

S TO THE EDITOR

Incinerator at Haybridge

It will be crucial for members of the city council to give very serious consideration to the many reasons for rejecting this so-called pyrolysis plant or incinerator. Indeed the particular scheme proposed is essentially untried and unproven so should be similarly rejected in any other location for that matter.

This proposed development has been in the pipeline for some time now with a series of public presentations and displays by WP2 during 2005.

It was evident then as now that this proposed plant is ecologically unsustainable, environmentally unacceptable and economically unviable in that location, as it would require a vast amount of potentially recyclable waste to be imported from across Somerset and even further afield.

That, from an environmental and

ecological perspective would be nonsense, as would the inherent dangers and pollution generated by the huge increase in heavy traffic already using the inadequate road system such as the A371.

Not to mention the increased dangers along the routes and the hidden costs of the erosion of our roads, building and the many other structures and utility networks inexorably undermined.

It would also mean that the re-processing of materials on that site would cease, which though in a far from ideal location does at least fit with the Somerset County Council's Waste Strategy.

As part of the Waste Strategy, the Strategic Plan requires that the siting of one (or more) processing plants has to be identified by the Waste Disposal Authority (i.e. the county council), in order to manage non-degradable, non-reusable, non-recyclable waste with a view to minimising

landfill as an option (and avoid any eventual financial penalties).

It does seem that this application is an attempt to pre-empt the emerging democratically determined Strategic Plan in that regard. In effect, it is both premature and financially driven rather than carefully considered in the context of an overall strategy. That cannot make sense. Worse, it is doubly premature and seriously flawed because it has been completely overtaken by the positive actions and waste management policies of the Somerset Waste Partnership.

It was first proposed when we in Somerset may have been lagging a little over the level of segregated waste collection, waste management and sorting pre-disposal, and ever improving strategies which, while this ill-conceived and unsustainable proposal has matured into an actual application, have gathered momentum to the point that the reduction in waste destined for landfill has been substantially reduced, and more much more can

and will be achieved in that direction without resorting to speculative measures. In other words, and in no way being contradictory, this proposal is both premature and has been overtaken by events.

These local factors offer further solid ground for opposing a pyrolysis plant in this area. This is a vital factor in the Waste Strategy's sequential test of how/where the residual waste should be processed, which this amply shows should not be in the Wells area, even if this particular process was tried, tested and proven.

With segregated food and garden waste now being collected for composting and with other bio-degradable waste such as bottles, paper, clothing, etc all being collected for re-use/recycling, the amount of non-degradable waste matter will be progressively reduced locally and across the county.

To summarise, this application is contrary to broader environmental objectives; potentially disastrous in terms of air quality/emissions; untried, untested and methodologically unproven; wholly inappropriately sited given waste generation/logistics; premature for the reasons outlined above; seeks to pre-empt the county's waste strategy; takes no account of the success to date of the county's waste partnership and seems to seek to undermine the policies being developed through our democratically elected councillors at city, district and above all at county council level.

These detailed matters and the more strategic issues set out only touch upon just some of the very significant reasons why this planning application should be rejected by our elected councillors at all levels.

John Gibson, Wells