

5-minute Summary



Scientific studies - more cancer & birth defects downwind

Public Health England say well managed incinerators don't have a significant effect on health, but they haven't done any recent long term multi-disease research. 81 scientific studies and more recent air quality reports from DEFRA, World Health Organisation, 6-cities landmark study on air pollution, Royal College of Physicians, The London Assembly for Environment, Chief Medical Officer for England all state increased cancer, respiratory, psychological and birth defects, from ultra-fine particulate air pollution. Waste incinerators produce ultra-fine particulate pollution and they travel miles. Particulates have no known safe threshold.

Recent landmark air pollution report from Royal College of Physicians (RCP) and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health (RCPCH): Chair Professor Holgate "We now know that air pollution has a substantial impact on many chronic long-term conditions, increasing strokes and heart attacks in susceptible individuals. We know that air pollution adversely effects the development of the foetus, including lung development. And now there is compelling evidence that air pollution is associated with new onset asthma in children and adults. When our patients are exposed to such a clear and avoidable cause of death, illness and disability, it is our duty to speak out". Dr Andrew Goddard RCP: "Taking action to tackle air pollution in the UK will reduce the pain and suffering for many people with long-term chronic health conditions, not to mention lessening the long-term demands on our NHS". Local doctors have also objected. Who do you trust?

Why should Cambridge residents be exposed to increased health risks because incinerator companies want to burn our black bin waste for profit? Why should residents be guinea pigs to long term safety studies on incineration?



Harmful emissions

The law and local council air quality policies require particulate emission reductions, because they have "significant negative impacts on human health." This incinerator will reduce air quality. A Swedish study shows a modern incinerator is a major contributor of these particles. The incinerator company says the UK's traffic releases more. This is misleading – it compares approximately 25 incinerators with all the millions of vehicles across the whole UK. Incinerators increase emissions in their local areas. If this plant is approved, we will all be breathing in the wrong kind of air.



Cancer promoting dioxins - monitored only 32 hrs / year

Modern incinerators emit dioxins, lead, arsenic, cadmium & mercury which accumulate in the body for years. The incinerator company will themselves monitor emissions of dioxins at the legal minimum - only 32 hours/year. Reputable scientific studies show this greatly underestimates true levels of dioxin emissions. 250,000 tonnes of black bin waste (including hazardous rubbers, PVCs, PVDs and batteries) will be burnt per year. Why doesn't the incinerator company put residents first and insist on proper air quality baseline monitoring in the surrounding area first and insist on better operational monitoring? They don't seem to understand the issues.



Recycling suffers

Publicly the incinerator company claimed the incinerator increases recycling. Recycling rates are getting worse not better in Cambridgeshire. East Cambs managed 52.4% 2016/17, a drop of 4% since 2015/16. South Cambs managed 46.1% 2016/17, dropping a massive 11.4% since 2015/16. Compare this to Powys in Wales who achieved 65.2% 2016/17. There are no new council or incinerator company initiatives to support better recycling. How will burning unchecked black bin waste increase recycling? It hasn't worked for some Scandinavian countries and London who are turning their back on incineration.



Carbon footprint bigger than landfill

The incinerator company says the incinerator cuts greenhouse emissions vs to landfill. But this relies on it sending its steam constantly as heating. Do you have your heating on all year? The application shows the carbon footprint exceeds landfill's. Incineration INCREASES greenhouse gas emissions compared with recycling because destroying materials through burning means we then must use more energy overall to extract and process raw materials into the goods that we buy and use. Recycling alternatives have a far lower carbon footprint. This incinerator will emit well over 200,000 tonnes/yr. of CO₂.



Few jobs.... & less electricity than a wind farm

We've been told the incinerator will produce 24 megawatts of electricity. But did you know a single large wind turbine can produce 5 megawatts? A gas power station produces far more. And do only 30-35 full time jobs after construction really sound like good value when the waste contract with the incinerator company already costs taxpayers hundreds of millions? A supermarket can employ more. **Recycling projects create more jobs.**



Ecology and the food chain

Substances like dioxins, furans and some metals, cannot be measured continuously or it may be prohibitively expensive to do so. Pollutants are distributed into the environment as part of chimney emissions and residual ash. Climates around incinerators change permanently and energy is not generated efficiently. Valuable materials that could be recycled are lost. The Chief Scientific Advisor to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) warned against further investment in incinerators in the UK while speaking at a hearing of Parliament's Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (EFRA) Committee on 31 January 2018. Soil Association who regulate and support safe farming "is concerned about remaining levels of pollution, particularly reports that regulated levels may be breached due to temperature fluctuations and at start-up & shut-down. This could result in the contamination of soils, water and food". The main route of exposure to dioxins is through food.



Safety record of incinerator company

The company have already been fined £50,000 for polluting the local area and causing sickness. All assurances given about the safety of the proposed incinerator site and protecting the surrounding area are based on the plant being run in an exemplary manner. Mr Richard Banwell, prosecuting for the Environment Agency, told District Judge Ken Sheraton: "There was a history of non-compliance at the site and there was a serious effect on human senses and it was persistent enough that it led to a widespread change in behaviour of those exposed to it". In sentencing in 2016 District Judge Sheraton said: "There had been a great deal of adverse effects on human health, quality of life and air quality. I therefore impose a fine at the maximum of my sentencing powers." They have also recently been found guilty of unfair dismissal at another site for sacking employees who formally raised health & safety concerns with HSE.



GOOD NEWS - Cheaper alternatives

CCC are currently facing tough battles with the incinerator company. The county's £738m PFI funded waste contract needs to deliver savings but CCC are struggling to negotiate contract changes that produce savings. Has CCC asked for alternatives to incineration? **Other waste companies have cheaper better alternatives.** Recycling is a cheaper way to process waste than landfill and commands less tax.

Incineration is more expensive than recycling, but cheaper than landfilling incl. tax, making it more lucrative business than recycling for operators and councils. Why doesn't the incinerator company build another recycling centre? Incinerators and their expensive contracts are not flexible to legislative changes, to deliver sound economic profit, they need 40-50 years operation. In 1998, Kent entered a 25yr 'money saving' incineration contract. As the recycling economy has vastly improved, Kent is losing an estimated £1.5 million/yr. Rather than sell recyclables for reuse, which would be both economically and environmentally efficient, it must send those valuable resources up in smoke until the contract expires. See council local plan below for more on this.



GOOD NEWS - Better alternatives

Other companies offer more environmentally-friendly alternatives. One option is more high-tech MBT recycling which works already here in Cambridgeshire so why not more, and more investment in recycling? Complementary options include autoclave steam treatment, heat treatment etc. These wouldn't send hazardous fly ash to landfill and are far more publicly acceptable, environmentally friendly, more profitable and create more jobs. The company has selected the 2nd worst option according to the EU Directive 'waste hierarchy' and Eunomia (global authority on waste management).



Traffic

There will be an increase in HGV lorry movements to and from the plant. The incinerator will be burning 24/7 for 30-35yrs, 250,000 tonnes/yr. as soon as it's built. To meet demand, rubbish will be imported from as far away as Isle of Wight, Yorkshire, Northamptonshire, Norfolk, Peterborough plus commercial contracts. Additional lorry movements also to take bottom ash away to hazardous waste plants for either local landfill or processing. The incinerator company have so far been unable to clarify accurate traffic movements, but working with their capacity needs, it is fair to estimate an extra 200 lorry journeys will be made each day. The additional traffic movements will add to air and noise pollution, and congestion in the area.



County strategic plan for waste isn't finished yet

There is an emerging 5yr joint Cambs and Peterborough waste strategic plan that goes into consultation the same month this application will be decided. There is also an emerging EU Directive on Renewable Energy which will influence policy and financial investors. This represents a major opportunity to offset unproductive investments and concentrate the efforts on the options that are the most sustainable, the most profitable, and generate the most jobs. Wouldn't it be sensible to wait for that plan to assess the various waste management options against county needs before deciding whether the company being paid hundreds of millions to manage waste can build an incinerator? Aren't they putting the cart before the horse?



Public consultation by stealth

Many residents and businesses only recently found out about this plan. Several local parishes were not even consulted. Surely all Cambridgeshire residents need to be asked if they want their rubbish burning? The public consultation period fell mainly over Christmas, and to date the incinerator company have failed to provide proper public engagement and information to residents of Cambridge.

The proposals are literally thousands of pages long, are of a technical nature and of the utmost importance to the future of Waterbeach and Cambridge. It is completely unacceptable and, frankly, undemocratic for typical residents who are not experts in this field to have so short a time to review and comment upon this information.

Residents called for a public meeting and just before the end of the consultation period one was organised by a district councillor. It was standing room only. The public called for another because of the wealth of unanswered or ambiguously answered questions, complexity of proposal and continued lack of engagement from the incinerator company. A balanced 'for' and 'against' informative public meeting was arranged by CBWin -a non-politically aligned group of educated, professional, concerned residents who have gathered to provide non-industry sponsored information so that the public can make truly informed decisions.

The incinerator company are boycotting the meeting that residents have called (and rearranged dutifully according to local government advice to avoid the pre-election sensitive period). Representatives from county planning, Environment Agency and Public Health England are all invited. Residents want the incinerator company to come so that both sides can be heard in a meaningful, fair and balanced, healthy, informative debate, rather than listening to one-sided promotional information and biased answers to questions. The inadequacy of this period and utter lack of engagement let alone balanced discussion from the incinerator company constitutes valid reasons for approval to be withheld.



Impact on historic setting of Denny Abbey

Historic England, CPRE and SCDC have objected strongly because the giant incinerator will severely impact on this heritage asset and nearby deserted medieval village (DMV), as listed on the Sites and Monuments Record. To what point do you erode this historic asset and setting and surrounding landscape so that it becomes worthless? To what point do you industrialise a historic village and a proposed new residential settlement next door.

Thousands of local people including doctors and scientists have voted no to living in a UK regional centre for burning rubbish. Residents attending a public meeting in January saw 'pro' arguments collapse under scrutiny. It's always the same – the devil is in the detail.

If you would like non-industry sponsored information to include in personal comments to the council on the incinerator application, or would like to help please visit www.cbwin.co.uk or call 01223 441599