

Public Document Pack

ADDITIONAL CIRCULATION



To: Councillor Milne, Convener; Councillor Finlayson, Vice Convener; and Councillors Boulton, Cooney, Corall, Cormie, Crockett, Donnelly, Greig, Hutchison, Jaffrey, Lawrence, Malik, Jean Morrison MBE, Nicoll, Jennifer Stewart and Sandy Stuart.

Town House,
ABERDEEN 26 May 2016

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

The undernoted items are circulated in connection with the meeting of the **PLANNING DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE** to be held here in the Town House on **WEDNESDAY, 1 JUNE 2016 at 10.00 am.**

FRASER BELL
HEAD OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

PLEASE NOTE

Can you disregard the previous additional circulation (pink) which was issued on 25 May 2016, as it contained letters pertaining to an application which will not come before this Committee until a future meeting.

B U S I N E S S

- 2.1 Letters of Representation re: Scottish Gas Network, Greenbank Crescent - Erection of Energy From Waste Facility - P160276
Planning Reference – 160276

The documents associated with this application can be found at:-
<http://planning.aberdeencity.gov.uk/PlanningDetail.asp?ref=160276>

Planning Officer – Nicholas Lawrence

2.4 Additional Letter of Representation re: 26 Sunnybank Road and 16 Sunnyside Terrace - Subdivision of house to form 2 dwellings - P160306
Planning Reference – 160306

The documents associated with this application can be found at:-
<http://planning.aberdeency.gov.uk/PlanningDetail.asp?ref=160306>

Planning Officer – Dineke Brasier

Should you require any further information about this agenda, please contact Mark Masson on 01224 522989 or email mmasson@aberdeency.gov.uk or Lynsey McBain on 01224 522123 or email lymcbain@aberdeency.gov.uk

Agenda Item 2.1

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
To: [PI](#)
Subject: Planning Comment for 160276
Date: 11 April 2016 16:52:53

Comment for Planning Application 160276

Name : Margo Rocha
Address : 127 Walker Road
Torry
Aberdeen

Telephone :

Email : [REDACTED]

type :

Comment : I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds: -

A This planned incinerator is contrary to the overarching national policy for zero-waste, will lead to increases in carbon footprints and contribute to climate change

B This planned incinerator will be damaging to the environment, be a loss of amenity, and damaging to the health and wellbeing of communities

C The long term financial implications of building this incinerator are flawed and could add to future debt that the council tax payers of Aberdeen will have to pay

In more detail, my concerns are

1 The proposal to incinerate waste rather than address the source of waste materials is the wrong priority and is contrary to policy R3 of the present LDP. Attention should be given to reuse and recycling of finite materials. This proposal can only lead to lower levels of recycling of many materials as they would be incinerated rather than reused.

2 The proposal to incinerate waste in one building from all of the North-East is contrary to Policy NE 10 and will lower of air quality in this area of Aberdeen which has a high concentration of odour creating industrial activities that use an over-stretched and inadequate network of roads.

3 The enormous size and design of this major proposal is contrary to Policies D1, and D6 will add to traffic congestion and air-polluting diesel exhaust fumes near and on routes leading to this proposed site in and around Torry which is known to have its own micro-climate. Baseline data used to support the planning application is flawed as the data used is taken from Dyce (7miles away). It is a well-known and established fact that temperature inversion is a North-East Coastal phenomenon creating a micro-climate in Torry that traps gases and odours

4. The proposed development of the site does not comply with Policy CF1 of the current LDP and can only adversely affect the health and mental wellbeing of the residents of Torry whose lives have been blighted over decades by serious odours from fish factories and the sewage works. The proposed site for this huge incinerator at the foot of the Gramps is too close to many thousands of family homes and one of the local primary schools. Enforcement action by the statutory regulators, SEPA and the City Council over the last 15 years proved totally inadequate to help communities when the sewage treatment works failed consistently with the repugnant odours affecting Torry and nearby communities

The building of this incinerator at the foot of the Gramps can only make Torry a dumping ground for the waste of the North East of Scotland. By reason of the clear deviation from National and Local Policy, and to meet local health and social needs of the local communities, I appeal to the Planning Committee and the City Council to refuse this application to build an incinerator next to Torry

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This e-mail (including any attachment to it) is confidential, protected by copyright and may be privileged. The information contained in it should be used for its intended purposes only. If you receive this email in error, notify the sender by reply email, delete the

From: webmaster@aberdeencity.gov.uk
To: [PI](#)
Subject: Planning Comment for 160276
Date: 11 April 2016 12:19:20

Comment for Planning Application 160276

Name : John Webb
Address : 13 Morven Place
Aberdeen
Ab11 8EU

Telephone : [REDACTED]
Email : [REDACTED]
type :
Comment : 13 Morven Place

Torry
Aberdeen
AB11 8EU

11th April 2016

Aberdeen City Planning Department
Marishal College
Broad Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1AB

Dear Sir/Madam,

Response to Planning Application 160276
(Local reference: 100004449-001)

I am writing to you in the capacity of a permanent resident of Torry. I live within ~1km of the Proposed Development.

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to construct and operate a so-called Energy from Waste (incinerator) facility as detailed in the Planning application No. 160276. The application should be rejected.

Some specific points in relation to my objection to the application:

• The long list of potentially serious contaminants generated and discharged by the process of industrial-scale incineration of domestic and industrial waste are well known and a matter of public record. (For example, see http://www.no-burn.org/downloads/Greenpeace_Incineration_HumanHealth.pdf)

• The practice of incineration releases a wide range of contaminants into the environment and is potentially damaging to human health. The concept of proposing to incinerate ~150,000 tonnes of waste materials next to a long-established and already vulnerable residential community within the boundaries of a modern city constitutes an unwelcome throwback to the ignorance and abuses of the Industrial Revolution. Completely unacceptable.

• The decision to only allow a month for consideration and response to a long and hugely complex application is completely unacceptable. Furthermore, the decision by the applicant not to notify those who had specifically requested that they be informed of the date when the application would be posted on the ACC planning website is also unacceptable.

• The application is biased, subjective and prejudicial. It persistently understates the potential significance of the Proposed Development on the local community – in terms of the scale and duration of its potential impacts via construction, operation, impacts upon visual amenity and quality of life of local residents. This is consistent with the aggressively biased and subjective promotional stance adopted by some councilors and some ACC employees involved with the project.

Unacceptable.

• The Torry area is already subjected to significant environmental degradation due to existing noise, air and water quality pressures. The prospect of any further source of deliberate and persistent environmental contamination and degradation is therefore completely unacceptable.

• Any prospect of the Torry community (and the surrounding areas) having to bear the environmental consequences of the incineration of a majority of the projected waste tonnage being generated by ratepayers in Aberdeenshire and Morayshire is completely unacceptable.

• Both SEPA and ACC have a long and well-documented history of persistently failing to protect the Torry community from the impacts of local industrial etc activities. For example, it has taken 7-8 years for ACC to use its legal powers (under the Sewerage Nuisance Order 2006) to reduce the nuisance caused by unpleasant smells produced by Scottish Water's nearby STW at Nigg Bay. Any prospect of ACC having any role in regulating or monitoring a new and hugely invasive polluting activity in which it has a large financial interest is completely unacceptable.

• The applicant's public ‘consultation’ events were totally inadequate and characterized by unprecedented levels of ‘spin’, propaganda, manipulation and general misinformation. The whole event smacked of the need to ‘going through the process’ – at the expense of delivering relevant data and information to attendees. Key data and information was withheld. For example, details of the criteria for the selection of the current site (i.e. a key basis of the public ‘consultation’ event) were not made available. Unacceptable.

• The decision by the applicant and its agents to attempt to publically promote the Proposed Development almost solely in terms of some theoretical measure of ‘cheap’ energy production is cynical and disingenuous - and an insult to ratepayer's intelligence. Unacceptable.

• It takes a lot of energy to burn a pot of out-of-date yogurt! It is a matter of Public record that scheme promoters and their consultants and equipment manufacturers tend to persistently overplay the energy (and other benefits) likely to be produced by such developments. They also underplay the amounts of energy required (and associated costs) to maintain adequate combustion temperatures; the amounts and classes of ash produced. Ratepayers currently have no basis to be confident that they are being fully informed of the real costs and impacts associated with the Proposed Development. This is unacceptable.

• A recent mail-shot leaflet produced by the applicant is biased, subjective and therefore misleading. For example, the summary of results of the ‘local survey’ detailed on the leaflet undertaken made no distinction between residents and non-residents - or indeed non-resident councilors that may have taken part. Any contributions to the ‘survey’ made by individuals who have a vested interest in the Proposed Development going ahead have not been disclosed. Unacceptable.

• Human vulnerability to air pollution from agents generated by incineration varies with age, sex and existing health conditions etc. The applicant seems to have chosen not to identify nearby care/residential homes for the elderly i.e. a particularly vulnerable group. This is completely unacceptable.

• The decision by the applicant not to include the required demolition, decontamination and re-routing of a vulnerable watercourse as part of the current application is unacceptable. The decision could be regarded as an attempt to hide the levels of contamination currently present at the site from public scrutiny. All correspondence (and meeting minutes) between the applicant and SEPA on this matter/decision should therefore be placed on the public record.

• The East Tullos burn runs through a Community Park. However, it currently constitutes an unregulated industrial sewer that takes effluents from the East Tullos Industrial Estate. SEPA has monitored water quality in the system for many years Nevertheless, whilst stating that the burn is grossly polluted, the applicant has chosen not to fully disclose the current levels of chemical contamination (including corresponding units) in the burn (the data is held by SEPA), and the potential risks of further serious contamination (particularly potentially carcinogenic compounds derived from coal gas manufacture) when the proposed site (a former coal-gas works) is re-developed. This important omission appears to be a calculated decision on the part of the applicant, and is therefore completely unacceptable.

The decision to present data generated by Aberdeen Harbour Board (AHB) re the East Tullos burn rather than SEPA's full data is highly questionable. Note: AHB's decision not to use SEPA's data is currently subject to a number of formal written questions submitted to MSPs, MPs and Regulators.

The applicant has evidently gone to considerable lengths to attempt to keep projected traffic level estimates below key thresholds. The application acknowledges that waste materials will be delivered to the Proposed Development by private/commercial waste company vehicles etc. However, the impact analysis appears to deliberately avoid using known data on private/commercial vehicle traffic/tonnage movements to existing waste (landfill) facilities operating in the region - in favor of a derivation from an abstract and highly questionable projection of wider traffic volumes. This is unacceptable. Any study on the traffic/transport impacts of the proposed plant should take fully into account deliveries of waste from local authority vehicles and private waste companies/contractors/private individuals. The decision not to use all relevant existing data (i.e., vehicle movements and tonnages) in relation to waste disposal should be fully explored.

It should be noted that the long-established fish processing plant (UFI) is immediately next to the Proposed Development. The plant produces materials that ultimately end up in the human food chain. The two operations are therefore wholly incompatible. Unacceptable.

Aberdeen city has one of the lowest average life expectancies in the country. See <https://www.pressandjournal.co.uk/fp/news/politics/holyrood/722358/aberdeen-life-expectancy-worst-in-decade/>

The decision to consider the potential risks to human health on the basis of the individual's (age and health status is unknown) is novel and ridiculous. Increases in the risks to human health should be presented in terms of numbers per 100/1000/10000 for each key group including infants, people with existing health conditions and the elderly etc. The current assessment appears to be deliberately written in a manner that is likely to underplay the potential risks posed by the Proposed Development and is therefore completely unacceptable.

The applicant has neglected to mention that the emissions from the existing chimneystack (and other facilities) of the UFI fish processing plant (right next to the Proposed Development site) is already the subject of regular complaints to SEPA and local councilors from Torry residents. Unacceptable.

The application is characterized by an almost complete lack of environmental data and information (e.g. air quality) that has been gathered at the site of the Proposed Development. Consequently, there is insufficient local baseline data on which to measure the impacts of the Proposed Development particularly over the longer term. Completely unacceptable.

The applicant has failed to provide details on the key design criteria for the choice of the height of the stack associated with the Proposed Development. Indeed, the current specification appears to constitute a standard issue design with no specific consideration having been given to local site conditions. Unacceptable.

The Proposed Development sits near the base of a valley that is sheltered from the south by a large hill/trees. The locally high density of buildings in the area is also very likely to reduce wind speeds. However, it is evident that no wind speed/direction/duration monitoring appears to have been gathered at the site and no smoke/tracer tests have been performed in support of this application. Indeed, the stack dispersion modeling appears to have been largely based upon meteorological data gathered at Dyce; a very open and expansive area (supporting an International Airport) that is over 11.5 km away. The suitability of Dyce as an analogue of pertaining wind speeds and direction is highly questionable: the difference in wind speed and duration (particularly re winds from the south) between the sites has not been explored. Consequently, the robustness (or otherwise) of the various dispersal modeling outputs have not

been independently tested. This is completely unacceptable.

Stack emission (dispersion) modeling should be largely based upon meteorological data gathered at the Proposed Development site. The East Tullos valley area is known to be particularly prone to fog and persistent frost conditions. The potential impacts of fog and temperature inversions (particularly during extended periods of frosty weather associated with high pressure/descending air anticyclone dominated weather) in the valley should be investigated. The regular build-up and persistence of smoke from heath fires during the summer months in the area near the Proposed Development is also a testament to the potential risks posed by a large, discharging stack.

The proposed design of the Development is overbearing, hideously ugly and will constitute a particularly unwelcome visual intrusion on the community over which it will dominate. The suggestion that it should be illuminated at night to celebrate its existence is widely regarded as being particularly insensitive and contemptuous on the part of the applicant. The design and proposed lighting regime are completely unacceptable.

The application details a number of potential hot water heating supply scenarios in the local area including numerous private residences. However, to my knowledge, no homeowner in the area has been formally asked whether this concept would be attractive or acceptable. The proposed plans involving the provision of hot water to nearby private housing are therefore speculative, unsubstantiated and therefore bogus. This is unacceptable.

Domestic and industrial waste management is becoming an increasingly profitable business. Furthermore, large-scale incinerators require continuous feeding with materials. The applicant has chosen not to explicitly exclude the possibility that waste may be imported from other areas of Scotland other areas of the UK - or abroad. This is completely unacceptable.

The leachate produced by ~2 million tonnes of domestic, industrial and medical/research waste dumped in the former landfill site next to the Proposed Development is currently unregulated by SEPA and is discharged via a small burn as an untreated effluent into the sea at the southern end of Nigg Bay. Public access to the area is unrestricted and there are no warning signs present. The disposal of ash (base and fly) generated by industrial-scale incinerators is a controversial topic. Toxic ash (incl. heavy metals) is expensive to safely dispose of. The Proposed Development is sited very close to a major marine outfall via a Scottish Water's STW. The application contains no unequivocal statement that any ash materials generated by the Proposed Development will never, under any circumstances be discharged into the sea via the existing SW marine outfall. This is unacceptable.

Some key aspects of the Site Selection Assessment Report are highly questionable. Some key issues are as follows:

- a. Most of the waste destined for the Proposed Development would be generated outside the ACC area. Nevertheless, all of the sites considered are within or very near Aberdeen City. Unacceptable
- b. The applicant appears have been negligent by failing to consider site positions that would minimise waste transport costs and associated impacts (e.g. where is the geographical centre of gravity re waste sources?). Unacceptable.
- c. The criteria rankings used by the applicant are highly questionable, and may have been generated to suit a particular objective. For example, Site access feasibility is covered by only three score options only (0, 1 and 2). Nevertheless, a site near the outskirts of Aberdeen/AWPR (and the largest overall sources of waste materials) is scored the same (Score: 2) as a site near the centre of Aberdeen. This approach is ridiculous and unacceptable.
- d. The final site selection appears to have been made primarily upon on the basis of cheap contaminated land next to a vulnerable community offering least resistance. Unacceptable.

• The applicant has failed to provide adequate details of the nature and levels of pollutants and contaminants at the top of the Proposed Development’s chimneystack (i.e. the point of discharge into the environment) under ‘normal’ operating conditions. Consequently, the precise basis and credibility of the dispersal model outputs is therefore not known. Unacceptable.

• The applicant has consistently confused contaminant discharge consent thresholds/detection and current monitoring capabilities/limitations with what levels are currently considered safe to human health and the environment. Many of the contaminants generated and discharged by industrial incinerators (irrespective of whether they capture energy produced or not) have no known ‘safe’ limits. Unacceptable.

• The applicant has chosen not to provide a fully independent review of the impacts of similar Developments in Scotland and elsewhere. Unacceptable.

• The applicant is reported to have so far failed to confirm in writing to the Torry Community council that the Proposed Development will be ‘safe’ and pose no risks to Torry residents. This is completely unacceptable.

• Given its proximity to a very vulnerable community, any prospect that such a Proposed Development may be only tested for compliance (how and by whom?) once every six months is ridiculous and completely unacceptable. Stack emissions (at source and at a wide range of locations in the surrounding area) should be monitored continuously. Any breach should result in the immediate automatic shut down of the plant.

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of this letter, and provide details of the relevant file number that you have attached to it for the purposes of your records.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

John Webb

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This e-mail (including any attachment to it) is confidential, protected by copyright and may be privileged. The information contained in it should be used for its intended purposes only. If you receive this email in error, notify the sender by reply email, delete the received email and do not make use of, disclose or copy it. Whilst we take reasonable precautions to ensure that our emails are free from viruses, we cannot be responsible for any viruses transmitted with this email and recommend that you subject any incoming email to your own virus checking procedures. Unless related to Council business, the opinions expressed in this email are those of the sender and they do not necessarily constitute those of Aberdeen City Council. Unless we expressly say otherwise in this email or its attachments, neither this email nor its attachments create, form part of or vary any contractual or unilateral obligation. Aberdeen City Council's incoming and outgoing email is subject to regular monitoring.

JAMIE PARK

163 KIRK HILL ROAD

TORRY ABERDEEN AB11 8FS

Development Management
Communities, Housing and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4, Marischal College
Broad Street
ABERDEEN AB10 1AB

Date: 22.4.16

Dear Sir,

Application Reference P160276, proposed Incinerator (EfW), Torry, Aberdeen.

I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds: -

- A This planned incinerator is contrary to the overarching national policy for zero-waste, will lead to increases in carbon footprints and contribute to climate change
- B This planned incinerator will be damaging to the environment, be a loss of amenity, and damaging to the health and wellbeing of communities
- C The long term financial implications of building this incinerator are flawed and could add to future debt that the council tax payers of Aberdeen will have to pay

In more detail, my concerns are

- 1 The proposal to incinerate waste rather than address the source of waste materials is the wrong priority and is contrary to policy R3 of the present LDP. Attention should be given to reuse and recycling of finite materials. This proposal can only lead to lower levels of recycling of many materials as they would be incinerated rather than reused.
- 2 The proposal to incinerate waste in one building from all of the North-East is contrary to Policy NE 10 and will lower of air quality in this area of Aberdeen which has a high concentration of odour creating industrial activities that use an over-stretched and inadequate network of roads.
- 3 The enormous size and design of this major proposal is contrary to Policies D1, and D6 will add to traffic congestion and air-polluting diesel exhaust fumes near and on routes leading to this proposed site in and around Torry which is known to have its own micro-climate. Baseline data used to support the planning application is flawed as the data used is taken from Dyce (7miles away). It is a well-known and established fact that temperature inversion is a North-East Coastal phenomenon creating a micro-climate in Torry that traps gases and odours
- 4. The proposed development of the site does not comply with Policy CF1 of the current LDP and can only adversely affect the health and mental wellbeing of the residents of Torry whose lives have been blighted over decades by serious odours from fish factories and the sewage works. The proposed site for this huge incinerator at the foot of the Gramps is too close to many thousands of family homes and one of the local primary schools. Enforcement action by the statutory regulators, SEPA and the City Council over the last 15 years proved totally inadequate to help communities when the sewage treatment works failed consistently with the repugnant odours affecting Torry and nearby communities

The building of this incinerator at the foot of the Gramps can only make Torry a dumping ground for the waste of the North East of Scotland. By reason of the clear deviation from National and Local Policy, and to meet local health and social needs of the local communities, I appeal to the Planning Committee and the City Council to refuse this application to build an incinerator next to Torry

Yours sincerely,



MANFIELD ROAD 33.....

ABERDEEN.....

AB 11 90N.....

KRZYSZTOF LEWANDOWSKI.....

Development Management
Communities, Housing and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4, Marischal College
Broad Street
ABERDEEN AB10 1AB

Date: 22 04 2016.....

Dear Sir,

Application Reference P160276, proposed Incinerator (EfW), Torry, Aberdeen.

I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds: -

- A This planned incinerator is contrary to the overarching national policy for zero-waste, will lead to increases in carbon footprints and contribute to climate change
- B This planned incinerator will be damaging to the environment, be a loss of amenity, and damaging to the health and wellbeing of communities
- C The long term financial implications of building this incinerator are flawed and could add to future debt that the council tax payers of Aberdeen will have to pay

In more detail, my concerns are

- 1 The proposal to incinerate waste rather than address the source of waste materials is the wrong priority and is contrary to policy R3 of the present LDP. Attention should be given to reuse and recycling of finite materials. This proposal can only lead to lower levels of recycling of many materials as they would be incinerated rather than reused.
- 2 The proposal to incinerate waste in one building from all of the North-East is contrary to Policy NE 10 and will lower of air quality in this area of Aberdeen which has a high concentration of odour creating industrial activities that use an over-stretched and inadequate network of roads.
- 3 The enormous size and design of this major proposal is contrary to Policies D1, and D6 will add to traffic congestion and air-polluting diesel exhaust fumes near and on routes leading to this proposed site in and around Torry which is known to have its own micro-climate. Baseline data used to support the planning application is flawed as the data used is taken from Dyce (7miles away). It is a well-known and established fact that temperature inversion is a North-East Coastal phenomenon creating a micro-climate in Torry that traps gases and odours
- 4. The proposed development of the site does not comply with Policy CF1 of the current LDP and can only adversely affect the health and mental wellbeing of the residents of Torry whose lives have been blighted over decades by serious odours from fish factories and the sewage works. The proposed site for this huge incinerator at the foot of the Gramps is too close to many thousands of family homes and one of the local primary schools. Enforcement action by the statutory regulators, SEPA and the City Council over the last 15 years proved totally inadequate to help communities when the sewage treatment works failed consistently with the repugnant odours affecting Torry and nearby communities

The building of this incinerator at the foot of the Gramps can only make Torry a dumping ground for the waste of the North East of Scotland. By reason of the clear deviation from National and Local Policy, and to meet local health and social needs of the local communities, I appeal to the Planning Committee and the City Council to refuse this application to build an incinerator next to Torry

Y
.....


From: [Mandy](#)
To: [PI](#)
Subject: Letter of objection to proposed Incinerator (EfW), Torry, Aberdeen (Application Reference P160276)
Date: 13 April 2016 15:18:47

Development Management
Communities, Housing and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4
Marischal College
Broad Street
ABERDEEN
AB10 1AB

Dear Sir

Application Reference P160276: Proposed Incinerator (EfW) based in Torry, Aberdeen.

I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds: -

A This planned incinerator is contrary to the overarching national policy for zero-waste, will lead to increases in carbon footprints and contribute to climate change.

B This planned incinerator will be damaging to the environment, be a loss of amenity, and damaging to the health and wellbeing of communities.

C The long term financial implications of building this incinerator are flawed and could add to future debt that the council tax payers of Aberdeen will have to pay.

In more detail, my concerns are

1 The proposal to incinerate waste rather than address the source of waste materials is the wrong priority and is contrary to policy R3 of the present LDP. Attention should be given to reuse and recycling of finite materials. This proposal can only lead to lower levels of recycling of many materials as they would be incinerated rather than reused.

2 The proposal to incinerate waste in one building from all of the North-East is contrary to Policy NE 10 and will lower of air quality in this area of Aberdeen which has a high concentration of odour creating industrial activities that use an over-stretched and inadequate network of roads.

3 The enormous size and design of this major proposal is contrary to Policies D1, and D6 will add to traffic congestion and air-polluting diesel exhaust fumes near and on routes leading to this proposed site in and around Torry which is known to have its own micro-climate. Baseline data used to support the planning application is flawed as the data used is taken from Dyce (7miles away). It is a well-known and established fact that temperature inversion is a North-East Coastal phenomenon creating a micro-climate in Torry that traps gases and odours

4. The proposed development of the site does not comply with

Policy CF1 of the current LDP and can only adversely affect the health and mental wellbeing of the residents of Torry whose lives have been blighted over decades by serious odours from fish factories and the sewage works. The proposed site for this huge incinerator at the foot of the Gramps is too close to many thousands of family homes and one of the local primary schools. Enforcement action by the statutory regulators, SEPA and the City Council over the last 15 years proved totally inadequate to help communities when the sewage treatment works failed consistently with the repugnant odours affecting Torry and nearby communities

The building of this incinerator at the foot of the Gramps can only make Torry a dumping ground for the waste of the North East of Scotland. By reason of the clear deviation from National and Local Policy, and to meet local health and social needs of the local communities, I appeal to the Planning Committee and the City Council to refuse this application to build an incinerator next to Torry.

Yours sincerely,

Mandy Roy LLM
Torry Community Councillor

Sent from my iPhone

Development Management
Communities, Housing and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4, Marischal College
Broad Street
ABERDEEN AB10 1AB

Date: 11th April 2016

Dear Sir,

Application Reference P160276, proposed Incinerator (EfW), Torry, Aberdeen.

I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds: -

- A This planned incinerator is contrary to the overarching national policy for zero-waste, will lead to increases in carbon footprints and contribute to climate change
- B This planned incinerator will be damaging to the environment, be a loss of amenity, and damaging to the health and wellbeing of communities
- C The long term financial implications of building this incinerator are flawed and could add to future debt that the council tax payers of Aberdeen will have to pay

In more detail, my concerns are

- 1 The proposal to incinerate waste rather than address the source of waste materials is the wrong priority and is contrary to policy R3 of the present LDP. Attention should be given to reuse and recycling of finite materials. This proposal can only lead to lower levels of recycling of many materials as they would be incinerated rather than reused.
- 2 The proposal to incinerate waste in one building from all of the North-East is contrary to Policy NE 10 and will lower of air quality in this area of Aberdeen which has a high concentration of odour creating industrial activities that use an over-stretched and inadequate network of roads.
- 3 The enormous size and design of this major proposal is contrary to Policies D1, and D6 will add to traffic congestion and air-polluting diesel exhaust fumes near and on routes leading to this proposed site in and around Torry which is known to have its own micro-climate. Baseline data used to support the planning application is flawed as the data used is taken from Dyce (7miles away). It is a well-known and established fact that temperature inversion is a North-East Coastal phenomenon creating a micro-climate in Torry that traps gases and odours
4. The proposed development of the site does not comply with Policy CF1 of the current LDP and can only adversely affect the health and mental wellbeing of the residents of Torry whose lives have been blighted over decades by serious odours from fish factories and the sewage works. The proposed site for this huge incinerator at the foot of the Gramps is too close to many thousands of family homes and one of the local primary schools. Enforcement action by the statutory regulators, SEPA and the City Council over the last 15 years proved totally inadequate to help communities when the sewage treatment works failed consistently with the repugnant odours affecting Torry and nearby communities

The building of this incinerator at the foot of the Gramps can only make Torry a dumping ground for the waste of the North East of Scotland. By reason of the clear deviation from National and Local Policy, and to meet local health and social needs of the local communities, I appeal to the Planning Committee and the City Council to refuse this application to build an incinerator next to Torry

Yours sincerely,

Malgorzata Kot

08.04.2016

Development Management
Communities, Housing and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4, Marischal College
Broad Street
ABERDEEN
AB10 1AB

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application Reference P160276, proposed Incinerator (EfW), Torry, Aberdeen.

We wish to object to the above application on the following grounds:

- A This planned incinerator is contrary to the overarching national policy for zero-waste, will lead to increases in carbon footprints and contribute to climate change
- B This planned incinerator will be damaging to the environment, be a loss of amenity, and damaging to the health and wellbeing of communities
- C The long term financial implications of building this incinerator are flawed and could add to future debt that the council tax payers of Aberdeen will have to pay

In more detail, my concerns are

- 1 The proposal to incinerate waste rather than address the source of waste materials is the wrong priority and is contrary to policy R3 of the present LDP. Attention should be given to reuse and recycling of finite materials. This proposal can only lead to lower levels of recycling of many materials as they would be incinerated rather than reused.
- 2 The proposal to incinerate waste in one building from all of the North-East is contrary to Policy NE 10 and will lower air quality in this area of Aberdeen which has a high concentration of odour creating industrial activities that use an over-stretched and inadequate network of roads.
- 3 The enormous size and design of this major proposal is contrary to Policies D1 and D6 and will add to traffic congestion and air-polluting diesel exhaust fumes near and on routes leading to this proposed site in and around Torry which is known to have its own micro-climate. Baseline data used to support the planning application is flawed as the data used is taken from Dyce (7miles away). It is a well-known and established fact that temperature inversion is a North-East Coastal phenomenon creating a micro-climate in Torry that traps gases and odours.
- 4. The proposed development of the site does not comply with Policy CF1 of the current LDP and can only adversely affect the health and mental wellbeing of the residents of Torry whose lives have been blighted over decades by serious odours from fish factories and the sewage works. The proposed site for this huge incinerator at the foot of the Gramps is too close to many thousands of family homes and one of the local primary schools. Enforcement action by the statutory regulators, SEPA and the City Council over the last 15 years proved totally inadequate to help communities when the sewage treatment works failed consistently with the repugnant odours affecting Torry and nearby communities.

The building of this incinerator at the foot of the Gramps can only make Torry a dumping ground for the waste of the North East of Scotland. By reason of the clear deviation from National and Local Policy and to meet local health and social needs of the local communities, I appeal to the Planning Committee and the City Council to refuse this application to build an incinerator next to Torry.

Yours faithfully,

David & Irene Smith

Planning

107 Kirkhill Rd
Torry
AB11 8PT

DEAR SIRS ON Planning application 160276

I object to the (incinerator) so called energy
From waste application on following grounds

- 1) The company cannot 100% guarantee no pollution
from the building not WATER STEAM FROM CHIMNEY
STACK
- 2) The size & location too close to my house
and bought houses in Kirkhill Place Torry
- 3) The fact that the company wasn't transparent
in the first place they have no idea how much
it will cost
- 4) The company have no idea how the water energy
will be supplied to properties who's paying for
the energy what year it would be provided
- 5) This application by energy & waste affects
my human rights to fresh air, At 3pm Hdr comes
in from the sea the steam from the air stack
would create a individual weather climate if went
ahead and it is a human right to breath fresh air
the amount of pollution from lorries to & from site
affects my human right
From [REDACTED]

AB118EU.....

.....

.....

Development Management
Communities, Housing and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4, Marischal College
Broad Street
ABERDEEN AB10 1AB

Date:.....
11/04/16

Dear Sir,

Application Reference P160276, proposed Incinerator (EfW), Torry, Aberdeen.

I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds: -

- A This planned incinerator is contrary to the overarching national policy for zero-waste, will lead to increases in carbon footprints and contribute to climate change
- B This planned incinerator will be damaging to the environment, be a loss of amenity, and damaging to the health and wellbeing of communities
- C The long term financial implications of building this incinerator are flawed and could add to future debt that the council tax payers of Aberdeen will have to pay

In more detail, my concerns are

- 1 The proposal to incinerate waste rather than address the source of waste materials is the wrong priority and is contrary to policy R3 of the present LDP. Attention should be given to reuse and recycling of finite materials. This proposal can only lead to lower levels of recycling of many materials as they would be incinerated rather than reused.
- 2 The proposal to incinerate waste in one building from all of the North-East is contrary to Policy NE 10 and will lower of air quality in this area of Aberdeen which has a high concentration of odour creating industrial activities that use an over-stretched and inadequate network of roads.
- 3 The enormous size and design of this major proposal is contrary to Policies D1, and D6 will add to traffic congestion and air-polluting diesel exhaust fumes near and on routes leading to this proposed site in and around Torry which is known to have its own micro-climate. Baseline data used to support the planning application is flawed as the data used is taken from Dyce (7miles away). It is a well-known and established fact that temperature inversion is a North-East Coastal phenomenon creating a micro-climate in Torry that traps gases and odours
4. The proposed development of the site does not comply with Policy CF1 of the current LDP and can only adversely affect the health and mental wellbeing of the residents of Torry whose lives have been blighted over decades by serious odours from fish factories and the sewage works. The proposed site for this huge incinerator at the foot of the Gramps is too close to many thousands of family homes and one of the local primary schools. Enforcement action by the statutory regulators, SEPA and the City Council over the last 15 years proved totally inadequate to help communities when the sewage treatment works failed consistently with the repugnant odours affecting Torry and nearby communities

The building of this incinerator at the foot of the Gramps can only make Torry a dumping ground for the waste of the North East of Scotland. By reason of the clear deviation from National and Local Policy, and to meet local health and social needs of the local communities, I appeal to the Planning Committee and the City Council to refuse this application to build an incinerator next to Torry

Yours sincerely,

...Mark Mutch.....

Natalja Meshkovskaya.....

137 Walker road, Aberdeen

AB11 8DH

Development Management
Communities, Housing and Infrastructure
Aberdeen City Council
Business Hub 4, Marischal College
Broad Street
ABERDEEN AB10 1AB

Date:...11/04/2016.....

Dear Sir,

Application Reference P160276, proposed Incinerator (EfW), Torry, Aberdeen.

I wish to object to the above application on the following grounds: -

- A This planned incinerator is contrary to the overarching national policy for zero-waste, will lead to increases in carbon footprints and contribute to climate change
- B This planned incinerator will be damaging to the environment, be a loss of amenity, and damaging to the health and wellbeing of communities
- C The long term financial implications of building this incinerator are flawed and could add to future debt that the council tax payers of Aberdeen will have to pay

In more detail, my concerns are

- 1 The proposal to incinerate waste rather than address the source of waste materials is the wrong priority and is contrary to policy R3 of the present LDP. Attention should be given to reuse and recycling of finite materials. This proposal can only lead to lower levels of recycling of many materials as they would be incinerated rather than reused.
- 2 The proposal to incinerate waste in one building from all of the North-East is contrary to Policy NE 10 and will lower of air quality in this area of Aberdeen which has a high concentration of odour creating industrial activities that use an over-stretched and inadequate network of roads.
- 3 The enormous size and design of this major proposal is contrary to Policies D1, and D6 will add to traffic congestion and air-polluting diesel exhaust fumes near and on routes leading to this proposed site in and around Torry which is known to have its own micro-climate. Baseline data used to support the planning application is flawed as the data used is taken from Dyce (7miles away). It is a well-known and established fact that temperature inversion is a North-East Coastal phenomenon creating a micro-climate in Torry that traps gases and odours
4. The proposed development of the site does not comply with Policy CF1 of the current LDP and can only adversely affect the health and mental wellbeing of the residents of Torry whose lives have been blighted over decades by serious odours from fish factories and the sewage works. The proposed site for this huge incinerator at the foot of the Gramps is too close to many thousands of family homes and one of the local primary schools. Enforcement action by the statutory regulators, SEPA and the City Council over the last 15 years proved totally inadequate to help communities when the sewage treatment works failed consistently with the repugnant odours affecting Torry and nearby communities

The building of this incinerator at the foot of the Gramps can only make Torry a dumping ground for the waste of the North East of Scotland. By reason of the clear deviation from National and Local Policy, and to meet local health and social needs of the local communities, I appeal to the Planning Committee and the City Council to refuse this application to build an incinerator next to Torry

Yours sincerely,
Natalja Meshkovskaya

.....

Application no 160306

E M Barrett-Ayres
15 Sunnyside Terrace
Aberdeen
AB24 3NB

18.3.16

Dear Sir, I was surprised to see your notice of 16 March referring to a proposed development at 26 Sunnyside Rd & 16 Sunnyside Terrace AB24 3NB.

Is there a 16 Sunnyside Terrace? I have lived here for nearly fifty years without being aware of it. The post code for Sunnyside Ter. is AB24 3NB. Is the proposed no. 16 to have a different code?

I did notice, about Christmas time, that a No. 16 had been attached to the back of Sunnyside Cottage, & thought that rather strange. I wondered if it was official; if, for example, the emergency services, the Police, & the Post Office were aware of it. After all, the cottage remains one building, with a front door & a back door.

I object to it suddenly being classed as two dwellings, & have a concern that

there is no provision for car parking on site, nor any possibility of it.

It seems foolhardy, to say the least, for anyone to have gone ahead with such a major extension, without the relevant planning permission, disregarding Aberdeen Town Council's regulations, & expecting retrospective approval.

Yours faithfully



P&SD Letters of Representation		
Application Number:		
RECEIVED 22 MAR 2016		
Name	SCJ	MAD
Case Officer Initials:		
Date Acknowledged:		