

Dear Inspectorate,

From the start I am not opposed to a carbon capture facility in Belvedere, however I totally oppose any encroachment onto the nature reserve, in fact the nature reserve should be expanded for obvious reasons; there are ways for that to happen as I have endeavoured to demonstrate below.

In investigating Cory's plans for carbon capture please take into consideration;

The opportunity to develop the facility elsewhere in Belvedere

The dangers of incinerator-based carbon capture in an area scheduled for further residential development

The inherent inefficiency of the design of the project.

The unique dangers of capturing carbon from waste.

The rushed nature of Cory's plans and Cory's environmental record to date.

To the east of the planned unit lies Norman Road, which on inspection forms the west side of a two lane dual carriage way, albeit that the eastern side is on private land.

Norman Road is either owned by Bexley Council or Highways England. There is no technical reason why the new complex could not be moved towards the east, and the road used/owned by Iron Mountain/ASDA be also used to access all of Cory's facilities. Eg Cory would pay the Exchequer to buy the Norman Road land and pay a fee or an annual rent to Iron Mountain/ASDA for use of the eastern carriageway' or some other legal/financial mechanism to allow this to happen.

Of course, there are difficulties in this proposal not least objections from Cory, Iron Mountain and ASDA, mainly of the expectation of heavier traffic on the revamped Norman Road, my observation as a long term Belvedere resident is that the road could not be classified as

busy even during the construction of incinerator 2. Also, I believe Cory have stated in the past that their proposals will not greatly increase vehicle numbers as most of their traffic is via the River Thames.

I recommend a traffic use survey be conducted at the north end of Norman Road to judge the efficacy of this proposal.

In nature as in engineering the most effective, economic and efficient movement between two points is a straight line. Yet Cory in a rush to develop their project have chosen to defy logic and produce a plan that moves dangerous substances from A to B and then pass through A again to awaiting ships.ie a U-turn.

If I am right and HM Government are subsidising the Cory project then they could be wastefully using tax payer's money on an inefficient project. Also, the long A to B back to A pipeline enhances the danger of leakages to cause harm to the Nature Reserve and the increasing population.

If inefficiency and enhanced danger from an elongated pipeline are not a major concern then the new facility could therefore be sited close to the river east of Iron Mountain/ASDA. Of course that would involve compulsory purchase orders, but aren't we in that situation anyway? Note: To the east of the Iron Mountain/ASDA complex is a strip of land currently undeveloped, I believe this land is designated for a River Thames road crossing, postponed until 2030. Please consult with the GLA the project may be abandoned.

A link from the incinerators east along the river foreshore to a riverside de carboning plant would allow direct access to awaiting ships. This is surely worth consideration and in the long term may be better value for money

Another major advantage, mainly for Cory is that processing carbon to the east of Iron Mountain/ASDA puts the facility amongst the developing industry in North Bexley. Many factories new and old are

releasing carbon; a close by extraction facility will offer widespread long-term benefits

Carbon capture from incinerators is a new and untested procedure with little if any empirical evidence or experience of the dangers. The vast majority of carbon capture experience is concentrated on extraction from singular processes eg Oil, Coal, Gas and Cement where the outcomes are generally predictable. This is not the case when decarbonising waste.

Extracting carbon from unknown substances in our rubbish will be unpredictable in quantity and complexity. As there are isn't any effective monitoring of what we send to incineration we can and do dispose of all types of waste: poisons, drugs, harmful minerals, plastics, much of it producing innumerable harmful particulates, these will have to be separated from the carbon, stored and disposed of. Until we learn how to process this unsafe material in a safe and effective manor it would be irresponsible to experiment in an urban area. Let the science evolve through experimentation in facilities away from urban populations.

Is there any reason, efficiency or safety wise why the processing plant could not be separated into two or more separate units, eg the storage element after processing be sited between or north of the incinerators adjacent to the moored boats. Eg. From an aerial photograph it is noted a high proportion of the Riverside Recovery Facility is and will become designated for car parking, it is surely possible to build part of the carbon capture process under or above car parks, or of course use the river foreshore that appears to be part of Cops plan.

Through experiment and development, the process of decarbonisation will likely become more effective less hazardous and probably end up with smaller footprints eg computers. I prophesise that given time carbon capture will develop in this way ie become more efficient and safer and at the same time needing less land.

The above-mentioned proposals could be judged singularly or in conjunction with each other.

After reading the above you will probably dismiss my proposals as being impossible, remember in 1969 Neil Armstrong walked on the moon, that was impossible.

Finally, I want you to consider the history of Cory and the planning process in general.

At the turn of the century some 60,000 names voted against incinerator No,1, despite their warnings re the effect on global warming (now found to be true) the project went ahead. Incineration does contribute to overwarming the planet, as does the process of extracting carbon.

During the planning process for incinerator No.2 evidence was presented to the Planning Inspectorate that demonstrated any person living in a London wide borough with an on-site incinerator or lived down wind of an incinerator was more likely to die or become ill from COPD. The Planning Inspectorate went ahead and granted permission for the second incinerator.

I hope you will understand my lack of faith in Planning Legislation, I know you will be diligent in your endeavours, but please do not let errors of judgement happen again, and please put in place an effective mechanism that will rigorously monitor the project over time.

Yours sincerely

Lawrence A Fairbairn MA