

As a Burton resident, my main concern is the pollution that will drift to our raised village.

The railway:

The railway is a fantastic environmental highway and also a suspected multiple roost site for bats. The results of the bat survey carried out on behalf of the applicant seem flawed. If the volume of bats detected is taken as correct and the sparsity of roosts is correct, may I suggest there are a large volume of roosts that remain unaccounted for. Locating these is imperative as opening the railway will mean rebuilding two road bridges which are known foraging and roosting sites of large size. (When the bats come out of hibernation in March/April we will be carrying out our own survey to establish a more factual representation of bat activity in the area. Can I also say that the number of species of bats recorded is beyond amazing according to local opinion!).

Ownership of the railway is shared between RMS Port Flixborough and Vossloh Rail. Vossloh Rail own Dragonby sidings, which we are led to believe by the applicant, is going to be expanded and recommissioned. Having spoken to Vossloh Rail themselves on the 23rd of January 2023, I can confirm that, according to their office, the only conversation that has been repeatedly had with Vossloh Rail is in relationship to ownership. They are aware of the incinerator proposal but are totally oblivious that any permissions are being sought to include Dragonby sidings expansion or recommissioning as a part of the proposal. I am aware that planning can be applied for on land not owned by the applicant as the whole application is based on this premiss, but it would be common courtesy to at least let them know the outline of what they are applying for.

Another part of the railway that has been overlooked is informing the residents of Dragonby directly of their proposals which should have been paramount as part of the consultation process at the proposal stage 18+ months ago as some residents live in very close proximity to the sidings.

The River:

The River Trent is a fickle beast at Flixborough. The tidal range ensures that the loading and unloading times for vertical lift loading/unloading of containers is limited to a very small window of 3-4 hours max on the highest tides so a max of 6-8 hours in 24 hrs. Realistically this tidal window could be much reduced on a lower tide. Having spoken at length on this subject with Colin Hammond representing the applicant, he gave me the following weights and volumes. It was stated that each ship would hold 4 " 5,000 tonnes net cargo weight " i.e. what the boat can carry and not taking into account the weight of the ship.

Each container would have a tare weight of 2.2 tonnes. The load per container (of RDF) would be 3.75-4 tonnes.

However information received from the shipping manager John Richardson at Grove Port (for verification), he suggests that the maximum boat length is 100m (this relates to the turning of ships in the river), maximum gross weight (including the weight of the ship) would be 3,800 " 5,000 depending on tide. Mean net cargo

weight including containers is approx 3,000 – 3,800 tonnes taking neap and spring tides into account. These weights are restricted by the ships draught and the water depth on the varying tides.

Road:

The local road network has not been surveyed either for current volume percentage of capacity or for the maximum capacity.

There is also no carbon emissions data according to Highways England or North Lincs Council both of which I have consulted with personally. I have requested NLC and also the CPRE to see if this can be done.

A lot of the background and local effects have been detailed in my other submissions.

The number of vehicles leaving the site appears to be undervalued. In 6.2.13 Traffic and Transport - Revision: 1 available from

[https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wpcontent/uploads/projects/EN010116/EN010116-000754-6.2.13ES-Chapter13-Trafficand](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wpcontent/uploads/projects/EN010116/EN010116-000754-6.2.13ES-Chapter13-TrafficandTransport[Revision1].pdf)

[Transport\[Revision1\].pdf](https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wpcontent/uploads/projects/EN010116/EN010116-000754-6.2.13ES-Chapter13-TrafficandTransport[Revision1].pdf) the survey needs to include vehicles going in both directions. Also what percentage of vehicles leaving or arriving on the site would be loaded or empty as this may drastically affect the number of vehicle movements. It also omits any reference to movement of plastics in and out, chemicals used to “clean” the plastics during processing, dirty “cleaning chemical” transport to and from site?

I also made reference to “a landowner with close interests to the site” in my questioning. Can Mr Bradley “the applicant” explain why he told the interested party “don't worry about the rail or river as they are only a smoke screen and everything will end up going by road”!

In the main construction, the excavation to get full bunker depth will go into the fluvial gravels due to its location and risks any contaminated soils will be washed into these fluvial gravels and contaminate a wider area. The same can be said of piling. By carrying out both these processes regardless of method, the act of crossing the different strata levels will create a vertical pathway between these layers and allow any contamination to percolated down the fluvial gravel layer.

If the excavation soil is contaminated it will need removing from site and replacing, that will increase traffic. What will the effect be on local traffic volumes and the carbon footprint.

I must highlight the test diggings that have been recently carried out between Ferry Road West and the proposed site location. It was quite disturbing to see only a few inches between the water table and ground surface in some trenches while the trenches were open thus showing the fine balance between land and water in the proposed area.

Of what benefit is this project going to have to the people and wildlife that have to receive the pollution, smells and noise?

What chemicals are used to clean the plastics? Where are those chemicals stored? Where are waste chemicals stored and disposed of?

In the proposed manufacture of concrete blocks from the bottom

ash, how are the potentially explosive metals to be removed completely? The applicant states that the weathering of bottom ash will be done within a covered shed where the concrete blocks are manufactured. What process does this involve? Having researched this it appears that "leaching out embedded toxins" is the only way to weather the substrate to a satisfactory level. How can this happen inside the confines of the block plant? Also where and how will these toxins be collected and processed and what will then happen to these toxins? Will these toxins be potentially gaseous or odorous? If so, how will this be controlled and where? What will happen to in excess of 90 % of carbon not captured in the CCS process? The applicant insisted that CCS would not happen for "several years after the project is completed" contrary to earlier statements that all the separate processes in the application would be commissioned when the incinerator is lit. This cannot happen as the "weathering of the bottom ash will take 6 months" by their own admission.

In relation to emissions what particle sizes will be emitted through stack?

Has EPR Energy been considered? They have a current incineration plant adjacent to AB Agri and have their emissions and plume been considered regarding cumulative effect when overlaid with the proposed developments plume? At ISH on the 25th of January noted the close proximity of the proposed development to the existing EPR energy development was noted, and the potential for the NLGEP development to provide cumulative air quality impacts if pollution from both sources follow the prevailing wind was brought up. This EPR energy development has permit number UP3232SX and is operated by EPR Glanford Limited under the name "Glanford Power Station" at Flixborough Industrial Estate, DN15 8SD (easting 486000; northing 414800).

As set out in the Excel spreadsheet (extracts which accompanies this submission), the Environment Agency's 2021 Pollution Inventory records that Glanford Power Station released the following pollutants in 2021:

- \* 2,190 kg of Particulate matter (PM2.5)
- \* 196,000 kg of NOx (Nitrogen oxides (NO and NO2) as NO2)
- \* 22.9 kg of Chromium
- \* 15.6 kg of Copper
- \* 18.3 kg of Nickel
- \* 12,900 kg of Chlorine and inorganic chlorine compounds - as HCl

There does not appear to be any reference to this existing source of emissions in the NLGEP Applicant's Air Quality Assessment [APP-053] or in the Environmental Statement report on Cumulative Effects (6.2.18) [APP-066].

I have started the conversation with the applicant for clarification of the plume and associated data and methodology and been asked by the examiner's support officer to forward any info that I have by the deadline. I am still in consultation with the applicant and the plume specialist and will update as close to the deadline as that final information becomes available.

In relation to the contents of the plume from both EPR Energy and the application for the NLGEP incinerator, in the Rule 6 letter, it

states specifically in bullet point two in the long-term and point one in the shorter term:

#### 1. Air Quality

â€¢ The extent to which the construction of the Proposed Development and the associated changes to traffic movements would affect air quality with respect to sensitive receptors (human and ecological) from the construction of the Proposed Development and the associated traffic;

â€¢ The extent to which the operation of the Proposed Development and plant emissions would affect air quality from the operational process emissions including odour, the approach to amines and operational traffic emissions; and

â€¢ The appropriateness of proposed mitigation and extent to which such mitigation should be controlled and secured through any Development Consent Order (DCO).

Therefore any increase in emissions of any type would exacerbated, by the cumulative effect, the combination of existing and proposed emissions and their