I waste.</p> <p>Similarly, a 33% improvement would assume a 3:1 equivalence, meaning that for every 3 tonnes of improved household recycling 1 additional tonne of formerly residual waste is assumed to be recycled for the equivalent amount of residual C&I waste.</p>

Para

Applicant comment

UKWIN response

... If data was available, the most likely starting point for C&I recycling would be an existing rate of 50 or 55% as large quantities of materials are already recovered. The step change to meet the 65% CEP target may lead to a further 10% of material being diverted from landfill...

The Applicant proposes, but has not modelled, C&I recycling increasing from 50/55% to 65%.

To understand what the Applicant is now arguing, UKWIN has carried out modelling of the Applicant's new approach based on the figures provided by the Applicant in their Addendum to Fuel Availability and Waste Hierarchy Assessment (Document 9.5 / REP1-018) as follows:

FIGURE 1. ESTIMATE OF REDUCTION IN RESIDUAL WASTE DUE TO INCREASE OF C&I RECYCLING FROM 50% TO 65% (KTPA)

Ref	Description	UK	In Catchment	Source / Calculation
A	Landfilled combustible wastes (ktpa)	12,502	10,437	Table 4-1 of Applicant's Doc 9.5 (REP1-018)
B	C&I Fraction (ktpa)	6,876	5,740	A × 55% (i.e. 0.55) as per para 21 of REP2-058
C	Derived total C&I waste (assuming 50% recycling)	13,752	11,481	B ÷ 50% (i.e. 0.5 as 100%–50% = 50%)
D	C&I Residual assuming 65% recycling	4,813	4,018	C × 35% (i.e. 0.35 as 100%–65% = 35%)
E	Reduction in available waste due to 15% increase in C&I recycling	2,063	1,722	B – D

FIGURE 2. ESTIMATE OF REDUCTION IN RESIDUAL WASTE DUE TO INCREASE OF C&I RECYCLING FROM 55% TO 65% (KTPA)

Ref	Description	UK	In Catchment	Source / Calculation
A	Landfilled combustible wastes (ktpa)	12,502	10,437	Table 4-1 of Applicant's Doc 9.5 (REP1-018)
B	C&I Fraction (ktpa)	6,876	5,740	A × 55% (i.e. 0.55) as per para 21 of REP2-058
C	Derived total C&I waste (assuming 55% recycling)	15,280	12,756	B ÷ 45% (i.e. 0.45 as 100%–55% = 45%)
D	C&I Residual assuming 65% recycling	5,348	4,465	C × 35% (i.e. 0.35 as 100%–65% = 35%)
E	Reduction in available waste due to 10% increase in C&I recycling	1,528	1,276	B – D

These figures indicate that - in the Applicant's proposed catchment - increasing recycling rates from 50-55% to 65% would result in a reduction in available waste of between 1.2 and 1.7 million tonnes per annum.

This does not alter the conclusion of the assessment UKWIN set out in Figure 2 of REP6-042 which can therefore be updated (as Figure 3) as follows:

**FIGURE 3. INCINERATION CAPACITY MISSING FROM APPLICANT'S CAPACITY ANALYSIS
(ASSUMING 90% UTILISATION; FIGURES IN KTPA)**

Description	55% to 65%	50% to 65%	3:1 of HH	2:1 of HH	1:1 of HH	Source
Landfilled combustibles wastes	10,437	10,437	10,437	10,437	10,437	Applicant
RDF exported	2,450	2,450	2,450	2,450	2,450	Applicant
Available fuel	12,887	12,887	12,887	12,887	12,887	Applicant
Additional new EfW (construction & commissioning phase) capacity	4,255	4,255	4,255	4,255	4,255	Applicant
Missing additional new EfW capacity	2,392	2,392	2,392	2,392	2,392	UKWIN
Fuel demand of additional EfW (construction & commissioning)	3,830	3,830	3,830	3,830	3,830	Applicant
Fuel demand of missing additional EfW (construction & commissioning)	2,153	2,153	2,153	2,153	2,153	UKWIN
Remaining available fuel (after under construction EfW operational)	6,904	6,904	6,904	6,904	6,904	Derived
Higher recycling rates reducing residual waste (HH)	5,147	5,147	5,147	5,147	5,147	Applicant
Higher recycling rates reducing residual waste (C&I)	1,276	1,722	2,076	3,145	6,291	Derived
Remaining available fuel (after new EfW operational and higher recycling rates met)	481	35	-319	-1,388	-4,534	Derived

This means that, even using the Applicant's assumed level of C&I recycling improvement, the amount of residual waste available (between a maximum of 35,000 and 481,000 tonnes) is significantly less than the proposed 1.2 million tonne Boston RDF capacity (which would require 1,600,000 tonnes of waste per annum).

Within the context of anticipated future residual waste, it is also worth noting that in addition to the current recycling targets, the UK Government is currently proposing to introduce waste reduction targets for England.

On the 16th of March 2022 the Government proposed a target of halving English residual waste per capita by 2042 based on 2019 levels. 2042 is well within the anticipated operational lifetime of the proposed Boston facility. The Government makes clear on pages 28–30 of their 'Consultation on Environmental Targets' document that reducing the incineration of waste is desirable, stating: *"Tackling residual waste reduces the environmental impacts of treatment, including air, soil, and water pollution, and unnecessary energy use. It is more sustainable to prevent waste completely and, where waste is unavoidable, to recycle it...The proposed target can drive both waste minimisation and recycling of unavoidable waste..."*

Para	Applicant comment	UKWIN response
Comments on Greenhouse Gas emissions and Climate Change impacts – UKWIN calculation of carbon intensity of exported electricity & Comments on Greenhouse Gas emissions and Climate Change impacts – weight of carbon benefits or disbenefits		
19-27	...The Facility's potential electricity export per annum would be...some 0.2% of total UK 2020 demand...	It is notable that the Applicant is downplaying the contribution that the facility would make to UK electricity generation. The obvious conclusion to draw is that there would be no significant impact on UK energy generation capacity were this application to be refused.