

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 13 September 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 Committee Room 2 in the Town House on **THURSDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2016 at 10.00 am.**

FRASER BELL
HEAD OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

BUSINESS

MEMBERS PLEASE NOTE THAT ALL LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION, INCLUDING THOSE NOT IN THE REPORT PACK, ARE AVAILABLE TO VIEW IN THE MEMBERS' LIBRARY

- 2.1 Minute of Meeting of PDMC Public Hearing of 24 August 2016 - for approval (Pages 3 - 14)

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

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARING

ABERDEEN, 24 August 2016. Minute of Meeting of the PLANNING DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARING. Present:- Councillor Milne, Convener; Councillor Finlayson, Vice Convener; and Councillors Boulton, Cooney, Crockett, Donnelly, Hutchison, Jaffrey, Lawrence, Jean Morrison MBE, Nicoll and Sandy Stuart.

Also in attendance:- Councillors Allan, Cameron, Copland, Dickson, Flynn, MacGregor, Taylor and Townson.

The agenda and reports associated with this minute can be found at:-
<http://committees.aberdeencity.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=348&MIId=4413&Ver=4>

Please note that if any changes are made to this minute at the point of approval, these will be outlined in the subsequent minute and this document will not be retrospectively altered.

SITE VISIT – SCOTTISH GAS NETWORK, GREENBANK CRESCENT – ERECTION OF ENERGY FROM WASTE FACILITY - 160276

1. The Committee conducted a site visit prior to the Hearing. The Committee was addressed by Mr Nicholas Lawrence, Senior Planner and summarised the proposal for the overall site.

The Convener explained that the Committee would return to the Town House to commence the Hearing.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Dickson declared a personal interest in the following matter due to a family member's employment.

HEARING

ENERGY FROM WASTE FACILITY – ERECTION OF ENERGY FROM WASTE FACILITY, VEHICULAR AND NON-VEHICULAR ACCESSES, ANCILLARY BUILDINGS, ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING AT SCOTTISH GAS NETWORK, GREENBANK CRESCENT ABERDEEN - 160276

2. The Hearing was opened by the Convener who extended a warm welcome to all present and explained that at the Planning Development Management Committee

meeting of 1 June 2016, consideration was given to a report which recommended that a public hearing be arranged, and that this had been agreed.

Gail Beattie, Interim Head of Planning and Sustainable Development, explained that the application would be referred back to Planning Development Management Committee for determination and not Full Council as stated within the report.

The Convener made it clear that the purpose of the Hearing was not to determine the application but to allow all members of Council to consider (1) officers' objective views of the development; (2) details of the development presented by the developer and their agents; and (3) the views of those who submitted written representations and responded positively to the invitation to speak at the Hearing. The Convener advised that a decision would not be taken today and that the report would be heard at the appropriate committee in due course.

The Convener invited **Mr Nicholas Lawrence, Senior Planner, Aberdeen City Council**, as the first speaker to address the hearing. Mr Lawrence described the application proposal, advised on the policy background and the main issues arising, and identified the nature of the concerns expressed by consultees and objectors. His presentation to the Committee was in the following terms:-

The proposal before members comprises the demolition of the current gas holder on the site, to be replaced with an Energy from Waste (EfW) facility comprising the following principle elements:-

- The main building would measure 47.50 metres high, length of 170.00 metres with a depth of 51.40 metres that will house the processing plant, together with office and welfare functions. This aspect of the scheme also incorporates the flue stack that extends to 80.00 metres in height;
- Air Cooled Condensers and Combined Heat and Power (CHP) building with a height of 20.00 metres, length of 66.00 metres and depth of 20.00 metres;
- Substation compound that measures 15.00 in length, depth of 10.00 metres and 7.00 in height; and
- Firewater Tank that has a diameter of 15.00 metres and height of 12.00 metres.

Other developmental elements include two weightbridges, parking for 22 cars, landscaping, drainage, security and utility lighting.

Regarding the operation of the facility it would process domestic residue municipal waste from the administrative areas of Aberdeen City Council, Aberdeenshire Council and Moray Councils. There would be no pre-treatment of waste on site and the combustion process would recover energy from waste in the form of heat.

It was noted that whilst the facility would operate on a continuous basis, it was proposed that the delivery of waste and dispatch of materials would only occur between 07:00 and 19:00 hours Monday to Friday and between 07:00 hours and 13:00 hours on a Saturday. The consequent vehicle movements associated with the operational capacity of the facility would equate to 222 heavy good vehicle movements per week, 40 movements a day.

The Convener then invited **Mr Gregor Whyte, Engineering Officer, Aberdeen City Council**, to address the Committee.

Mr Whyte explained that Aberdeen City Council are required to follow Scottish Government guidance by requesting the developer provides a Transport Statement (TS) for the planning application and a TS had been submitted and audited. The Roads Development Management team required a number of amendments be made and revised TS was submitted by the agent.

Mr Whyte advised that there would be a marginal effect on the traffic within the area of the proposed site, on the A956 at Wellington Road, and the performance of the junction with Wellington Road (Greenbank Road/Wellington Road signalized junction) appeared to be within the Council's accepted capacity limits. The hours of operation would be restricted to begin with, with a view to the proposed plant being operational 24 hours a day 7 days a week. Waste vehicles would be between 6 and 22 tonnes in size and 40 vehicles per day would supply waste to the site. There would be access to the site off Greenbank Crescent, one for the main site and a second to the staff car park and also vehicle parking for 12 staff would be provided at the site. He also explained that the Roads Department would propose to have cycle spaces included within the facility as well as encouraging measures for non-car based travel, in line with the Council's Transport policies..

The Convener then invited **Ms Aileen Brodie, Environmental Health, Aberdeen City Council**, to address the Committee.

Ms Brodie advised that within the Environmental Health department, their purpose is to protect public health and to ensure that appropriate standards are met. Local authorities are responsible for the monitoring and assessment of ambient air quality and must adhere to national and EU standards. Ms Brodie advised that SEPA is responsible for issuing the necessary permit to run the facility and this permit covers all emissions to the atmosphere, including noise and odour. In regards to existing ambient levels, Ms Brodie explained that the air quality in the area is generally good, although there are raised pollution levels on Wellington Road due to road traffic emissions. She also highlighted that no significant health risks were identified in the submitted air quality assessment. She concluded that Environmental Health were satisfied with all aspects but intimated that SEPA would be looking in more detail at the proposal through the permitting process

At this point, the Convener invited Mr George Smith, SEPA to answer any questions from members, and the following information was noted:-

- If planning permission is granted, this does not mean that a permit is automatically granted;
- An informative could be added to highlight that the applicant needs to get a permit before the plant can be operational;
- The applicant needs to demonstrate certain standards before they can get a permit and this permit would be live, which means it gets reviewed periodically;
- In regards to odour, this would be controlled by SEPA through an odour management plan;
- In regards to offsite monitoring of air quality, it was noted the distance monitored would be determined following discussions with the applicant.

Members then asked questions of Mr Nicholas Lawrence, Mr Gregor Whyte, Ms Aileen Brodie and George Smith from SEPA, and the following information was noted:-

- Regarding any restrictions for the lorries, it was noted that there would be a construction and operational plan in place and could also be covered by a planning condition;
- Regarding the waste water treatment and any in site pollution levels being breached, it was noted that a permit can be revoked or conditions added as necessary;
- In relation to the main junction that would be used to access the site, the Roads Department were content the nearby signallised junction would operate within capacity. The surrounding area of the site is an industrial area;
- The school is 300 metres from the proposed site and at present the air quality at the school is very good with no concerns over pollution;
- In relation to the sea haar in Torry, it was noted that experts within SEPA look at air modelling and haar as well as weather platforms, and haar had been accounted for within the modelling.
- Decontamination of the site is governed through the License that the applicant has to secure;
- There will be a condition regarding fly ash.

The Convener then invited the applicant to address the Committee. **Mr Peter Lawrence and Ms Heidi Thorsdalen** outlined the application to members, in the following terms:-

Peter Lawrence, Waste and Recycling Manager, provided a brief introduction to the proposed application and provided details on Aberdeen City's Waste Strategy. Mr Lawrence explained about the wider benefits of having an Energy from Waste facility and noted that it could improve people's lives by providing low carbon energy and heat to many residents. He explained that the project was a key element to heat Aberdeen and had direct employment opportunities.

Heidi Thorsdalen, Amec Foster Wheeler, acting on behalf of the applicant, explained that an extensive site search had been undertaken and this site was selected as the preferred site. Ms Thorsdalen advised that a comprehensive application and transport study had been submitted, and SEPA had confirmed they were satisfied with various assessments including the Odour Assessment. A Health Impact Assessment had also been submitted and accepted and the increase in road capacity also accepted by the Council. Ms Thorsdalen intimated that there would not be a significant increase in HGV vehicles as most of the vehicles going to the site would be ACC vehicles and these are already in operation throughout the city.

In regards to the design, Ms Thorsdalen explained that it was a functional design, with tapered elevation and inward facing lighting and it was hoped that it would create a positive impact in the area in the future. The benefits of the proposal were also highlighted as (a) affordable heat for residents, (b) low carbon energy, (c) economic investment, (d) economic diversity and (e) it would rejuvenate East Tullos.

Peter Lawrence provided information on the coastal haar that is present within Torry and he explained that they had undertaken modelling regarding the coastal effects and

it concluded that it would have a low level effect. Mr Lawrence also explained that should the plant need to cease its operation for any reason, it can be shut down very quickly.

In conclusion, Mr Lawrence advised that recycling throughout Scotland was changing, and there was to be a ban on biodegradable waste by January 2020. As a result, the Council had to look at different ways of getting rid of waste and noted that with this facility value such as heat could be generated from the waste, through Aberdeen Heat and Power. Affordable heat could be offered to those who need it. It was also noted that they had consulted with the local community and Community Council's regarding the proposed application.

Members then asked questions of Mr Peter Lawrence and Ms Heidi Thorsdalen, and the following information was noted:-

- The building stack would be 80metres high and the applicant would like the building to be an asset to the city;
- A scoping exercise was carried out to see which various locations throughout Aberdeen the stack would be visible from;
- In regards to the visual impact, the size has been reduced;
- Infrared lighting would be on the stack, however officers have asked the applicant for a red light to be included as not all planes use infrared;
- In regards to the ammonia storage, it was noted that this was for the gas treatment and it commonly used in plants throughout the UK;
- Regarding the control of odour, it was noted that waste vehicles are sheeted and controlled and also have to comply with various regulations;
- Should the plant have to close down due to omissions etc, it would not affect the heat and power as there is constant monitoring and also the waste within the bunker would continue to burn. Householders would not see any change.
- The waste is burned at over 800 degrees and management controls in place should it need to shut down.
- Around 20 jobs would be created and apprentices will be offered.
- Regarding traffic, a traffic impact assessment was carried out and no problems were identified at the junction. It was noted that on a Saturday, very little waste will be accepted to the site, to help minimize traffic.
- When the landfill site ban comes into place in 2020, should this development not go ahead, the other option for waste is to be transported somewhere else in Scotland, at a significantly high cost;
- There was scope for a visitor centre within the facility;
- Less than 10 vehicles would visit the site per hour on average over the 24 hour period;
- Regarding the amount of houses the facility could help heat, it was noted that initially it would be 350 houses with a view to increasing to in excess of 4-5000 homes, and this would help to deliver on a Scottish Government target;
- An environmental impact statement was carried out independently;
- The Council are in the process of purchasing the site;
- In regards to community consultation, it was noted that there were 2 days of exhibitions and questionnaires were also distributed. They acted on feedback received and changed the design to curved due to the feedback. A subsequent set of consultation was then carried out in 3 sessions, however the attendance was lower at these events;

- 100 people attended the initial events with 60 responses submitted, 30 people said yes to the facility and 28 said no, with 1 unsure;
- Consultation undertaken with Community Councils and a Stakeholder Working Group was established following this, which includes members of the Council, SEPA and members of Community Councils, with meetings taking place regularly. The group had a site visit to a similar plant in Shetland and also one in England;
- It was noted that the use of the rail had been investigated for transporting waste but it was not viable;
- In regards to the proposed site, it was noted that various other sites were looked at and considered including sites out with the city boundaries, however the further away the plant is located the harder it is to provide the heat and to satisfy the permit regarding SEPA.

The Convener then advised that there would be a joint presentation from the four community Councils and welcomed **Mr David Fryer, Secretary, Torry Community Council**, to address the Committee and he did so in the following terms:-

Mr Fryer advised that he had brought written objections and evidence for the Planning Officers which contained independent reports from many sources including the World Health Organisation on the harmful emissions from incinerators, as well as other evidenced references from the internet on incineration, temperature inversion and health impacts. He indicated that the information provided within the application was incomplete and flawed and there was no requirement for an incinerator. He advised that there were real concerns that the proposed facility was to be built near a primary school in a residential area of Torry. He explained that there was nothing new about incinerators and that across the world they were now banning them. He made reference to the Aberdeen Local Development Plan and advised that reusing and recycling was a key national strategy in the Scottish Planning Policy. He intimated that the toxic waste coming from the proposed facility was extremely harmful and hazardous and would create health issues for future generations. He indicated that the chimney stack was high because it needed to vent harmful gases, however the sea haar would create an artificial ceiling and prevent many of the harmful gases from escaping. He sought to determine what the cost of the facility would be as this information was not in the public domain.

David Fryer also showed a power point video of the anticipated emissions from the proposed incinerator.

The Convener then welcomed **Father George, Planning Officer, Kincorth and Leggart Community Council**, to address the Committee and he did so in the following terms:-

Father George advised that there were no guarantees that emissions from the incinerator would remain static and within the government guidelines. He explained that there would be approximately 112 additional vehicles travelling on Wellington Road which would increase pollution. He made reference to the damage and effects caused by air pollution and contamination, specifically with regard to miscarriages, child birth defects, an increase in children suffering from asthma, diabetes and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). He indicated that he was astonished to learn that the incinerator was proposed to be built near a primary school. He explained that the

vulnerable (children, older people and people with chronic health problems) would suffer the most harm and those living in deprived areas which often have higher levels of air pollution were at risk. He advised that several pollutants that cause environmental damage are also toxic to our bodies and those people living in Torry with COPD could not go outside because of the high levels of pollution in the area. He intimated that the annual mortality burden in the UK from exposure to outdoor air pollution was equivalent to around 40,000 deaths. He advised that air pollution monitoring by central and local government must track exposure to harmful pollutants in major urban areas and near schools and the results should be communicated proactively to the public, in a clear way that everyone can understand. He accepted that there was a need for progress, but not at the expense and detriment of the wellbeing of the local community. He intimated that to appreciate fully the risk to health, there was a need for further research on air pollution's effects on the body and in addition to lung and cardiovascular disease, research into the adverse health effects of pollution should accommodate systemic effects such as obesity, diabetes, changes linked to dementia, cancer as well as on the developing fetes and in early childhood. He intimated that the Council needed to guarantee that there were no health ramifications to those living in the area as this would lead to environmental health litigation. He concluded by advising that he was yet to see scientific statistics proving that the incinerator emissions would be safe for the environment.

The Convener then welcomed **Alan Strachan, Chairman of Nigg Community Council**, to address the Committee and he did so in the following terms:-

Mr Strachan advised that he wished to convey the concerns of Nigg Community Council relating to the Incinerator with particular attention being paid to the surrounding local infrastructure. He made reference to the partial gridlock on Wellington Road during peak periods and the cumulative effect that additional ongoing major developments would have on the current road infrastructure linking to Wellington Road, namely 600+ houses in Cove, 1200 homes and commercial opportunities in Loirston, the AWPR due for completion in 2017, the new academy at Calder Park and the new proposed Harbour at Bay of Nigg. He explained that the expected increase in traffic from these developments alone raises the potential risk of additional congestion, traffic volume and emissions on Wellington Road. He indicated that the plant's operating requirements would have to be sourced and transported from the city, Aberdeenshire and Moray which would equate to an estimated 200 vehicle movements per day, most of which would be HGV vehicles. He intimated that long term exposure to air pollution increases the risks of having a heart attack and it is accepted that the highest risk to respiratory complications such as asthma and COPD and general well-being comes from vehicle emissions, in particular from diesel fumes. He made reference to the Council's Air Quality Annual Progress report (Local Air Quality Management, June 2016) wherein it stated "the main pollutants of concern in Aberdeen City were Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) and particulate Matter (PM₁₀) related to road traffic emissions". Reference was also made to a Project Report (Vehicle Emission Measurement and Analysis – Aberdeen City Council, April 2016) which highlighted "Road transport is the main source is the pollution in UK urban areas" and stated that "Modern diesel vehicle emission controls, under-perform in urban driving conditions when exhaust gasses from the engine are relatively cool, inhibiting the operation of catalysts and filters. Such stop/start traffic motions are common place in the streets of our towns and cities, but aren't adequately represented in the legislated vehicle emission standard test conditions". He indicated that given the number of significant planning applications which have been approved or still under consideration for the area, it must be accepted

that the volume of traffic was likely to generate an increase on the potential risk of additional congestion and already high level of pollution on Wellington Road.

Mr Strachan intimated that it is the view of Nigg Community Council that the present usage and configuration of the current road infrastructure along the Wellington corridor was outdated and inadequate to cope with the Energy from Waste's rise in vehicular traffic wishing to access and egress the East Tullos Industrial Estate safely on a daily basis, which would lead to constant start/stop movements of queuing vehicles, furthering a rise in harmful emissions within the area. He concluded by advising that if this application was to be approved, the possible long term effects on health and quality of life of all citizens remain unknown and immeasurable.

The Convener then welcomed **Raymond Clarke, Vice Chairman of Cove and Altens Community Council**, to address the Committee and he did so in the following terms:-

Mr Clarke advised that he opposed the proposal for an incinerator. He made reference to a meeting two years ago attended by representatives from the four community councils, which discussed the concerns of local residents in relation to the impact the traffic on the Wellington Road corridor was having on the environment, this being prior to the proposal for the incinerator being submitted. He indicated that he was concerned by the way the shareholder group was being run, specifically regarding the economic issues and the business viability study for the district heating plan scheme which he requested some time ago but only received recently from Peter Lawrence. He advised that many health issue questions still required to be answered and he urged all councillors to receive clarification in this regard. He intimated that the incinerator was now deemed to be 'old technology' which has been tweaked and updated, but in relation to the very real emissions coming from it, there was nothing more important than personal health. He concluded by asking the Councillors to leave their mark and to reject the project which would affect the whole of Aberdeen.

Members then asked questions of the representatives from the four Community Councils, and the following information was noted:-

- that there was a need to educate the residents of Aberdeen in relation to recycling;
- there was a need to drive down the volume of waste; and
- that Sweden leads the way in Europe for recycling and energy from waste;
- that a number of people in Torry did not know about the public exhibitions and events.

The Convener then welcomed **John Webb**, resident living in Torry to address the Committee and he did so in the following terms:-

Mr Webb advised that he lives approximately 1km from the proposed development and that he wished to object to the application in the strongest possible terms. He indicated that he was a firm believer that local authorities have a duty to protect the health and wellbeing of ratepayers including those living in Torry and the surrounding areas. He indicated that the aforementioned area already suffers from a poorly regulated and degraded environment which was impacted by poor air quality, noise, high levels of traffic, contaminated land and a heavily polluted watercourse. The proposed development would add to this burden and act to further increase levels of environmental inequality. He made reference to the horrors of the industrial revolution

and indicated that now, in the 21st Century, the impacts of hazardous pollutants such as PCB's, heavy metals, fine particulates and a wide range of other contaminants generated by waste incineration (with or without heat exchanger) on human health and the environment were well known. He intimated that the concept of the proposal to site the incinerator near the bottom of a valley adjacent to a long established residential community (including nurseries, schools and care homes) was environmentally and socially regressive, reckless crass and ridiculous. He made reference to his own health and advised that the discharges from the chimney stack would constitute a significant environmental threat to his own health and the members of other vulnerable groups living in the area. He indicated that the application was deficient and should be rejected on the following grounds:-

- the Air Quality Assessment Technical report which covered so called 'worst case scenarios' but did not cover potential impacts of a temperature inversion in the valley;
- the pollutant dispersion modelling has been based upon climatic metrics recorded at Dyce (11km away). No on-site measurements were made neither were smoke/tracer dispersal work undertaken;
- the application does not discount the possibility of burning sewage sludge, agricultural and forestry derived waste and materials brought in from even more regions of Scotland, the UK and abroad;
- the applicant's community consultation and events constituted a new low in the dark arts of gloss, spin and distortion. The consultation process was well below the standards that should be expected from local authority (the applicant) that was supposedly acting in the public interest;
- the site selection criteria/ranking exercise used was biased and prejudicial, suggesting perhaps that from the outset, it was designed to deliver the proposed development at a 'soft' location offering 'least resistance'; and
- the net energy output (and inputs) of the proposed development including the proposed supply operation from the point of waste collection, have not been adequately considered.

Mr Webb advised that the proposed design of the incinerator was hideously ugly, obtrusive and overbearing. He advised that the suggestion that it should be illuminated at night was particularly insensitive and provocative and the key arguments underpinning the proposed stack should be thoroughly scrutinised. Finally he questioned whether the applicant has the necessary mandate(s) to willfully pollute and further degrade Torry and surrounding areas by the industrial-scale incineration of waste trucked in from areas out with its jurisdiction.

The Hearing was then shown a video presentation from **Mike Maas-Lowit** in the following terms:-

Mr Maas-Lowit advised that in 2012 the European Parliament determined EU resolution on a more resource efficient Europe and within that they had determined the phasing out of incinerators by 2020. He explained that following on from that it is rather difficult to say anything definite about the situation in Europe just now, but a couple of permutations are that by the time the proposed incinerator is built and 2020 comes around we will not yet have left Europe and Scotland may be making a bid to join Europe. He advised that we seem to be charging ahead with building an incinerator, ignoring the European resolution, ignoring the GAIA study in 2013 that suggested that the UK has a greater incinerator capacity currently than it has to generate waste in

which to burn. He indicated that if Scotland stays in the UK the proposed incinerator would not be needed because elsewhere people are burning more waste which we could transport to them, and if we remain in Europe or we don't exit it, we will be building an incinerator which the European Parliament has determined should be phased out by 2020. He intimated that the European MSPs did not take lightly the decision to make this resolution; they based it on greater environmental evidence than Aberdeen has based its determination to build an incinerator, that evidence with the 2008 resolution means that incinerators are not good for the environment.

The Convener then welcomed **Alastair Spence, Planning Officer, Torry Community Council** to address the Committee and he did so in the following terms:-

Mr Spence advised that the incinerator was not just a Torry concern, but it was a serious concern not only to the south of the Dee, but for the whole city and beyond Westhill and Dyce. He indicated that it would affect the shipping anchored offshore waiting to enter the harbour and up until recently he had not known about temperature inversion or the plume effect. He intimated that at the last stakeholders meeting, two gentlemen each gave a 20 minute talk about the problems they have had in Runcorn with their incinerator. Over the past two years, we have been offered trips to Norway and Shetland to visit plants, although we refused. We requested that a visit be made to the Runcorn facility instead, however this request was rejected.

The Convener then welcomed **Helen McPherson, resident in Cove**, to address the Committee and she did so in the following terms:-

Ms McPherson advised that at the moment the Council do not recycle as much as it should, specifically with containers containing fruit and vegetables which are usually made with PET or PVC plastic. She indicated that it would be much better if residents were to receive a wheelie bin to put all the recycling into and that it get separated at the recycling plant rather than incinerated, causing smog and pollution. She intimated that if the incinerator is built in the proposed location, it would be used to burn the majority of waste instead of making the effort to recycle it. Ms McPherson advised that she had concerns in relation to vermin (rats, mice, seagulls and insects) and how they would be kept under control when the rubbish was decomposing during storage whilst waiting to be incinerated. She made reference to the weather conditions and coastal effects when there is low pressure causing colder weather and more rain, and this combined with the emissions from the incinerator would result in poor air quality. She intimated that it was a human right to have clean air not contaminated with fumes containing heavy metals and other chemicals which the public would be exposed to. She explained that the direction of the wind usually comes from south east, and if the energy from waste plant was relocated to the north of Aberdeen, there would then be little pollution and risk from the fumes for those living in the city. She indicated that it was unfair that the residents from Cove did not receive a mail drop providing information regarding the public meetings. She concluded by advising that it had taken 16 years and £12m to reduce the foul odour from the sewage plant at the bay of Nigg with the promise that there would not be foul odours coming from it, however she indicated that she visited the location 2 days ago and the odour had still not been resolved, therefore how could we trust that the proposed development won't produce pollution and whether it would be monitored properly.

The Convener then welcomed **Simon McLean**, to address the Committee and he did so in the following terms:-

Mr Mclean made reference to the Planning, Development Management Committee meeting of 14th January 2016 advising that the view that the proposed development was not welcomed by the local residents was not included within the report. He indicated that the photographs/pictures of the proposed incinerator did not show the nearby school. He intimated that some of the concerns raised were not all detailed and the development should not happen anywhere in Aberdeen. He outlined his concerns in relation to security at the site, specifically whether terrorism issues have been addressed given that the facility may be used as a dirty bomb. He made reference to the cost of construction and the initial option was that the incinerator was to be built in the Bridge of Don, however the land was not for sale. He made reference to an anonymised leaflet which was posted through his letterbox which purported to say that the development would be going through and referred to a similar quote from an elected member at Stakeholder meeting. In conclusion, Mr McLean advised that all information should be considered and Councillors should be thinking about clean air for our children.

Members then asked further questions, and the following information was noted:-

- that confirmation was needed in relation to alleged legislation that apparently seeks to ban incinerators; and
- that there were 44 sites looked at over a number of years, prior to deciding (through criteria) that East Tullos was the preferred location for the proposed incinerator.

The Convener thanked all those who participated in the public hearing and advised that the points raised today would be addressed in the report for determination.

- **Councillor Ramsay Milne, Convener**

This page is intentionally left blank